



THE ROYAL BOROUGH OF
KINGSTON
UPON THAMES

**Royal Borough of Kingston upon
Thames**

**Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation
Needs Assessment (GTANA)**

Final Report

September 2018



Opinion Research Services, The Strand, Swansea, SA1 1AF
Steve Jarman, Claire Thomas and Ciara Small
enquiries: 01792 535300 · info@ors.org.uk · www.ors.org.uk

© Copyright September 2018

Contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v 3.0

Contains OS Data © Crown Copyright (2018)

Contents

1. Executive Summary	6
Introduction and Methodology	6
Key Findings.....	6
Additional Pitch Needs – Gypsies and Travellers	6
Additional Plot Needs - Travelling Showpeople	8
Transit Recommendations	8
Implications of Changes to Government Guidance	9
2. Introduction	10
Definitions	10
The Planning Definition in PPTS (2015)	10
Definition of Travelling.....	11
Legislation and Guidance for Gypsies and Travellers.....	13
PPTS (2015).....	13
3. Methodology	15
Background.....	15
Glossary of Terms	15
Desk-Based Review	16
Stakeholder Engagement	16
Working Collaboratively with Neighbouring Planning Authorities	16
Survey of Travelling Communities.....	16
Engagement with Bricks and Mortar Households.....	18
Timing of the Fieldwork.....	19
Applying the Planning Definition.....	20
Unknown Households	21
Households that Do Not Meet the Planning Definition	22
Calculating Current and Future Need.....	23
Pitch Turnover	24
Transit Provision.....	24
4. Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople Sites & Population	15
Introduction.....	15
Sites and Yards in Kingston upon Thames.....	16
Traveller Caravan Count.....	16
5. Stakeholder Engagement	17
Introduction.....	17
Views of Council Officers in Kingston upon Thames.....	17

Neighbouring Authorities	17
Elmbridge Borough Council	20
Epsom & Ewell Borough Council	21
London Borough of Merton.....	22
Mole Valley District Council	23
Borough of Richmond upon Thames.....	24
London Borough of Sutton	25
London Borough of Wandsworth.....	25
6. Survey of Travelling Communities	27
Interviews with Gypsies and Travellers.....	27
Interviews with Gypsies and Travellers in Bricks and Mortar	28
7. Current and Future Pitch Provision.....	29
Introduction.....	29
New Household Formation Rates	29
Breakdown by 5 Year Bands	31
Applying the Planning Definition.....	31
Pitch Needs – Gypsies and Travellers that meet the Planning Definition.....	33
Pitch Needs – Unknown Gypsies and Travellers	33
Pitch Needs - Gypsies and Travellers that do not meet the Planning Definition	34
Plot Needs – Travelling Showpeople	35
Transit Recommendations	36
8. Conclusions	37
Gypsies and Travellers.....	37
Travelling Showpeople	37
Transit Provision.....	37
Summary of Need to be Addressed	37
Implications of Changes to Government Guidance	38

List of Figures39

Appendix A: Glossary of Terms40

Appendix B: Unknown Households42

Appendix C: Households that do not meet the Planning Definition44

Appendix D: Sites and Yards Lists (March 2018).....46

Appendix E: Household Interview Questions47

Appendix F: Technical Note on Household Formation and Growth Rates.....56

1. Executive Summary

Introduction and Methodology

- 1.1 The primary objective of this Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA) is to provide a robust assessment of current and future need for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation in the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames (RBK). As well as updating previous GTANAs, another key reason for completing the study was the publication of a revised version of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) in August 2015. This included a change to the definition of Travellers for planning purposes. The key change that was made was the removal of the term persons “...who have ceased to travel permanently”, meaning that those who have ceased to travel permanently will not now fall under the planning definition of a Traveller for the purposes of assessing accommodation need in a GTANA (see Paragraph 2.7 for the full definition).
- 1.2 The GTANA provides a credible evidence base which can be used to aid the implementation of Development Plan policies and the provision of new Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots for the period up to 2041 to fit in with the RBK Local Plan period. The outcomes of this study supersede the outcomes of any previous GTANAs completed in RBK.
- 1.3 The GTANA has sought to understand the accommodation needs of the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population in RBK through a combination of desk-based research, stakeholder interviews and engagement with members of the travelling community living on all known sites and yards. A total of 30 interviews were completed with Gypsies and Travellers. There were no Travelling Showpeople identified. Despite the efforts that were made it was not possible to identify any households to interview that were living in bricks and mortar.
- 1.4 The fieldwork for the study was completed between February and March 2018. The baseline date for the study is March 2018 which was when the majority of the household interviews were completed.

Key Findings

Additional Pitch Needs – Gypsies and Travellers

- 1.5 Overall the additional pitch needs for Gypsies and Travellers from 2018-2041 are set out below. Additional needs are set out for those households that meet the planning definition of a Gypsy or Traveller; for those unknown households¹ where an interview was not able to be completed (either due to households refusing to be interviewed, or not being present despite up to three visits to each pitch) who may meet the planning definition; and for those households that do not meet the planning definition – although this is not now a requirement for a GTANA.
- 1.6 Only the need from those households who meet the planning definition and from those unknown households who subsequently demonstrate that they meet it should be formally considered as need arising from the GTANA.

¹See Paragraph 3.22 for further information on unknown households.

- 1.7 The need arising from households that meet the planning definition should be addressed through site allocation/intensification/expansion Local Plan policies.
- 1.8 The Council will need to carefully consider how to address the needs associated with unknown Travellers as it is unlikely that all of this need will have to be addressed through the provision of conditioned² Gypsy or Traveller pitches. In terms of Local Plan Policies, the Council should consider the use of a criteria-based policy (as suggested in PPTS) for any unknown households, as opposed to making a specific allocation in Local Plan Policies.
- 1.9 In general terms, the need for those households who do not meet the planning definition will be addressed as part of general housing need and through separate Local Plan Policies (including any plans that have already been adopted, as all Travellers will have been included as part of the overall Objectively Assessed Need - OAN).
- 1.10 This approach is specifically referenced in the revised National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018). Paragraph 60 of the NPPF sets out that in determining the minimum number of homes needed, strategic plans should be based upon a local housing need assessment conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance. Paragraph 61 then states that *'Within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes'*. The footnote to this section states that *'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites sets out how travellers' housing needs should be assessed for those covered by the definition in Annex 1 of that document.'*
- 1.11 It is recognised that the Council already have in place an adopted Core Strategy that sets out overall housing need. When this plan is reviewed, or a new plan prepared, the findings of this report should be considered as part of future housing mix and type within the context of the assessment of overall housing need.
- 1.12 There were 18 Gypsy or Traveller households identified in RBK that meet the planning definition, 6 unknown households that may meet the planning definition and 12 households that do not meet the planning definition.
- 1.13 There is a need for **44 additional pitches** for households that meet the planning definition. This is made up of current need from 6 concealed or doubled-up households or adults and 13 households on unauthorised pitches. There is a future need from 8 teenage children who will be in need of a pitch of their own in the next 5 years and 17 additional pitches as a result of new household formation using a formation rate of 1.90% derived from the household demographics.
- 1.14 There is a need for up to 7 additional pitches for unknown households and this is made up of 1 unauthorised pitch, 2 concealed or doubled-up households or single adults, 2 households in need of a pitch of their own in the next 5 years (whilst interviews were not completed with these households it was possible to identify concealed households and 5 year need from other sources), and 2 pitches from new household formation using the ORS national formation rate of 1.50%. If the ORS national average³ of 25% were applied this could result in a need for 2 additional pitches. Whilst the proportion of households in RBK that meet the planning definition (60%) is higher than 25% this is based on a small household base, it is therefore felt that it would be more appropriate to consider the more statistically

² Pitches with specific planning conditions restricting occupation to Gypsies and Travellers as defined by Annex 1 in PPTS (2015).

³ Based on over 3,500 interviews completed by ORS across England.

robust ORS national figure. However, if the locally derived proportion were to be applied this could result in a need for 4 additional pitches.

- 1.15 Whilst not now a requirement to include in a GTANA, there is a need for 23 additional pitches for households that do not meet the planning definition. This is made up of 2 households who are living on unauthorised pitches, 7 concealed or doubled-up households or adults, 2 for teenagers who will be in need of a pitch of their own in the next 5 years, and 12 from new household formation using a formation rate of 2.00% derived from the household demographics.

Figure 1 – Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households in RBK (2018-2041)

Status	Total
Meet Planning Definition	44
Unknown	0-7 (25% = 2)
Do not meet Planning Definition	23

Figure 2 – Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households in RBK that meet the Planning Definition

Years	0-5	5-10	10-15	15-20	20-22	Total
	2018-23	2023-28	2028-2033	2033-38	2038-41	
	30	3	4	5	2	44

Additional Plot Needs - Travelling Showpeople

- 1.16 There were no Travelling Showpeople identified in RBK so there is no current or future need for additional plots over the GTANA period to 2041. Any planning applications that are submitted to the Council should be dealt with through the development management system.

Transit Recommendations

- 1.17 Whilst there is some evidence of a small number of unauthorised encampments in RBK in recent years, it is recommended that there is currently no need to provide any new transit pitches at this time. It is also recommended that the situation relating to levels of unauthorised encampments should be monitored whilst any potential changes associated with PPTS (2015) develop.
- 1.18 As well as information on the size and duration of the encampments, this monitoring should also seek to gather information from residents on the reasons for their stay in RBK; whether they have a permanent base or where they have travelled from; whether they have any need or preference to settle permanently in RBK; and whether their travelling is a result of changes to PPTS (2015). This information should be collected as part of a Welfare Assessment (or equivalent).
- 1.19 A review of unauthorised encampments, including the monitoring referred to above, should be undertaken once there is a sufficient evidence base following the changes to PPTS in 2015. This will establish whether there is a need for investment in any formal transit sites or emergency stopping places, or whether a managed approach is preferable.
- 1.20 In the short-term, the Council should consider the use of management arrangements for dealing with unauthorised encampments and could also consider the use of Negotiated Stopping Agreements, as opposed to taking forward an infrastructure-based approach. The term ‘negotiated stopping’ is used to describe agreed short-term provision for Gypsy and Traveller caravans. It does not describe permanent ‘built’ transit sites but negotiated agreements which allow caravans to be sited on suitable specific pieces of ground for an agreed and limited period of time, with the provision of limited services such as

water, waste disposal and toilets. Agreements are made between the authority and the (temporary) residents regarding expectations on both sides.

- ^{1.21} Temporary stopping places can be made available at times of increased demand due to fairs or cultural celebrations that are attended by Gypsies and Travellers. A charge may be levied as determined by the local authority although they only need to provide basic facilities including: a cold-water supply; portaloos; sewerage disposal point and refuse disposal facilities.

Implications of Changes to Government Guidance

- ^{1.22} A Judicial Review of the new planning definition started in September 2017 but had not yet been determined at the time of this report. The review is seeking to reinstate the former planning definition of a Traveller, so it will include households that have ceased to travel permanently.
- ^{1.23} Should this review be successful a proportion of those households that do not meet the current planning definition may meet the definition if they can demonstrate that they have ceased to travel permanently but have travelled for work in the past. However, given that the previous Housing Definition of a Traveller was repealed by the Housing and Planning Act (2016) it is unlikely that all of the households that do not meet the current Planning Definition will meet the previous Planning Definition.
- ^{1.24} In addition, the Draft London Plan (December 2017) is proposing to introduce a different definition of a Traveller for planning purposes. This is very similar to the repealed Housing Definition in that it would also include households that have not travelled for work providing that they live in a caravan. Should this definition be adopted it is likely that all households in RBK would meet it and total need will be for **74 additional pitches** plus any additional need arising from households living in bricks and mortar.

2. Introduction

- 2.1 The primary objective of this Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTANA) is to provide a robust assessment of current and future need for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation in the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames (RBK). The outcomes of the study will supersede the outcomes of any previous Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessments completed in RBK.
- 2.2 The study provides an evidence base to enable the Council to comply with their requirements towards Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople under the Housing Act 1985, Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) 2014, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) 2015, the Housing and Planning Act (2016) and the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018.
- 2.3 The GTANA provides a robust assessment of need for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation in the study area. It is a credible evidence base which can be used to aid the implementation of Development Plan Policies and the provision of Traveller pitches and plots covering the period 2018 to 2041. As well as identifying current and future permanent accommodation needs, it also seeks to identify any need for the provision of transit pitches or emergency stopping places.
- 2.4 We would note at the outset that the study covers the needs of Gypsies (including English, Scottish, Welsh and Romany Gypsies), Irish Travellers, New (Age) Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, but for ease of reference we have referred to the study as a Gypsy and Traveller (and Travelling Showpeople) Accommodation Needs Assessment (GTANA).
- 2.5 The baseline date for the study is March 2018, which was when the majority of the household interviews were completed.

Definitions

- 2.6 The planning definition for a Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showperson is set out in PPTS (2015). The previous definition set out in the Housing Act (2004) was repealed by the Housing and Planning Act (2016).

The Planning Definition in PPTS (2015)

- 2.7 For the purposes of the planning system, the definition was changed in PPTS (2015). The planning definition is set out in Annex 1 and states that:

For the purposes of this planning policy “gypsies and travellers” means:

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, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.

In determining whether persons are “gypsies and travellers” for the purposes of this planning policy, consideration should be given to the following issues amongst other relevant matters:

- a) *Whether they previously led a nomadic habit of life.*
- b) *The reasons for ceasing their nomadic habit of life.*

c) *Whether there is an intention of living a nomadic habit of life in the future, and if so, how soon and in what circumstances.*

For the purposes of this planning policy, “travelling showpeople” means:

Members of a group organised 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, but excludes Gypsies and Travellers as defined above.

(Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), August 2015)

- 2.8 The key change that was made to both definitions was the removal of the term *persons...who have ceased to travel permanently*, meaning that those who have ceased to travel permanently will no longer fall under the planning definition of a Traveller for the purposes of assessing accommodation need in a GTANA.
- 2.9 A Judicial Review of the new definition started in September 2017 but had not yet been determined at the time of this report.

Definition of Travelling

- 2.10 One of the most important questions that GTANAs will need to address in terms of applying the planning definition is *what constitutes travelling?* This has been determined through case law that has tested the meaning of the term ‘*nomadic*’.
- 2.11 **R v South Hams Borough Council (1994)** – defined Gypsies as “persons who wander or travel for the purpose of making or seeking their livelihood (not persons who travel from place to place without any connection between their movements and their means of livelihood.)” This includes ‘born’ Gypsies and Travellers as well as ‘elective’ Travellers such as New Age Travellers.
- 2.12 In **Maidstone BC v Secretary of State for the Environment and Dunn (2006)**, it was held that a Romany Gypsy who bred horses and travelled to horse fairs at Appleby, Stow-in-the-Wold and the New Forest, where he bought and sold horses, and who remained away from his permanent site for up to two months of the year, at least partly in connection with this traditional Gypsy activity, was entitled to be accorded Gypsy status.
- 2.13 In **Greenwich LBC v Powell (1989)**, Lord Bridge of Harwich stated that a person could be a statutory Gypsy if he led a nomadic way of life *only seasonally*.
- 2.14 The definition was widened further by the decision in **R v Shropshire CC ex p Bungay (1990)**. The case concerned a Gypsy family that had not travelled for some 15 years in order to care for its elderly and infirm parents. An aggrieved resident living in the area of the family’s recently approved Gypsy site sought judicial review of the local authority’s decision to accept that the family had retained their Gypsy status even though they had not travelled for some considerable time. Dismissing the claim, the judge held that a person could remain a Gypsy even if he or she did not travel, provided that their nomadism was held in abeyance and not abandoned.
- 2.15 That point was revisited in the case of **Hearne v National Assembly for Wales (1999)**, where a traditional Gypsy was held not to be a Gypsy for the purposes of planning law as he had stated that he intended to

abandon his nomadic habit of life, lived in a permanent dwelling and was taking a course that led to permanent employment.

- 2.16 **Wrexham County Borough Council v National Assembly of Wales and Others (2003)** determined that households and individuals could continue to lead a nomadic way of life with a permanent base from which they set out from and return to.
- 2.17 The implication of these rulings in terms of applying the planning definition is that it will only include **those who travel (or have ceased to travel temporarily) for work purposes, or for seeking work, and in doing so stay away from their usual place of residence**. It can include those who have a permanent site or place of residence, but that it will not include those who travel for purposes other than work – such as holidays and visiting friends or relatives. It will also not cover those who commute to work daily from a permanent place of residence (see APP/E2205/C/15/3137477).
- 2.18 It may also be that within a household some family members travel for nomadic purposes on a regular basis, but other family members stay at home to look after children in education, or other dependents with health problems etc. In these circumstances, the household unit would be defined as travelling for the purposes of this GTANA.
- 2.19 Households will also fall under the planning definition if they can demonstrate that they have ceased to travel temporarily as a result of their own or their family's or dependants' educational, health needs or old age. In order to have ceased to travel temporarily these households will need to demonstrate that household members have travelled for work purposes in the past and that household members plan to travel again for work purposes in the future.
- 2.20 This approach was endorsed by a Planning Inspector in a Decision Notice for an appeal in East Hertfordshire (Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/W/16/3145267) that was issued in December 2016. A summary can be seen below.

Case law, including the R v South Hams Borough Council ex parte Gibb (1994) judgment referred to me at the hearing, despite its reference to 'purposive activities including work' also refers to a connection between the travelling and the means of livelihood, that is, an economic purpose. In this regard, there is no economic purpose... This situation is no different from that of many landlords and property investors or indeed anyone travelling to work in a fixed, pre-arranged location. In this regard there is not an essential connection between wandering and work... Whilst there does appear to be some connection between the travel and the work in this regard, it seems to me that these periods of travel for economic purposes are very short, amounting to an extremely small proportion of his time and income. Furthermore, the work is not carried out in a nomadic manner because it seems likely that it is done by appointment... I conclude, therefore, that XX does not meet the definition of a gypsy and traveller in terms of planning policy because there is insufficient evidence that he is currently a person of a nomadic habit of life.

- 2.21 This was further reinforced in a more recent Decision Notice for an appeal in Norfolk that was issued in February 2018 (Ref: APP/V2635/W/17/3180533) that stated:

As discussed during the hearing, although the PPTS does not spell this [the planning definition] out, it has been established in case law (R v South Hams DC 1994) that the nomadism must have an economic purpose. In other words, gypsies and travellers wander or travel for the purposes of making or seeking their livelihood.

Legislation and Guidance for Gypsies and Travellers

^{2.22} Decision-making for policy concerning Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sits within a complex legislative and national policy framework and this study must be viewed in the context of this legislation and guidance. For example, the following key pieces of legislation and guidance are relevant when developing policies relating to Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople:

- » The Housing and Planning Act, 2016
- » Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS), 2015
- » National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2018
- » Planning Practice Guidance⁴ (PPG), 2014

^{2.23} The primary guidance for undertaking the assessment of housing need for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople is set out in PPTS (2015). It should be read in conjunction with the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In addition, the Housing and Planning Act (2016) makes provisions for the assessment of need for those Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople households living on sites and yards who do not meet the planning definition – through the assessment of all households living in caravans.

PPTS (2015)

^{2.24} PPTS (2015) sets out the direction of Government policy. As well as introducing the planning definition of a Traveller, PPTS is closely linked to the NPPF. Among other objectives, the aims of the policy in respect of Traveller sites are (PPTS Paragraph 4):

- » *Local planning authorities should make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning.*
- » *To ensure that local planning authorities, working collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites.*
- » *To encourage local planning authorities to plan for sites over a reasonable timescale.*
- » *That plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development.*
- » *To promote more private Traveller site provision while recognising that there will always be those Travellers who cannot provide their own sites.*
- » *That plan-making and decision-taking should aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments and make enforcement more effective.*
- » *For local planning authorities to ensure that their Local Plan includes fair, realistic and inclusive policies.*
- » *To increase the number of Traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply.*
- » *To reduce tensions between settled and Traveller communities in plan-making and planning decisions.*
- » *To enable provision of suitable accommodation from which Travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure.*

⁴With particular reference to the sections on Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessments

- » *For local planning authorities to have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.*

2.25 In practice, the document states that (PPTS Paragraph 9):

- » *Local planning authorities should set pitch targets for Gypsies and Travellers and plot targets for Travelling Showpeople, which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of Travellers in their area, working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities.*

2.26 PPTS goes on to state (Paragraph 10) that in producing their Local Plan local planning authorities should:

- » *Identify and annually update a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of sites against their locally set targets.*
- » *Identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15.*
- » *Consider production of joint development plans that set targets on a cross-authority basis, to provide more flexibility in identifying sites, particularly if a local planning authority has special or strict planning constraints across its area (local planning authorities have a Duty-to-Cooperate on strategic planning issues that cross administrative boundaries).*
- » *Relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density.*
- » *Protect local amenity and environment.*

2.27 Local Authorities now have a duty to ensure a 5-year land supply to meet the identified needs for Traveller sites. However, 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' also notes in Paragraph 11 that:

- » *Where there is no identified need, criteria-based policies should be included to provide a basis for decisions in case applications nevertheless come forward. Criteria-based policies should be fair and should facilitate the traditional and nomadic life of Travellers, while respecting the interests of the settled community.*

Revised National Planning Policy Framework (2018)

2.28 The revised National Planning Policy Framework was issued in July 2018. Paragraph 60 of the revised NPPF sets out that in determining the minimum number of homes needed, strategic plans should be based upon a local housing need assessment conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance.

2.29 Paragraph 61 then states that '*Within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes*'. The footnote to this section states that '*Planning Policy for Traveller Sites sets out how travellers' housing needs should be assessed for those covered by the definition in Annex 1 of that document.*'

2.30 This essentially sets out that the needs of households that meet the planning definition should be assessed under the PPTS and that the needs of households that are not found to meet the planning definition should be assessed as part of the wider housing needs of an area.

3. Methodology

Background

- 3.1 Over the past 10 years, ORS has continually refined a methodology for undertaking robust and defensible Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessments. This has been updated in light of the introduction of the PPG in 2014, changes to PPTS in August 2015, the Housing and Planning Act (2016) and the revised NPPF (2018). It has also responded to changes set out by Planning Ministers, with particular reference to new household formation rates. This is an evolving methodology that has been adaptive to changes in planning policy as well as the outcomes of Local Plan Examinations and Planning Appeals.
- 3.2 PPTS (2015) contains a number of requirements for local authorities which must be addressed in any methodology. This includes the need to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities (including discussing travellers' accommodation needs with travellers themselves); identification of permanent and transit site accommodation needs separately; working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities; and establishing whether households fall within the planning definition for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
- 3.3 The approach currently used by ORS was considered in April 2016 and July 2017 by the Planning Inspector for the Cheltenham, Gloucester and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy. She concluded in her final Examination Report that was published in October 2017:

'The methodology behind this assessment incorporates a full demographic study of all occupied pitches, a comprehensive effort to undertake interviews with Gypsy and Traveller households, and consideration of the implications of the new national policy. I am satisfied that the GTAA provides a robust and credible evidence base and I accept its findings.'

- 3.4 In addition, whilst there was a subsequent Holding Direction issued by the Secretary of State, the Inspector for the East Herts District Plan also found the evidence base in relation to Gypsies and Travellers to be sound in her Inspection Report that was issued in July 2018. She concluded:

The need of the travelling community has been carefully and robustly assessed and locations to meet identified needs have been allocated for the plan period. Policy HOU9 sets out the need for 5 permanent pitches for Gypsies and Travellers... the approach to the provision of housing is comprehensive, positively prepared, appropriate to the needs of the area and consistent with national policy.

- 3.5 The stages below provide a summary of the methodology that was used to complete this study. More information on each stage is provided in the appropriate sections of this report.

Glossary of Terms

- 3.6 A Glossary of Terms can be found in **Appendix A**.

Desk-Based Review

- 3.7 ORS collated a range of secondary data that was used to support the study. This included:
- » Census data.
 - » Traveller Caravan Count data.
 - » Records of authorised sites.
 - » Records of unauthorised sites/encampments.
 - » Information on planning applications/appeals.
 - » Information on enforcement actions.
 - » Previous Needs Assessments and other relevant local studies.
 - » Existing national and local policy, guidance and best practice.

Stakeholder Engagement

- 3.8 Engagement was undertaken with key Council Officers and with wider stakeholders through telephone interviews. A total of 6 interviews were completed with Council Officers from the study area. A detailed topic guide was agreed with the Council.

Working Collaboratively with Neighbouring Planning Authorities

- 3.9 To help support the Duty-to-Cooperate and provide background information for the study, telephone interviews were conducted with Planning Officers in neighbouring planning authorities. These interviews will help to ensure that wider issues that may impact on this project are fully understood. This included interviews with Officers from the Councils set out below. Again, a detailed topic guide was agreed with the Council.
- » Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - » Epsom & Ewell Borough Council.
 - » London Borough of Merton.
 - » Mole Valley District Council.
 - » London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.
 - » London Borough of Sutton.
 - » London Borough of Wandsworth.

Survey of Travelling Communities

- 3.10 Through the desk-based research and the stakeholder interviews, ORS sought to identify all authorised and unauthorised sites/yards and encampments in the study area and attempted to complete an interview with the residents on all occupied pitches and plots. In order to gather the robust information needed to assess households against the planning definition of a Traveller up to 3 visits were made to households where it was not initially possible to conduct an interview because they were not available at the time.

- 3.11 Our experience suggests that an attempt to interview households on all pitches is more robust. A sample-based approach often leads to an under-estimate of need – and is an approach which is regularly challenged by the Planning Inspectorate at Planning Appeals and Local Plan Examinations.
- 3.12 ORS worked closely with the Council to ensure that the interviews collected all the necessary information to support the study. The household interview questions that were used (see **Appendix E**) have been updated to take account of recent changes to PPTS and to collect the information ORS feel is necessary to apply the planning definition. All sites (no Showmen’s yards were identified) were visited by members of ORS’ team of experienced Researchers who work on GTANA studies across England and Wales. Researchers attempted to conduct semi-structured interviews with residents to determine their current demographic characteristics; their current and future accommodation needs; whether there is any over-crowding or the presence of concealed or doubled-up households or single adults; and their travelling characteristics. Researchers sought to identify contacts living in bricks and mortar to interview, as well as an overall assessment of each site to determine any opportunities for intensification or expansion to meet current and future needs.
- 3.13 Researchers also sought information from residents on the type of pitches they may require in the future – for example private or socially rented, together with any features they may wish to be provided on a new pitch or site.
- 3.14 Where it was not possible to undertake an interview, Researchers sought to capture as much information as possible about each pitch from sources including neighbouring residents and site management (if present).
- 3.15 Researchers also distributed copies of an information leaflet that was prepared by Friends, Families and Travellers explaining the reasons for the need to complete the household interview as part of the GTANA process.

Figure 3 – Friends, Families and Travellers Leaflet

fft
Friends Families and Travellers

We are writing to you from Friends, Families and Travellers (FFT) a national charity working on behalf of Gypsies and Travellers
www.gypsy-traveller.org

MORE PITCHES PLEASE!

Councils are currently carrying out new Accommodation Needs Assessments. The assessments are being done to work out if there is a need for more Gypsy/Traveller sites in your area and it is really important that you take part in the process so that your Council identifies the true level of need for sites in your area.

Your council will almost certainly employ consultants to carry out the assessment and you will probably be asked to complete a questionnaire.

How you answer the assessment questions is really important as it will affect the number of pitches required in an area.

Questions about traveling are particularly important.

In 2015 the Government changed the planning definition of what it means to be a 'Gypsy or Traveller' and it now reads as follows:

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, but excluding members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.

This means that if you have completely stopped travelling, even if it is as a result of ill-health or old age or because you care for people who are too old or too ill to travel then you will be unlikely to meet the planning definition and any need you or your dependants have for a caravan site will no longer be included in the Council's assessment of its need for Gypsy/Traveller sites in your area.

fft
Friends Families and Travellers

fft
Friends Families and Travellers

If you want to speak to us further please do not hesitate to call
FFT on 01273 234 777 or your local Gypsy/Traveller group.

! So, if you are still travelling for work, even if it is only for part the year or in order to buy and sell goods at any of the traditional horse fairs etc. then it is essential you make that clear to your Council when it assesses its need for sites in your area.

We have already seen some examples of questionnaires being used by consultants to assess needs and have some concerns about the way in which the questions have been worded and the limited space on forms to give answers.

For example, on a form produced by ORS questionnaire there is a section in the questionnaire about travelling (Section F) which could cause people to give misleading answers.

For example, one question asks 'How many trips you have made in the last 12 months' If you answer '0' to this question then you will probably not be deemed a Gypsy or Traveller according to the new planning definition, so don't forget to include trips such as for work, looking for work, going to horse fairs etc.

Another question asks 'When did you stop travelling' Please think carefully before answering such a question. Have you stopped travelling for good? If so then you could be judged not to be a Gypsy or Traveller in planning terms.

Another question asks 'Have you or family members ever travelled?' If you answer 'No' to this question then you will be probably be judged not to be a Gypsy or Traveller in planning terms. So again don't forget to include trips looking for work, visiting horse fairs etc.

Finally, a question asks 'Do family members plan to travel in the future?' Again, please bear in mind that if you answer 'No' you will be judged not to be a Gypsy or Traveller in planning terms, so think carefully about whether you are ever likely to be travelling again in the future.

Engagement with Bricks and Mortar Households

- 3.16 The 2011 Census recorded 31 households that identified as Gypsy or Irish Travellers who live in a house or flat in RBK.
- 3.17 ORS apply a rigorous approach to making contact with bricks and mortar households as this is a common issue raised at Local Plan Examinations and Planning Appeals. Contacts were sought through a range of sources including the interviews with people on existing sites, intelligence from the stakeholder interviews, information from housing registers and other local knowledge from stakeholders and adverts on social media (including the Friends, Families and Travellers Facebook page). Through this approach ORS endeavoured to do everything within our means to give households living in bricks and mortar the opportunity to make their views known to us.
- 3.18 The following additional approach was also undertaken locally to identify potential households to interview in the RBK area:
- » A letter was sent to 15 households living in bricks and mortar accommodation who had indicated to the Council previously that they were members of the Travelling Community. Not all of these households were on the waiting list for the public site.
- 3.19 As a rule, ORS do not make any assumptions on the overall needs from household in bricks and mortar based on the outcomes of any interviews that are completed as, in our experience, this leads to a significant over-estimate of the number of households wishing to move to a site or a yard. The assumption is made that all those wishing to move will make their views known based on the wide range of publicity that has been put in place. Thus, ORS are seeking to shift the burden of responsibility on to those living in bricks and mortar through demonstrating extensive efforts to make them aware of the study.

Figure 4 – Bricks and Mortar Advert



Friends, Families and Travellers

29 January · 🌐



ORS would like to speak to anyone interested in developing a site or yard or who is living in bricks and mortar who would prefer to live on a site or yard in #Arun, #Adur, #Barnet, #Brent, #CheshireEast, #CheshireWest, #Chester, #Chichester, #Dacorum, #Ealing, #Gravesham, #Halton, #Harrow, #Hillingdon, #Hounslow, #KingstonUponThames #Medway, #MoleValley, #Runnymede, #Spelthorne, #StAlbans, #SurreyHeath, #Warrington, #Watford and #Worthing

This is part of a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments in these areas. Here are some details on what that means and advice on what questions you might be asked: <https://www.gypsy-traveller.org/.../answer-gypsy-traveller-a.../>



Opinion Research Services
Excellent research for the public, voluntary and private sectors

Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessments

Opinion Research Services (ORS) is an independent research company who carry out Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessments across the country. These assessments must be carried out by every council to inform them how many new pitches and plots will need to be provided in the future.

ORS would like to speak to Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople who are looking to develop a site or yard or who live in bricks and mortar and would prefer to live on a site or yard in any of the following areas:

Arun, Adur, Cheshire East, Cheshire West and Chester, Chichester, Dacorum, Gravesham, Halton, Hounslow, Kingston upon Thames Medway, Mole Valley, Runnymede, Spelthorne, St Albans, Surrey Heath, Runnymede, Warrington, Watford and Worthing

Your views are very important to us.

For additional advice from Friends, Families and Travellers on the Needs Assessment process please visit http://www.gypsy-traveller.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/GTAA-leaflet-A4_v5.pdf

If you would like to speak to ORS about your accommodation needs please contact **Claire Thomas** on **01792 535337**

Timing of the Fieldwork

- 3.20 ORS are fully aware of the transient nature of many travelling communities and subsequent seasonal variations in site and yard occupancy. As such, all of the fieldwork was undertaken during the non-travelling season, and also avoided days of known local or national events. The fieldwork was completed between February and March 2018.

Applying the Planning Definition

- 3.21 The primary change introduced by PPTS (2015) in relation to the assessment of need was the change in the definition of a Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showperson for planning purposes. Through the site interviews, ORS sought to collect information necessary to assess each household against the planning definition. The relatively short time since the publication of PPTS (2015) has meant that only a small number of relevant appeal decisions have been issued by the Planning Inspectorate on how the planning definition should be applied (see Paragraphs 2.20 and 2.21 for examples). These decisions support the view that households need to be able to demonstrate that they **travel for work purposes, or for seeking work, and stay away from their usual place of residence when doing so, or have ceased to travel temporarily due to education, ill health or old age** to meet the planning definition.
- 3.22 The household survey included a section of structured questions to record information about the travelling characteristics of household members. This included questions on the following key issues:
- » Whether any household members have travelled in the past 12 months.
 - » Which household members had travelled.
 - » Whether household members have ever travelled.
 - » The reasons for travelling – carefully probing visits to fairs to determine whether for work or cultural purposes.
 - » Where household members travelled to.
 - » The times of the year that household members travelled.
 - » Where household members stay when they are away travelling.
 - » When household members stopped travelling.
 - » The reasons why household members stopped travelling.
 - » Whether household members intend to travel again in the future.
 - » When and the reasons why household members plan to travel again in the future.
- 3.23 When the household interviews were completed, the answers from these questions on travelling were used to determine the status of each household against the planning definition in PPTS (2015). Through a combination of responses, households needed to provide sufficient information to demonstrate that household members travel for work purposes, or for seeking work, and in doing so stay away from their usual place of residence, or that they have ceased to travel temporarily due to education, ill health or old age, and plan to travel again for work purposes in the future.
- 3.24 Households that need to be considered in the GTANA fall under one of three classifications. Only those households that meet, or may meet, the planning definition will form the formal components of need to be included in the GTANA:
- » Households that travel under the planning definition;
 - » Households that have ceased to travel temporarily under the planning definition; and
 - » Households where an interview was not possible who may fall under the planning definition.

- 3.25 Whilst the needs of those households that do not meet the planning definition do not need to be formally included in the GTANA, they have been assessed to provide the Council with components of need to consider as part of their work on wider housing needs assessments.

Unknown Households

- 3.26 As well as calculating need for households that meet the planning definition, the needs of the households where an interview was not completed (either due to refusal to be interviewed or households that were not present during the fieldwork period) need to be assessed as part of the GTANA where they are believed to be Gypsies and Travellers who *may* meet the planning definition. Whilst there is no guidance that sets out how the needs of these households should be addressed; an approach has been taken that seeks an estimate of potential need from these households. This will be an additional need figure over and above the need identified for households that do meet the planning definition⁵.
- 3.27 The estimate seeks to identify potential current and future need from any pitches known to be temporary or unauthorised, and through new household formation. For the latter the ORS national rate of 1.50%⁶ has been used as the demographics of residents are unknown.
- 3.28 Should further information be made available to the Council that will allow for the planning definition to be applied, these households could either form a confirmed component of need to be addressed in through the GTANA or through wider assessments of housing need.
- 3.29 ORS are of the opinion that it would not be appropriate when producing a robust assessment of need to make any firm assumptions about whether or not households where an interview was not completed meet the planning definition based on the outcomes of households where an interview was completed.
- 3.30 However, data that has been collected from over 3,500 household interviews that have been completed by ORS across England since the changes to PPTS in 2015 suggests that, overall, approximately 25% of households who have been interviewed meet the planning definition – and in some local authorities, particularly London Boroughs, no households meet the planning definition.
- 3.31 ORS are not implying that this is an official national statistic - rather a national statistic based on the outcomes of ORS fieldwork since the introduction of PPTS (2015). It is estimated that there are up to 14,000 Gypsy and Traveller pitches in England. ORS have interviewed households on 25% of these pitches at a representative range of sites. Of the households that have been interviewed, approximately 25% meet the planning definition. ORS also asked similar questions on travelling in over 2,500 pre-PPTS (2015) household interviews and also found that approximately 10% of households would have met the PPTS (2015) planning definition. It is ORS' view therefore that this is the most comprehensive national statistic in relation to households that meet the planning definition in PPTS (2015) and should be seen as a robust statistical figure.
- 3.32 This would suggest that it is likely that only a proportion of the potential need identified from unknown households will need conditioned Gypsy and Traveller pitches, and that the needs of

⁵ Plus any additional unidentifiable need arising from concealed or doubled-up households or adults and 5 year need from teenage children.

⁶ See Chapter 5.

the majority will need to be addressed through separate Local Plan Policies. An assessment of need for unknown Travellers can be found in **Appendix B**.

3.33 The ORS methodology to address the need arising from unknown households was supported by the Planning Inspector for a Local Plan Examination for Maldon Borough Council, Essex. In his Report that was published on 29th June 2017 he concluded:

150. The Council's stance is that any need arising from 'unknowns' should be a matter left to the planning application process. Modifications to Policy H6 have been put forward by the Council setting out criteria for such a purpose, which I consider further below. To my mind, that is an appropriate approach. While there remains a possibility that up to 10 further pitches may be needed, that cannot be said to represent identified need. It would be unreasonable to demand that the Plan provide for needs that have not been established to exist. That being said, **MM242h** is nonetheless necessary in this regard. It commits the Council to a review of the Plan if future reviews of the GTAA reveal the necessity for land allocations to provide for presently 'unknown' needs. For effectiveness, I have altered this modification from the version put forward by the Council by replacing the word "may" with "will" in relation to undertaking the review committed to. I have also replaced "the Plan" with "Policy H6" – the whole Plan need not be reviewed.

Households that Do Not Meet the Planning Definition

3.34 Households who do not travel for work fall outside the planning definition of a Traveller. However Romany Gypsies, Irish and Scottish Travellers may be able to claim a right to culturally appropriate accommodation under the Equality Act (2010). In addition, provisions set out in the Housing and Planning Act (2016) now include a duty (under Section 8 of the 1985 Housing Act that covers the requirement for a periodical review of housing needs) for local authorities to consider the needs of people residing in or resorting to their district with respect to the provision of sites on which caravans can be stationed, or places on inland waterways where houseboats can be moored. Draft Guidance⁷ related to this section of the Act has been published setting out how the government would want local housing authorities to undertake this assessment and it is the same as the GTANA assessment process. The implication is therefore that the housing needs of any Gypsy and Traveller households who do not meet the planning definition of a Traveller will need to be assessed as part of the wider housing needs of the area and will form a subset of the wider need arising from households residing in or resorting to caravans. This is echoed in the revised NPPF (July 2018).

3.35 Paragraph 61 of the revised NPPF states that '*Within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people wishing to commission or build their own homes*'. The footnote to this section states that '*Planning Policy for Traveller Sites sets out how travellers' housing needs should be assessed for those covered by the definition in Annex 1 of that document.*'

3.36 An assessment of need for Travellers that do not meet the planning definition can be found in **Appendix C**.

⁷ Draft guidance to local housing authorities on the periodical review of housing needs for caravans and houseboats. (March 2016)

Calculating Current and Future Need

3.37 To identify need, PPTS (2015) requires an assessment for current and future pitch requirements but does not provide a methodology for this. However, as with any housing assessment, the underlying calculation can be broken down into a relatively small number of factors. In this case, the key issue is to compare the supply of pitches available for occupation with the current and future needs of the population.

Supply of Pitches

3.38 The first stage of the assessment sought to determine the number of occupied, vacant and potentially available supply in the study area:

- » Current vacant pitches.
- » Pitches currently with planning consent due to be developed within 5 years.
- » Pitches vacated by people moving to housing.
- » Pitches vacated by people moving from the study area (out-migration).

3.39 It is important when seeking to identify supply from vacant pitches that they are in fact available for general occupation – i.e. on a public or socially rented site, or on a private site that is run on a commercial basis with anyone being able to rent a pitch if they are available. Typically, vacant pitches on small private family sites are not included as components of available supply but can be used to meet any current and future need arising from the family living on the site.

Current Need

3.40 The second stage sought to identify components of current need, which is not necessarily the need for additional pitches because they may be able to be addressed by space already available in the study area. This is made up of the following:

- » Households on unauthorised developments for which planning permission is not expected.
- » Concealed, doubled-up or over-crowded households (including single adults).
- » Households in bricks and mortar wishing to move to sites.
- » Households in need on waiting lists for public sites.

Future Need

3.41 The final stage was to identify components of future need. This includes the following four components:

- » Teenage children in need of a pitch of their own in the next 5 years.
- » Households living on sites with temporary planning permission.
- » New household formation.
- » In-migration.

3.42 Household formation rates are often the subject of challenge at appeals or examinations. ORS firmly believe that any household formation rates should use a robust *local* evidence base, rather than simply relying on precedent. The approach taken is set out in more detail later in this report.

- 3.43 All of these components of supply and need are presented in tabular format which identify the overall net need for current and future accommodation for both Gypsies and Travellers. This has proven to be a robust model for identifying needs. The residential and transit pitch needs for Gypsies and Travellers are identified separately and the needs are identified in 5-year periods to 2041.

Pitch Turnover

- 3.44 Some assessments of need make use of pitch turnover as an ongoing component of supply. ORS do not agree with this approach or about making any assumptions about annual turnover rates. This approach frequently ends up significantly under-estimating need as, in the majority of cases, vacant pitches on sites are not available to meet any additional need. The use of pitch turnover has been the subject of a number of Inspectors Decisions, for example APP/J3720/A/13/2208767 found a GTANA to be unsound when using pitch turnover and concluded:

West Oxfordshire Council relies on a GTAA published in 2013. This identifies an immediate need for 6 additional pitches. However, the GTAA methodology treats pitch turnover as a component of supply. This is only the case if there is net outward migration, yet no such scenario is apparent in West Oxfordshire. Based on the evidence before me I consider the underlying criticism of the GTAA to be justified and that unmet need is likely to be higher than that in the findings in the GTAA.

- 3.45 In addition, a GTANA Best Practice Guide produced jointly by organisations including Friends, Families and Travellers, the London Gypsy and Traveller Unit, the York Travellers Trust, the Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group, Garden Court Chambers and Leeds GATE concluded that:

Assessments involving any form of pitch turnover in their supply relies upon making assumptions; a practice best avoided. Turnover is naturally very difficult to assess accurately and in practice does not contribute meaningfully to additional supply so should be very carefully assessed in line with local trends. Mainstream housing assessments are not based on the assumption that turnover within the existing stock can provide for general housing needs.

- 3.46 As such, other than current vacant pitches on sites that are known to be available, or pitches that are known to become available through the household interviews, pitch turnover has not been considered as a component of supply in this GTANA.

Transit Provision

- 3.47 PPTS also requires an assessment of the need for any transit sites or stopping places. While the majority of Gypsies, Travellers have permanent bases either on Gypsy and Traveller sites or in bricks and mortar and no longer travel, other members of the community either travel permanently or for part of the year. Due to the mobile nature of the population, a range of sites or management approaches can be developed to accommodate Gypsies and Travellers as they move through different areas, including:

- » Transit sites
- » Temporary (seasonal) sites
- » Temporary/Emergency stopping places
- » Negotiated Stopping Agreements

^{3.48} In order to investigate the potential need for transit provision when undertaking work to support the study, ORS sought to undertake analysis of any records of unauthorised sites and encampments, as well as information from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG⁸) Traveller Caravan Count. The outcomes of discussions with Council Officers and Officers from neighbouring planning authorities were also taken into consideration when determining this element of need in the study area.

⁸ Formerly the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG).

4. Gypsy, Traveller & Travelling Showpeople Sites & Population

Introduction

- 4.1 One of the main considerations of this study is to provide evidence to support the provision of pitches and plots to meet the current and future accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. A pitch is an area normally occupied by one household, which typically contains enough space for one or two caravans but can vary in size⁹. A site is a collection of pitches which form a development for Gypsies and Travellers. For Travelling Showpeople, the most common descriptions used are a plot for the space occupied by one household and a yard for a collection of plots which are occupied by Travelling Showpeople. Throughout this study, the main focus is on how many extra pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and plots for Travelling Showpeople are required in the study area.
- 4.2 The public and private provision of mainstream housing is also largely mirrored when considering Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. One common form of a Gypsy and Traveller site is the publicly-provided residential site, which is provided by a Local Authority or by a Registered Provider (usually a Housing Association). Pitches on public sites can be obtained through signing up to a waiting list, and the costs of running the sites are met from the rent paid by the tenants (similar to social housing).
- 4.3 The alternative to public residential sites are private residential sites and yards for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. These result from individuals or families buying areas of land and then obtaining planning permission to live on them. Households can also rent pitches on existing private sites. Therefore, these two forms of accommodation are the equivalent to private ownership and renting for those who live in bricks and mortar housing. Generally, the majority of Travelling Showpeople yards are privately owned and managed.
- 4.4 The Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population also has other forms of sites due to its mobile nature. Transit sites tend to contain many of the same facilities as a residential site, except that there is a maximum period of residence which can vary from a few days or weeks to a period of months. An alternative to a transit site is an emergency or negotiated stopping place. This type of site also has restrictions on the length of time someone can stay on it, but has much more limited facilities. Both of these two types of site are designed to accommodate, for a temporary period, Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople whilst they travel. A number of authorities also operate an accepted encampments policy where short-term stopovers are tolerated without enforcement action.
- 4.5 Further considerations for the Gypsy and Traveller population are unauthorised developments and encampments. Unauthorised developments occur on land which is owned by the Gypsies

⁹ Whilst it has now been withdrawn, *Government Guidance on Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites* recommended that, as a general guide, an average family pitch must be capable of accommodating an amenity building, a large trailer and touring caravan, parking space for two vehicles and a small garden area.

and Travellers or with the approval of the land owner, but for which they do not have planning permission to use for residential purposes. Unauthorised encampments typically occur on publicly owned land but can also occur on privately owned land.

Sites and Yards in RBK

- 4.6 In RBK, at the base date for the GTANA, there was 1 public site with planning permission for 18 pitches; 1 private site with permanent planning permission for 1 pitch; and 5 unauthorised sites with 16 pitches. There were no Travelling Showpeople yards or transit pitches identified. See **Appendix D** for further details.

Figure 5 - Total amount of provision in RBK (November 2017)

Category	Sites/Yards	Pitches/Plots
Public sites	1	18
Private with permanent planning permission	1	1
Private with temporary planning permission	0	0
Sites tolerated for planning purposes	0	0
Unauthorised sites	5	16
Transit sites	0	0
Travelling Showpeople yards	0	0

MHCLG Traveller Caravan Count

- 4.7 Another source of information available on the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population is the bi-annual Traveller Caravan Count which is conducted by each Local Authority in England on a specific date in January and July of each year and reported to MHCLG. This is a statistical count of the number of caravans on both authorised and unauthorised sites across England. With effect from July 2013, the count was renamed the Traveller Caravan Count due to the inclusion of data on Travelling Showpeople.
- 4.8 As this count is of caravans and not households, it makes it more difficult to interpret for a study such as this because it does not count pitches or resident households. The count is merely a 'snapshot in time' conducted by the Local Authority on a specific day, and any unauthorised sites or encampments which occur on other dates will not be recorded. Likewise, any caravans that are away from sites on the day of the count will not be included. As such it is not considered appropriate to use the outcomes from the Traveller Caravan Count in the calculation of current and future need as the information collected during the site visits is seen as more robust and fit-for-purpose. However, the Traveller Caravan Count data has been used to *support* the identification of the need to provide for transit provision and this is set out later in this report.

5. Stakeholder Engagement

Introduction

- 5.1 To be consistent with the guidance set out in PPTS (2015) and the methodology used in other GTANA studies, ORS undertook a stakeholder engagement programme to complement the information gathered through interviews with members of the Travelling Community. This consultation took the form of telephone interviews which were tailored to the role of the individual.
- 5.2 The aim of these interviews was to provide an understanding of: current provision and possible future need; short-term encampments; transit provision; and cross-border issues.
- 5.3 Six interviews were undertaken with Council Officers from the study area.
- 5.4 As stated in the PPTS (2015), Local Authorities have a duty to cooperate on strategic planning issues that cross administrative boundaries (S.110 Localism Act 2011). In order to explore issues relating to cross boundary working, ORS interviewed a Planning Officer from 7 neighbouring local authorities:
- » Elmbridge Borough Council
 - » Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
 - » London Borough of Merton
 - » Mole Valley District Council
 - » London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
 - » London Borough of Sutton
 - » London Borough of Wandsworth
- 5.5 Due to issues surrounding data protection, and in order to protect the anonymity of those who took part, this section presents a summary of the views expressed by interviewees and verbatim comments have not been used.
- 5.6 The chapter sets out the response from key stakeholders and Council Officers from the study area and neighbouring authorities. The views expressed in this section of the report represent a balanced summary of the views expressed by stakeholders, and on the views of the individuals concerned, rather than the official policy of their Council or organisation.

Views of Council Officers in RBK

- 5.7 Similar to a number of London Boroughs, the London-wide GTAA undertaken in 2008 was the last full assessment that has been carried out. This set targets for each London Borough but most of these were never acted upon. The Council has not completed a formal GTANA but the Core Strategy which was adopted in 2012 said that it would do a specific Traveller Sites DPD, and as a result some work was begun but was never finalised and a Traveller Sites DPD was not progressed.

Accommodation Needs

- 5.8 There is one public site in the area. The Council received a DCLG grant in 2012 to refurbish and reconfigure the site at Swallow Park and as a result the number of pitches increased from 15 to 18. However, this did not meet any additional need, and simply addressed the overcrowding on the site at that time. Since 2012 it has been suggested that overcrowding is once again becoming an issue, and one officer was aware of pitches which are doubled-up and situations whereby there are several generations of family living on a pitch. Indeed, this situation has had a detrimental impact on familial relationships with some children being asked to leave by their parents.
- 5.9 Positively, the site is considered to be of a good quality, and during the refurbishment all the utility blocks were replaced.
- 5.10 There are a number of private sites in the area (some with planning permission and some unauthorised) and it is acknowledged that there is no suitable alternative provision within the borough. There are also a lot of younger children on the sites and it is recognised that this will have an effect on the new household formation rate in the assessment.
- 5.11 It is felt that there is a clear need for further accommodation (public and private) and the forthcoming Local Plan will consider allocating sites to meet needs. However, it was explained that this will be extremely difficult given the public site cannot physically be extended as it is surrounded by development; there is a lack of available land in which to meet needs; and the undeveloped area of RBK is mostly either Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land where there is clear direction from the Government and Mayor to protect against development. In a recent 'Call for Sites' only one site was put forward and that was an existing unauthorised site, in the Green Belt, which was subject to enforcement measures.
- 5.12 One officer said that many of those currently living on unauthorised sites are suffering from mental health issues as a result of facing an uncertain future. The officer was of the view that there is unsureness amongst the younger generation of what to do now, and what to expect going forward and that there is a lack of confidence because there is not enough provision for them to live in a way that meets their cultural heritage. Now, when children are getting married, there are many more moving away and out of the Borough and have gone to go and live with other relatives which has been hard on the parents they are leaving behind.
- 5.13 One officer added that the Council are not meeting the needs of the Traveller population and the same can be said of housing needs of the general population. It is understood that this is the case for most local authorities, but the Council is doing their best in very difficult circumstances.
- 5.14 There are no Travelling Showpeople currently living the area.

Bricks and Mortar

- 5.15 There is a low turnover of pitches on the public site and although there are one or two older families their likely intention is to pass their pitches down to other family members. It is understood that there is only 1 household the waiting list for the site.
- 5.16 An officer has been involved in several homelessness applications which have occurred because there is not enough space on the public site, and residents have been forced into bricks and mortar accommodation.

Short-term Encampments and Transit Provision

- 5.17 Given the small number of encampments, in 2016 the responsibility for managing them was taken over by the team located in the London Borough of Wandsworth who have been successful in deterring encampments in this area (from April 2017 up until 2018 there have not been any encampments in Wandsworth).
- 5.18 In Kingston there were three encampments between August and September 2017. However, an officer with responsibility for managing encampments currently could not say whether this has been an increase or decrease from previous years. Travellers are said to be usually moving through the area mainly looking for employment opportunities and do not appear to be looking for more permanent accommodation.
- 5.19 It was felt that a good management procedure is now in place and it was explained that when an encampment occurs the officer will go along and meet with the Travellers to ascertain how long they will be staying and undertake a welfare needs assessment and then pass this information onto decision makers.
- 5.20 There were two well-known occurrences of encampments which resulted from a funeral and another event which attracted a lot of media attention. A popular Traveller event is the Epsom Derby which takes place in the neighbouring area Epsom and Ewell; however, this currently seems to be well managed and doesn't seem to result in any encampments in Kingston.
- 5.21 There was a difference of opinion about transit provision and one officer said that there is no need for any transit provision, but rather better prevention to protect vulnerable areas and to ensure vehicle gates are not left open. Other officers interviewed however felt there should be some provision; one officer felt that there should be a transit site located in the general area (not necessarily in RBK) and explained that the nearest transit could be as far away as Brighton which is a two-hour drive away but said that it is unlikely that any Council would volunteer to manage a transit site in their area.

Cross Border Issues and Meeting the Duty to Cooperate

- 5.22 The Council does meet with neighbouring authorities to discuss cross-border issues, including in relation to Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, but no solution has yet been found to meet unmet need across the wider sub-region. The Council does provide input into Local Plan preparation of neighbouring authorities and provides responses to formal consultation documents. In relation to Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, it is quite common to get requests for unmet need to be met within RBK. For example, in relation to the preparation of the new Sutton Local Plan such a request was made and in response it was made clear that there was not felt to have capacity in RBK to assist Sutton's unmet need.
- 5.23 An officer from RBK recently attended a London Gypsies and Travellers Forum event, which included a discussion with GLA officers responsible for the Gypsy and Traveller policy in the draft new London Plan. From this, the officer was of the view that the Mayor does not want to take on the responsibility for producing the need figures and is directing boroughs to meet that need.
- 5.24 One of the officers was of the view that the planning system prevents the needs of the travelling community to be met, particularly in areas with Green Belt like outer London Boroughs. Given the clear policy direction, the Council does not encourage and tends to refuse applications for new sites in the Green Belt.

Neighbouring Authorities

Elmbridge Borough Council

5.25 With regard to **overall accommodation need** in Elmbridge, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » In Elmbridge there is 1 public site (16 pitches); 6 private sites (21 pitches); 1 site with temporary permission (4 pitches); and 1 private Travelling Showpeople yard with 1 plot. There does also appear to be some unauthorised transit provision.
- » An appeal was recently dismissed for one site with two unauthorised pitches.
- » Elmbridge commissioned ORS to undertake an accommodation needs assessment which was completed in February 2017. The study identified a need of seven to nine additional pitches for the period 2017-2035. The previous identified need was 36 additional pitches, so due to the application of the new definition, the need has significantly reduced.
- » The authority has since gone out to consultation on the Local Plan Strategic Options Document in December 2016 and the Council had made a commitment to find more pitches and sites. In terms of the non-travelling travellers the intention is to include it as part of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment figure and look to provide some form of suitable accommodation as part of that and there are currently debates about what that actually entails – the current thinking is that it would be some form of mobile home type of accommodation. The authority will be undertaking a call for sites and the officer explained that sites which are brought forward are usually for bricks and mortar accommodation, so they will also explore opportunities to develop public land.
- » The 2013 GTAA recommended that there was not any need for the Council to consider providing a transit site due to very low numbers of unauthorised encampments. The 2017 GTAA concluded that whilst there has been an increase in the number of encampments recently, the situation relating to levels of unauthorised encampments should be continually monitored whilst any potential changes associated with the new PPTS develop. During the GTAA fieldwork some residential sites were providing pitches for travellers in transit and the Council are looking into this, and to explore whether some of these could provide the residential/mobile home park type of provision.

5.26 With regard to the subject of **cross border issues and the Duty to Cooperate**, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » The officer was not aware of any significant cross border issues and explained that whilst Gypsies and Travellers do cross boundaries, these don't tend to be with RBK but more with Runnymede and Spelthorne and people travelling up beyond Surrey. All authorities are said to be dealing with the same issues and have the same constraints.
- » The officer was of the view that a Surrey-wide GTAA would have been beneficial, and it would have picked up any cross-border issues. That said the officer felt that it had been helpful that the majority of Surrey authorities are using a consistent

GTAA methodology and was of the view that this was a good example of good practice.

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council

^{5.27} With regard to **overall accommodation need** in Epsom & Ewell, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » There are two sites within the Borough of Epsom & Ewell. One managed by the Borough's Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer has doubling-up and is slightly over capacity. The other site, managed by Surrey County Council, accommodates members of an extended family, and it would be difficult to accommodate Travellers from outside of that particular family. This is also at capacity.
- » There are no private sites in the area.
- » There are a number of housed Travellers known to the Council and they have not expressed any interest to live on a Traveller site.
- » There is one privately owned Travelling Showpeople yard in the Borough. It is understood that the residents are retired although there is still machinery stored on the site.
- » No expressions of interest have been received from the community to develop any private sites or yards.
- » It would be difficult for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling showpeople to purchase land speculatively as land values are very high. The officer suspected that the Borough's detachment from the wider strategic road network means it is not as ideal a location for Travelling Showpeople as some of the neighbouring boroughs. There is also a scarcity of industrial estates in the borough, which tend to be favoured by Showpeople for yards.
- » The Borough provides a temporary transit site (236 caravans) for two weeks for those attending the annual Epsom Derby, said to function quite well.
- » Outside of the Derby time period, the officer noted that encampments are limited and usually amount to one encampment per annum, the low level likely to be due to the lack of access to the wider strategic road network. Encampments usually occur on a vacant, unsecure site and so the main reason for these encampments appears to be opportunism. The number of encampments appears to have risen in the last few years.
- » The Borough reviewed its GTAA in June 2017 in light of the changes to the planning definition. The study found that need is exclusively for affordable or public provision. Most of the need comes from the growing families on the current sites, new household formations and overcrowding.
- » The Assessment identified a need for 27 pitches and zero Travelling Showpeople plots over the period 2017-2032. Of these 14 pitches are needed in the first five years to 2022. This equates to an annualised requirement of 1.8 pitches and zero plots. There is no identified need for transit accommodation over the period 2017-2032.

- » Upon application of the new planning definition, it was concluded that none of the need for new additional pitches is for 'Gypsies and Travellers'- as defined by National Planning Policy. As a consequence, the Assessment identifies that there is no requirement for new additional pitches to meet the accommodation needs of the local Gypsy and Traveller communities.
- » Nevertheless, the Council has a duty to consider the accommodation needs of 'caravan dwellers' or 'non-travelling Gypsies' in the Borough. Consequently, the pitch requirement identified should be considered within the Local Plan making process.

5.28 With regard to the subject of **cross border issues and the Duty to Cooperate**, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » The Duty to Cooperate is ambiguous and local authorities are left to interpret what is required to meet the duty. There is recognition that the problems associated with the Duty are not due to local authorities and the responsibilities for those problems and insufficiencies lies elsewhere.
- » Taking part in the GTAA study via an interview constituted good practice rather than the Duty to Cooperate. For example, the Local Strategic Statement currently being prepared by Surrey authorities highlights the type of work that needs to be undertaken to demonstrate the Duty to Cooperate, although this work should go further and could include meeting need sub-regionally and the location of sites. Similarly, they expected engagement on this study to be only one part of a wider conversation about meeting traveller needs.
- » The need within Epsom & Ewell is familial and historic; meeting needs via affordable accommodation is important but delivery is constrained by the size of the Borough and the lack of available and deliverable sites. As such, the main cross-border issue is to ensure Epsom & Ewell works with its neighbours (Royal Borough of Kingston, Mole Valley and Reigate & Banstead) to meet local needs sustainably. The possibility of opportunities for provision in those locations is a consideration which merits further discussion.

London Borough of Merton

5.29 With regard to **overall accommodation need** in Merton, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » The officer representing the London Borough of Merton referred to the existence of a council-owned 15 pitch site. With the help of government funding the site was improved four years ago and each pitch has been provided with a shower and toilet block as previously there were only two on site.

5.30 With regard to the subject of **cross border issues and the Duty to Cooperate**, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » The Officer was not aware of any cross-boundary issues and was not aware that the site in RBK is near the border with Merton.

- » The Borough is part of the South West London Partnership which is a housing strategy group but there is scope to discuss matters related to Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.
- » The Officer felt it would be beneficial to share good practice and methodologies and explained it would be useful to share ways in which other areas have identified Travellers in bricks and mortar.

Mole Valley District Council

5.31 With regard to **overall accommodation need** in Mole Valley, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » Within the District there are four public sites with a total of 21 pitches which are managed by Surrey County Council. There are seven privately owned sites which have 17 pitches between them. One of the private sites is occupied under a temporary planning permission, which expires in June 2020.
- » There are three yards for Travelling Showpeople.
- » Council policy favours smaller sites; on average sites contain one to four pitches, the largest site in the area is a public site with 11 pitches.
- » The 2009 Core Strategy set a target of 6 or 7 new pitches by 2026, which has been met. However, a 2013 Travellers Accommodation Assessment identified a need for an additional 44 pitches for Gypsy and Travellers and five for Travelling Showpeople up to 2026. The study alerted the Council about a number of families that were doubled up, of large families with growing children (including children living at the site which had temporary planning permission).
- » The 2013 TAA was superseded in February 2018 by an updated Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment for the period 2017-2033. This identified needs for an additional 21 pitches for gypsies and travellers falling within the PPTS definition. In addition, up to 2 pitches are required for those of unknown travelling status and 17 for those who do not meet the PPTS definition. An additional 3 plots are required for travelling showpeople falling within the PPTS definition.
- » The provision of pitches and plots to address the above needs will be a matter for the Future Mole Valley Local Plan 2018-2033, which is under preparation.
- » The area is not a traditional stopping place for Gypsies and Travellers mainly due to the lack of motorway access, other than in the very north of the District. Therefore, there are few instances of short-term roadside encampments; those who do occasionally visit the area tend to move on after one to two nights. Neither the 2013 TAA or the 2018 GTAA identifies a need for a transit site. However, the 2018 GTAA recommends that this is kept under review as further evidence emerges of the impact of the 2015 PPTS on travelling patterns and levels of unauthorised encampments.

5.32 With regard to the subject of **cross border issues and the Duty to Cooperate**, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » The officer was not aware of any significant cross border issues which require cooperation with neighbouring boroughs. Surrey authorities can attend the Surrey

and Gypsy and Traveller Forum to discuss Gypsy and Traveller issues and this provides an opportunity for on-going dialogue.

- » The officer explained that the District would like to be kept informed of what is happening in neighbouring boroughs and acknowledged that they are all in a similar position insofar as the high level of Green Belt land makes it difficult to meet the additional needs of Gypsies and Travellers.

London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

5.33 With regard to **overall accommodation need** in Richmond, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » There is currently one authorised site in the borough at Bishops Grove in Hampton which has 12 pitches, managed by Richmond Housing Partnership (RHP). Residents on the site all have an Irish Traveller ethnicity.
- » The Council has liaised with and asked RHP to undertake surveys of occupants on the site in 2013 and 2015 to understand existing and future needs. The initial research suggests that additional pitches are not needed in the short term, although there is a need to protect existing pitches as needs will be met through the existing site¹⁰.
- » There is no history of Travelling Showpeople having sites or winter sites in the Borough.
- » The preparation of the Richmond Local Plan has reached Examination¹¹. Policy LP37 'Housing Needs of Different Groups' protects the existing site and sets criteria to consider any sites for temporary or future use. The Inspector raised Gypsies and Travellers in initial correspondence¹² and¹³. The Inspector did not raise any further queries or ask the Council to consider any changes to the Plan in respect of this issue. The hearings closed on 12 October 2017. The Inspector's proposed Main Modifications were subject to consultation from 22 December 2017 until 2 February 2018 and did not propose any changes to LP37. The Inspector's report is expected to be received in 2018.

5.34 With regard to the subject of **cross border issues and the Duty to Cooperate**, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » Officers undertake ongoing liaison with neighbouring boroughs through Duty to Cooperate discussions, in particular at the key stages in the preparation of the Richmond Local Plan.
- » In Duty to Cooperate discussions with RBK (meeting in January 2016 and February 2017 along with general email correspondence during 2016 and 2017) we had not identified Gypsies and Travellers as a cross boundary issue.

¹⁰ www.richmond.gov.uk/media/14285/lha_gypsy_and_traveller_research.pdf

¹¹ www.richmond.gov.uk/local_plan_review.htm

¹² (see the [Council's response of 27 July 2017](#) on pages 7-8)

¹³ [Council's Written Statement on Housing](#) (question 8 on pages 26-27).

London Borough of Sutton

5.35 With regard to **overall accommodation need** in Sutton, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » There are two sites in the Borough, one is a public site with 15 pitches and the other is a private site with 16 pitches. There are issues of overcrowding at both sites.
- » In its Local Plan, adopted 26 February 2018, the council is to extend its public site by nine pitches. This will deal with the immediate, first five-year need.
- » The Inspector into the council's Local Plan has instructed the council to undertake a review of need and allocate any sites to meet the remaining need by 2023
- » The number of unauthorised encampments has reduced significantly in 2017 compared to previous years. From a high point of 28 unauthorised encampments in 2014, the number of unauthorised encampments has reduced to 21 in 2015, to 10 in 2016 and to 2 as of 12 June 2017.

5.36 With regard to the subject of **cross border issues and the Duty to Cooperate**, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » The officer referred to discussions with Reigate and Banstead, Tandridge, Elmbridge and Epsom and Ewell about Traveller accommodation needs.
- » The Borough works at an individual level with its neighbouring Boroughs as each has different issues according to the different ethnicity of resident Travellers. The officer said he understood that RBKs resident population were English Gypsies in contrast to Sutton's resident population who are mostly Irish Travellers. Therefore, given the lack of family ties there are no known cross border issues.

London Borough of Wandsworth

5.37 With regard to **overall accommodation need** in Wandsworth, the views of the two officers interviewed were as follows:

- » There is one public site in the Borough with 11 pitches. The site is managed by the Councils Housing Department, who provides a designated housing manager, a responsive repairs service, 24-hour access to Wandsworth Emergency Control and an Estate Services Officer who visits the site weekly. The site is currently fit for purpose and there are no current management concerns. The officers were not aware of any overcrowding on the site. There are no private sites.
- » The last GTAA was undertaken in 2012 did not identify any additional accommodation need, but this will need to be reviewed as part of the full review of the Local Plan. This will include carrying out a further Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), which will reassess the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers.
- » There are said to be occasional unauthorised encampments set up on the Commons, however the Council removes these usually with 24 hours. No need for transit provision has been identified.

5.38 With regard to the subject of **cross border issues and the Duty to Cooperate**, the views of the officer interviewed were as follows:

- » An officer said they regularly attend meetings under the Duty to Cooperate to discuss emerging Local Plans and evidence for example and a Duty to Cooperate report must be submitted with a Local Plan for examination to demonstrate that the Duty has been met.
- » Going forward the priority is to complete a further SHMA, which will reassess the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and inform the review of the Local Plan.

6. Survey of Travelling Communities

Interviews with Gypsies and Travellers

- 6.1 One of the major components of this study was a detailed survey of the Gypsy and Traveller population living in the study area (no Travelling Showpeople were identified), and also efforts to engage with the bricks and mortar community.
- 6.2 Through the desk-based research and stakeholder interviews ORS identified 1 public site, 1 private site with full planning permission and 5 unauthorised sites. There were no Travelling Showpeople yards identified. Household interviews were completed between February and March 2018 and up to 3 attempts were made to interview each household where they were not present when interviewers visited. The table below sets out the number of pitches, the number of interviews that were completed, and the reasons why interviews were not completed or why additional interviews were completed.

Figure 6 - Sites and yards visited in RBK

Planning Status	Pitches/Plots	Interviews	Reasons for not completing interviews/additional interviews
Public Sites			
Swallow Park Close	18	14	4 x no contact possible ¹⁴ , 1 x refusal, 1 x doubled-up pitch
Private Sites			
Yard adjoining The Piggeries	1	1	-
Temporary Sites			
None	-	-	-
Tolerated Sites			
None	-	-	-
Unauthorised Sites			
Clayton Park	3	2	1 x no contact possible
Northfield Bungalow	9	9	-
Rushett Stables	1	1	-
The Piggeries	1	1	-
Three Birches, Land Rear of Kenwood	2	2	-
Public Transit			
None	-	-	-
Travelling Showpeople			
None	-	-	-
TOTAL	35	30	

¹⁴ Whilst it was not possible to interview these households it was possible to identify instances of concealed or doubled-up households, and households in need of a pitch of their own in the next 5 years from other sources.

Interviews with Gypsies and Travellers in Bricks and Mortar

- ^{6.3} Despite all of the efforts that were made, it was not possible to identify any households to interview living in bricks and mortar in RBK. These efforts included:
- » Asking households that were interviewed on sites if they were aware of any relatives or friends living in bricks and mortar who were in need of a pitch;
 - » Writing to 15 known Traveller households living in bricks and mortar;
 - » Seeking information through the stakeholder interviews; and
 - » Adverts on social media.
- ^{6.4} Even though there were some households in bricks and mortar identified in the 2011 Census, it is not uncommon for no households to come forward to be interviewed when completing GTANA studies.

7. Current and Future Pitch Provision

Introduction

- 7.1 This section focuses on the additional pitch provision which is needed in the study area currently and to 2041 (there were no Travelling Showpeople identified). This includes both current unmet need and need which is likely to arise in the future¹⁵. This time period allows for robust forecasts of the requirements for future provision, based upon the evidence contained within this study and also secondary data sources. Whilst the difficulty in making accurate assessments beyond 5 years has been highlighted in previous studies, the approach taken in this study to estimate new household formation has been accepted by Planning Inspectors as the most appropriate methodology to use.
- 7.2 This section is based upon a combination of the on-site surveys, planning records and stakeholder interviews. In many cases, the survey data is not used in isolation, but instead is used to validate information from planning records or other sources.
- 7.3 This section concentrates not only upon the total additional provision which is required in the area, but also whether there is a need for any transit pitches and/or emergency stopping places.

New Household Formation Rates

- 7.4 Nationally, a household formation and growth rate of 3.00% net per annum has been commonly assumed and widely used in local Gypsy and Traveller assessments¹⁶, even though there is no statistical evidence of households growing so quickly. The result has been to inflate both national and local requirements for additional pitches unrealistically. In this context, ORS has prepared a *Technical Note on Household Formation and Growth Rates (2015)*. The main conclusions are set out here and the full paper is in **Appendix F**.
- 7.5 Those seeking to provide evidence of high annual net household growth rates for Gypsies and Travellers have sometimes sought to rely on increases in the number of caravans, as reflected in caravan counts. However, caravan count data is unreliable and erratic – so the only proper way to project future population and household growth is through detailed demographic analysis.
- 7.6 The Technical Note concludes that in fact, the growth in the national Gypsy and Traveller population may be as low as 1.25% per annum – much less than the 3.00% per annum often assumed, but still greater than in the settled community. Even using extreme and unrealistic assumptions, it is hard to find evidence that net Gypsy and Traveller population and household growth rates are above 2.00% per annum nationally.
- 7.7 The often assumed 3.00% per annum net household growth rate is unrealistic and would require clear statistical evidence before being used for planning purposes. In practice, the best available evidence supports a national net household growth rate of 1.50% per annum for Gypsies and

¹⁵ See Paragraphs 3.32 and 3.33 for details of components of current and future need.

¹⁶ Page 25, Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments – Guidance (DCLG – 2007) *Now withdrawn*.

Travellers (in addition research by ORS has identified a national growth rate of 1.00% for Travelling Showpeople) and this has also been adjusted locally based on site demographics. This view has been supported by Planning Inspectors in a number of Decision Notices.

- 7.8 In a Decision Notice for an appeal in Doncaster that was issued in November 2016 (Ref: APP/F4410/W/15/3133490) where the agent acting on behalf of the appellant claimed that a rate closer to 3.00% should be used. The Inspector concluded:

In assessing need account also needs to be taken of likely household growth over the coming years. In determining an annual household growth rate, the Council relies on the work of Opinions Research Services (ORS), part of Swansea University. ORS's research considers migration, population profiles, births & fertility rates, death rates, household size data and household dissolution rates to determine average household growth rates for gypsies and travellers. The findings indicate that the average annual growth rate is in the order of 1.50% but that a 2.50% figure could be used if local data suggest a relatively youthful population. As the Council has found a strong correlation between Doncaster's gypsy and traveller population age profile and the national picture, a 1.50% annual household growth rate has been used in its 2016 GTANA. Given the rigour of ORS's research and the Council's application of its findings to the local area I accept that a 1.50% figure is justified in the case of Doncaster.

- 7.9 Another more recent was in relation to an appeal in Guildford that was issued in March 2018 (Ref: APP/W/16/3165526) where the agent acting on behalf of the appellant again claimed that a rate closer to 3.00% should be used. The Inspector concluded:

There is significant debate about household formation rates and the need to meet future growth in the district. The obvious point to make is that this issue is likely to be debated at the local-plan examination. In my opinion, projecting growth rates is not an exact science and the debate demonstrates some divergence of opinion between the experts. Different methodologies could be applied producing a wide range of data. However, on the available evidence it seems to me that the figures used in the GTAA are probably appropriate given that they are derived by using local demographic evidence. In my opinion, the use of a national growth rate and its adaptation to suit local or regional variation, or the use of local base data to refine the figure, is a reasonable approach.

- 7.10 In addition, the Technical Note has recently been accepted as a robust academic evidence base and has been published by the Social Research Association in its journal Social Research Practice¹⁷. The overall purpose of the journal is to encourage and promote high standards of social research for public benefit.

- 7.11 ORS assessments take full account of the net local household growth rate per annum for each local authority, calculated on the basis of demographic evidence from the site surveys, and the 'baseline' includes all current authorised households, all households identified as in current need (including concealed households, movement from bricks and mortar and those on waiting lists not currently living on a pitch or plot), as well as households living on tolerated unauthorised pitches or plots who are not included as current need. The assessments of future need also take account of modelling projections based on birth and death rates, and in-/out-migration.

¹⁷ <http://the-sra.org.uk/journal-social-research-practice/>

- 7.12 Overall, the household growth rate used for the assessment of future needs has been informed by local evidence. This demographic evidence has been used to adjust the national growth rate of 1.50% up or down based on the proportion of those aged under 18 (by travelling status).
- 7.13 The table below sets out the approach used towards new household formation in RBK. In addition, the ORS national rates of 1.50% have been used for unknown Gypsies and Travellers and 1.00% for Travelling Showpeople.

Figure 7 – New household formation rates used

	Gypsies & Travellers		Travelling Showpeople	
	Meet Definition	Do not meet Definition	Meet Definition	Do not meet Definition
RBK	1.90% (46% of residents aged under 18)	2.00% (48% of residents aged under 18)	None present	None present

Breakdown by 5 Year Bands

- 7.14 In addition to tables which set out the overall need for Gypsies and Travellers, the overall need has also been broken down by 5-year bands as required by PPTS (2015). The way that this is calculated is by including all current need (from unauthorised pitches, pitches with temporary planning permission, concealed and doubled-up households, 5 year need from older teenage children, and net movement from bricks and mortar) in the first 5 years. In addition, the total net new household formation is split across the 5-year bands based on the compound rate of growth that was applied rather than being spread evenly over time.

Applying the Planning Definition

- 7.15 The outcomes from the household interviews were used to determine the status of each household against the planning definition in PPTS (2015). Only those households that meet the planning definition, in that ORS were able to determine that they travel for work purposes and stay away from their usual place of residence when doing so (or have ceased to travel temporarily due to education, ill health or old age) form the components of need that will form the baseline of need in the GTANA. Households where an interview was not completed who **may** meet the planning definition have also been included as a potential additional component of need from unknown households.
- 7.16 The information used to assess households against the planning definition included information on whether households have ever travelled; why they have stopped travelling; the reasons that they travel; and whether they plan to travel again in the future. The table below sets out the planning status of households living on sites in RBK.

Figure 8 – Planning status of households in RBK

Site Status	Meet Planning Definition	Unknown	Do Not Meet Planning Definition
Gypsies and Travellers			
Public Sites	4	5	10
Private Sites	1	0	0
Temporary Sites	-	-	-
Tolerated Sites	-	-	-
Unauthorised Sites	13	1	2
Bricks and mortar	-	-	-
Sub-Total	18	6	12
Travelling Showpeople			
Private Yards	-	-	-
Unauthorised Yards	-	-	-
Bricks and mortar	-	-	-
Sub-Total	0	0	0
TOTAL	18	6	12

- 7.17 Figure 8 shows that for Gypsies and Travellers 18 households meet the planning definition of a Traveller in that ORS were able to determine that they travel for work purposes and stay away from their usual place of residence or have ceased to travel temporarily. A total of 12 Gypsy and Traveller households do not meet the planning definition as they were not able to demonstrate that they travel away from their usual place of residence for the purpose of work, or that they have ceased to travel temporarily due to children in education, ill health or old age. Some did travel for cultural reasons, to visit relatives or friends, and others had ceased to travel permanently - these households did not meet the planning definition.
- 7.18 Households where it was not possible to complete an interview are recorded as unknown. Reasons for not completing interviews included households not being present during the fieldwork period and households that refused to be interviewed.

Migration

- 7.19 The study has also sought to address in-migration (households requiring accommodation who move into the study area from outside) and out-migration (households moving away from the study area). Site surveys typically identify only small numbers of in-migrant and out-migrant households and the data is not normally robust enough to extrapolate long-term trends. At the national level, there is nil net migration of Gypsies and Travellers across the UK, but the assessment has taken into account local migration effects on the basis of the best evidence available.
- 7.20 Evidence drawn from stakeholder and household interviews has been considered alongside assessments of need that have been completed in other nearby local authorities. ORS found no evidence the interviews or from other local studies that have been completed recently of any households wishing to move to the study area. Therefore, net migration to the sum of zero has been assumed for the GTANA – which means that net pitch requirements are driven by locally identifiable need rather than speculative modelling assumptions. Should any households from outside of the study area wish to develop a new site the proposal will need to be considered by criteria-based Local Plan Policies.

Pitch Needs – Gypsies and Travellers that meet the Planning Definition

- 7.21 The 18 households that meet the planning definition were found on the public site, the private site and 4 of the unauthorised sites. Analysis of the household interviews indicated that there is a current need from 13 households who are living on unauthorised pitches and 6 concealed or doubled-up households or adults. There is a future need from 8 teenage children who will be in need of a pitch of their own in the next 5 years, 1 from a household who is seeking to move into the area and 17 additional pitches as a result of new household formation using a formation rate of 1.90% derived from the household demographics.
- 7.22 Therefore, the overall level of additional need for those households who meet the planning definition of a Gypsy or Traveller is for **44 additional pitches** over the GTANA period.

Figure 9 – Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households in RBK that meet the Planning Definition (2018-41)

Gypsies and Travellers - Meeting Planning Definition	Pitches
Supply of Pitches	
Additional supply from vacant public and private pitches	0
Additional supply from pitches on new sites	0
Pitches vacated by households moving to bricks and mortar	0
Pitches vacated by households moving away from the study area	0
Total Supply	0
Current Need	
Households on unauthorised developments	13
Households on unauthorised encampments	0
Concealed households/Doubling-up/Over-crowding	6
Movement from bricks and mortar	0
Households on waiting lists for public sites	0
Total Current Need	19
Future Need	
5 year need from teenage children	8
Households on sites with temporary planning permission	0
In-migration	0
New household formation	17
<i>(Household base 32 and formation rate 1.90%)</i>	
Total Future Needs	25
Net Pitch Need = (Current and Future Need – Total Supply)	44

Figure 10 – Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households in RBK that meet the Planning Definition by year periods

Years	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-23	Total
	2018-23	2023-28	2028-2033	2033-38	2038-41	
	30	3	4	5	2	44

Pitch Needs – Unknown Gypsies and Travellers

- 7.23 Whilst it was not possible to determine the planning status of a total of 6 households as they either refused to be interviewed or were not on site at the time of the fieldwork, the needs of

these households still need to be recognised by the GTANA as they are believed to be Gypsies and Travellers who *may* meet the planning definition.

- 7.24 ORS are of the opinion that it would not be appropriate (when producing a robust assessment of need) to make any firm assumptions about whether or not households where an interview was not completed meet the planning definition based on the outcomes of households in that local authority where an interview was completed. However, data that has been collected from over 3,500 household interviews that have been completed by ORS since the changes to PPTS in 2015 suggests that nationally approximately 25% of households that have been interviewed meet the planning definition.
- 7.25 This would suggest that it is likely that only a proportion of the potential need identified from these households will need conditioned Gypsy and Traveller pitches and that the needs of the majority will need to be addressed through separate Local Plan Policies.
- 7.26 Should further information be made available to the Council that will allow for the planning definition to be applied to the unknown households, the overall level of need could rise by up to 1 from an unauthorised site, by up to 2 from concealed or doubled-up households, by up to 2 from households in need of a pitch of their own in the next 5 years (whilst it was not possible to interview these households it was possible to identify concealed/doubled-up households and households in need of a pitch of their own in the next 5 years from other sources), and by up to 2 pitches from new household formation using the ORS national rate of 1.50%.
- 7.27 Therefore, additional need could increase by up to 7 additional pitches if households on all 6 unknown pitches are deemed to meet the planning definition, plus any additional concealed adult households or five-year need arising from older teenagers living in households where an interview was not completed. However, as an illustration, if the ORS national average of 25% were to be applied this could be as few as 2 additional pitches.
- 7.28 Whilst the proportion of households in RBK that meet the planning definition (60%) is higher than 25% this is based on a small household base. Therefore, it is felt that it would be more appropriate to consider the more statistically robust ORS national figure. However, if the locally derived proportion were to be applied this could result in a need for 4 additional pitches.
- 7.29 Tables setting out the components of need for unknown households can be found in **Appendix B**.

Pitch Needs - Gypsies and Travellers that do not meet the Planning Definition

- 7.30 It is not now a requirement for a GTANA to include an assessment of need for households that do not meet the planning definition. However, this assessment is included for illustrative purposes to provide the Council with information on levels of need that will have to be addressed through separate Local Plan Policies and to help meet requirements set out in the Housing and Planning Act (2016) and the revised NPPF (2018). On this basis, it is evident that whilst the needs of the 12 households who do not meet the planning definition will represent only a very small proportion of the overall housing need, the Council will still need to ensure that arrangements are in place to properly address these needs – especially as many identified as Romany Gypsies and may claim that the Council should meet their housing needs through culturally appropriate housing.

- 7.31 Overall, there is need for 23 additional pitches for households that do not meet the planning definition. This is made up of 2 unauthorised pitches, 7 concealed or doubled-up households or adults, 2 for teenagers who will be in need of a pitch of their own in the next 5 years, and 12 from new household formation using a formation rate of 2.00% derived from the household demographics. A summary of this need for households that do not meet the planning definition can be found in **Appendix C**.

Plot Needs – Travelling Showpeople

- 7.32 There were no Travelling Showpeople identified in RBK so there is no current or future need for additional plots over the GTANA period 2018-2041.

Transit Requirements

- 7.33 When determining the potential need for transit provision the assessment has looked at data from the MHCLG Traveller Caravan Count, the outcomes of the stakeholder interviews, records on numbers of unauthorised encampments, and the potential wider issues related to changes made to PPTS in 2015.

MHCLG Traveller Caravan Count

- 7.34 Whilst it is considered to be a comprehensive national dataset on numbers of authorised and unauthorised caravans across England, it is acknowledged that the Traveller Caravan Count is a count of caravans and not households. It also does not record the reasons for unauthorised caravans. This makes it very difficult to interpret in relation to assessing future need because it does not count pitches or resident households. The count is also only a twice yearly (January and July) 'snapshot in time' conducted by local authorities on a specific day, and any caravans on unauthorised sites or encampments which occur on other dates are not recorded. Likewise, any caravans that are away from sites on the day of the count are not included. As such it is not considered appropriate to use the outcomes from the Traveller Caravan Count in the assessment of future transit provision. It does however provide valuable historic and trend data on whether there are instances of unauthorised caravans in local authority areas.
- 7.35 Data from the Traveller Caravan Count shows that there have been very low numbers of non-tolerated unauthorised caravans on land not owned by Travellers recorded in the study area in recent years.

Stakeholder Interviews and Local Data

- 7.36 There is currently no public or private transit provision in RBK. Information from the stakeholder interviews identified that Officers were aware of very low numbers of unauthorised encampments occurring in the area and that good management procedures are already in place to deal with them.

Potential Implications of PPTS (2015)

- 7.37 It has been suggested by some groups representing Travellers that there will need to be an increase in transit provision across the country as a result of changes to PPTS leading to more households travelling to seek to meet the planning definition. This may well be the case, but it

will take some time for any changes to materialise. As such the use of historic evidence to make an assessment of future transit need is not recommended at this time. Any recommendation for future transit provision will need to make use of a robust post-PPTS (2015) evidence base and there has not been sufficient time yet for this to happen at the time of reporting.

Transit Recommendations

- 7.38 Whilst there is some evidence of a small number of unauthorised encampments in RBK in recent years, it is recommended that there is currently no need to provide any new transit pitches at this time. It is also recommended that the situation relating to levels of unauthorised encampments should be monitored whilst any potential changes associated with PPTS (2015) develop.
- 7.39 As well as information on the size and duration of the encampments, this monitoring should also seek to gather information from residents on the reasons for their stay in RBK; whether they have a permanent base or where they have travelled from; whether they have any need or preference to settle permanently in RBK; and whether their travelling is a result of changes to PPTS (2015). This information should be collected as part of a Welfare Assessment (or equivalent).
- 7.40 A review of unauthorised encampments, including the monitoring referred to above, should be undertaken once there is a sufficient evidence base following the changes to PPTS in 2015. This will establish whether there is a need for investment in any formal transit sites or emergency stopping places, or whether a managed approach is preferable.
- 7.41 In the short-term, the Council should consider the use of management arrangements for dealing with unauthorised encampments and could also consider the use of Negotiated Stopping Agreements, as opposed to taking forward an infrastructure-based approach. The term 'negotiated stopping' is used to describe agreed short-term provision for Gypsy and Traveller caravans. It does not describe permanent 'built' transit sites but negotiated agreements which allow caravans to be sited on suitable specific pieces of ground for an agreed and limited period of time, with the provision of limited services such as water, waste disposal and toilets. Agreements are made between the authority and the (temporary) residents regarding expectations on both sides.
- 7.42 Temporary stopping places can be made available at times of increased demand due to fairs or cultural celebrations that are attended by Gypsies and Travellers. A charge may be levied as determined by the local authority although they only need to provide basic facilities including: a cold-water supply; portaloos; sewerage disposal point and refuse disposal facilities.

8. Conclusions

- 8.1 This study provides a robust evidence base to enable the Council to assess the housing needs of the Travelling Community as well as complying with their requirements towards Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople under the Housing Act 1985, Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) 2014, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) 2015, the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018. It also provides the evidence base which can be used to support Local Plan Policies.

Gypsies and Travellers

- 8.2 In summary there is a need for **44 additional pitches** in RBK over the GTANA period to 2041 for Gypsy and Traveller households that met the planning definition; a need for up to 7 additional pitches for unknown Gypsy and Traveller households that may meet the planning definition; and a need for 23 additional pitches for Gypsy and Traveller households who did not meet the planning definition.
- 8.3 It is recommended that need for households that met the planning definition is addressed through new pitch allocations or the expansion or intensification of existing sites. Any need arising from unknown or new households seeking to move to the area and develop a site should be addressed through a criteria-based Local Plan Policy. The need for those households who did not meet the planning definition will need to be addressed through other means such as the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and through separate Local Plan Policies.

Travelling Showpeople

- 8.4 In summary there is a need for no additional plots in RBK over the GTANA period to 2041 as no Travelling Showpeople were identified living in the area.

Transit Provision

- 8.5 There is evidence to suggest that there have been a very small number of encampments in RBK in recent years. However, it is not recommended that there is a need for any additional transit provision at this time.
- 8.6 It is recommended that the situation relating to levels of unauthorised encampments should continue to be monitored whilst any potential changes associated with PPTS (2015) develop. This will establish whether there is a need for investment in more formal transit sites or emergency stopping places.
- 8.7 In the short-term the Council should consider the use management-based approaches to dealing with unauthorised encampments and negotiated stopping agreements could also be considered.

Summary of Need to be Addressed

- 8.8 Taking into consideration all of the elements of need that have been assessed, together with the assumptions on the proportion of unknown households that are likely to meet the planning definition, the table below sets out the likely number of pitches that will need to be addressed either as a result of the GTANA, or through the SHMA and through separate Local Plan Policies.

- 8.9 Total need from Gypsy and Traveller households that met the planning definition, from unknown households, and from households that did not meet the planning definition is for 74 additional pitches. The table below breaks need down by the GTANA and SHMA by taking 25% (the ORS national average for Gypsies and Travellers) of need from unknown households and adding this to the need from households that met the planning definition, and by adding the remaining 75% of need from unknown households to the need from households that did not meet the planning definition.

Figure 11 – Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households broken down by potential delivery method

Site Status	GTANA	SHMA	TOTAL
Meet Planning Definition (+ 25% Unknown)	46 (44+2)	0	46
Not meeting Planning Definition (+ 75% Unknown)	0	28 (23+5)	28
TOTAL	46	29	74

Implications of Changes to Government Guidance

- 8.10 A Judicial Review of the new planning definition started in September 2017 but had not yet been determined at the time of this report. The review is seeking to reinstate the former planning definition of a Traveller, so it will include households that have ceased to travel permanently.
- 8.11 Should this review be successful a proportion of those households that do not meet the current planning definition may meet the definition if they can demonstrate that they have ceased to travel permanently but have travelled for work in the past. However, given that the previous Housing Definition of a Traveller was repealed by the Housing and Planning Act (2016) it is unlikely that all of the households that do not meet the current Planning Definition will meet the previous Planning Definition.
- 8.12 In addition, the Draft London Plan (December 2017) is proposing to introduce a different definition of a Traveller for planning purposes. This is very similar to the repealed Housing Definition in that it would also include households that have not travelled for work providing that they live in a caravan. Should this definition be adopted it is likely that all households in RBK would meet it and total need will be for **74 additional pitches** plus any extra need arising from households living in bricks and mortar.

List of Figures

Figure 1 – Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households in Kingston upon Thames (2018-2041)	8
Figure 2 – Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households in Kingston upon Thames that meet the Planning Definition	8
Figure 3 – Friends, Families and Traveller Leaflet.....	18
Figure 4 – Bricks and Mortar Advert.....	19
Figure 5 - Total amount of provision in Kingston upon Thames (November 2017)	16
Figure 6 - Sites and yards visited in Kingston upon Thames.....	27
Figure 7 – Planning status of households in Kingston upon Thames.....	32
Figure 8 – Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households in Kingston upon Thames that meet the Planning Definition (2018-41).....	33
Figure 9 – Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households in Kingston upon Thames that meet the Planning Definition by year periods	33
Figure 10 – Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households broken down by potential delivery method.....	38
Figure 11 - Additional need for unknown Gypsy and Traveller households in Kingston upon Thames (2018-2041).....	42
Figure 12 – Additional need for unknown Gypsy and Traveller households in Kingston upon Thames by Year Periods	42
Figure 13 - Additional need for unknown Travelling Showpeople households in Kingston upon Thames (2018-41)	43
Figure 14 – Additional need for unknown Travelling Showpeople households in Kingston upon Thames by Year Periods.....	43
Figure 15 - Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households in Kingston upon Thames that do not meet the Planning Definition (2018-41).....	44
Figure 16 – Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households in Kingston upon Thames that do not meet the Planning Definition by Year Periods	44
Figure 17- Additional need for Travelling Showpeople households in Kingston upon Thames that do not meet the planning definition (2018-41)	45
Figure 18 – Additional need for Travelling Showpeople households in Kingston upon Thames that do not meet the Planning Definition by Year Periods	45

Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

Amenity block/shed	A building where basic plumbing amenities (bath/shower, WC, sink) are provided.
Bricks and mortar	Mainstream housing.
Caravan	Mobile living vehicle used by Gypsies and Travellers. Also referred to as trailers.
Chalet	A single storey residential unit which can be dismantled. Sometimes referred to as mobile homes.
Concealed household	Households, living within other households, who are unable to set up separate family units.
Doubling-Up	Where there are more than the permitted number of caravans on a pitch or plot.
Emergency Stopping Place	A temporary site with limited facilities to be occupied by Gypsies and Travellers while they travel.
Green Belt	A land use designation used to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
GTANA/GTAA	Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation (Needs) Assessment.
Household formation	The process where individuals form separate households. This is normally through adult children setting up their own household.
In-migration	Movement of households into a region or community
Local Plans	Local Authority spatial planning documents that can include specific policies and/or site allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (formerly Department for Communities and Local Government – DCLG).
Out-migration	Movement from one region or community in order to settle in another.
Personal planning permission	A private site where the planning permission specifies who can occupy the site and doesn't allow transfer of ownership.
Pitch/plot	Area of land on a site/development generally home to one household. Can be varying sizes and have varying caravan numbers. Pitches refer to Gypsy and Traveller sites and Plots to Travelling Showpeople yards.
PPTS	Government planning policy for traveller sites which should be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Private site	An authorised site owned privately. Can be owner-occupied, rented or a mixture of owner-occupied and rented pitches.
Site	An area of land on which Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople are accommodated in caravans/chalets/vehicles. Can contain one or multiple pitches/plots.
Social/Public/Council Site	An authorised site owned by either the local authority or a Registered Housing Provider.
Temporary planning permission	A private site with planning permission for a fixed period of time.
Tolerated site/yard	Long-term tolerated sites or yards where enforcement action is not expedient, and a certificate of lawful use would be granted if sought.
Transit provision	Site intended for short stays and containing a range of facilities. There is normally a limit on the length of time residents can stay.
Traveller Caravan Count	The count of Traveller caravans in England which takes place in January and July each year, recording the number of caravans on both authorised and unauthorised sites across England. Since 2011 the January count has also included a count of caravans occupied by Travelling Showpeople.
Unauthorised Development	Caravans on land owned by Gypsies and Travellers and without planning permission.
Unauthorised Encampment	Caravans on land not owned by Gypsies and Travellers and without planning permission.
Waiting list	Record held by the local authority or site managers of applications to live on a site.
Yard	A name often used by Travelling Showpeople to refer to a site.

Appendix B: Unknown Households

Figure 12 - Additional need for unknown Gypsy and Traveller households in RBK (2018-2041)

Gypsies and Travellers - Unknown	Pitches
Supply of Pitches	
Additional supply from vacant public and private pitches	0
Additional supply from pitches on new sites	0
Pitches vacated by households moving to bricks and mortar	0
Pitches vacated by households moving away from the study area	0
Total Supply	0
Current Need	
Households on unauthorised developments	1
Households on unauthorised encampments	0
Concealed households/Doubling-up/Over-crowding	2
Movement from bricks and mortar	0
Households on waiting lists for public sites	0
Total Current Need	3
Future Need	
5 year need from teenage children	2
Households on sites with temporary planning permission	0
In-migration	0
New household formation	2
<i>(Household base 6 and formation rate 1.50%)</i>	
Total Future Needs	4
Net Pitch Need = (Current and Future Need – Total Supply)	7

Figure 13 – Additional need for unknown Gypsy and Traveller households in RBK by Year Periods

Years	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-23	Total
	2018-23	2023-28	2028-2033	2033-38	2038-41	
	5	1	0	1	0	7

Figure 14 - Additional need for unknown Travelling Showpeople households in RBK (2018-41)

Travelling Showpeople - Unknown	
Supply of Plots	
Additional supply from vacant public and private plots	0
Additional supply from plots on new yards	0
Plots vacated by households moving to bricks and mortar	0
Plots vacated by households moving away from the study area	0
Total Supply	0
Current Need	
Households on unauthorised developments	0
Households on unauthorised encampments	0
Concealed households/Doubling-up/Over-crowding	0
Movement from bricks and mortar	0
Households on waiting lists for public yards	0
Total Current Need	0
Future Need	
5 year need from teenage children	0
Households on yards with temporary planning permission	0
In-migration	0
New household formation	0
<i>(No Travelling Showpeople)</i>	
Total Future Needs	0
Net Plot Need = (Current and Future Need – Total Supply)	0

Figure 15 – Additional need for unknown Travelling Showpeople households in RBK by Year Periods

Years	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-23	Total
	2018-23	2023-28	2028-2033	2033-38	2038-41	
	0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix C: Households that do not meet the Planning Definition

Figure 16 - Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households in RBK that do not meet the Planning Definition (2018-41)

Gypsies and Travellers - Not Meeting Planning Definition	Pitches
Supply of Pitches	
Additional supply from vacant public and private pitches	0
Additional supply from pitches on new sites	0
Pitches vacated by households moving to bricks and mortar	0
Pitches vacated by households moving away from the study area	0
Total Supply	0
Current Need	
Households on unauthorised developments	2
Households on unauthorised encampments	0
Concealed households/Doubling-up/Over-crowding	7
Movement from bricks and mortar	0
Households on waiting lists for public sites	0
Total Current Need	9
Future Need	
5 year need from teenage children	2
Households on sites with temporary planning permission	0
In-migration	0
New household formation	12
<i>(Household base 21 and formation rate 2.00%)</i>	
Total Future Needs	14
Net Pitch Need = (Current and Future Need – Total Supply)	23

Figure 17 – Additional need for Gypsy and Traveller households in RBK that do not meet the Planning Definition by Year Periods

Years	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-23	Total
	2018-23	2023-28	2028-2033	2033-38	2038-41	
	13	2	3	3	2	23

Figure 18- Additional need for Travelling Showpeople households in RBK that do not meet the planning definition (2018-41)

Travelling Showpeople - Not Meeting Planning Definition	Plots
Supply of Plots	
Additional supply from vacant public and private plots	0
Additional supply from plots on new yards	0
Plots vacated by households moving to bricks and mortar	0
Plots vacated by households moving away from the study area	0
Total Supply	0
Current Need	
Households on unauthorised developments	0
Households on unauthorised encampments	0
Concealed households/Doubling-up/Over-crowding	0
Movement from bricks and mortar	0
Households on waiting lists for public yards	0
Total Current Need	0
Future Need	
5 year need from teenage children	0
Households on yards with temporary planning permission	0
In-migration	0
New household formation	0
<i>(No Travelling Showpeople)</i>	
Total Future Needs	0
Net Plot Need = (Current and Future Need – Total Supply)	0

Figure 19 – Additional need for Travelling Showpeople households in RBK that do not meet the Planning Definition by Year Periods

Years	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-23	Total
	2018-23	2023-28	2028-2033	2033-38	2038-41	
	0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix D: Sites and Yards Lists (March 2018)

Site/Yard	Authorised Pitches or Plots	Unauthorised Pitches or Plots
Public Sites		
Swallow Park Close	18	-
Private Sites with Permanent Permission		
Yard adjoining The Piggeries	1	-
Private Sites with Temporary Permission		
None	-	-
Tolerated Sites – Long-term without Planning Permission		
None	-	-
Unauthorised Developments		
Clayton Park	-	3
Northfield Bungalow	-	9
Rushett Stables	-	1
The Piggeries	-	1
Three Birches, Land Rear of Kenwood	-	2
TOTAL PITCHES	19	16
Authorised Travelling Showpeople Yards		
None	-	-
TOTAL PLOTS	0	0

Appendix E: Household Interview Questions

NOT FOR CIRCULATION

GTAA Questionnaire 2017



INTERVIEWER: Good Morning/afternoon/evening. My name is < > from Opinion Research Services, working on behalf of XXXX Council.

The Council are undertaking a study of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation needs assessment in this area. This is needed to make sure that accommodation needs are properly assessed and to get a better understanding of the needs of the Travelling Community.

The Council need to try and speak with every Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople household in the area to make sure that the assessment of need is accurate.

Your household will not be identified and all the information collected will be anonymous and will only be used to help understand the needs of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople households.

ORS is registered under the Data Protection Act 1998. Your responses will be stored and processed electronically and securely. This paper form will be securely destroyed after processing. Your household will not be identified to the council and only anonymous data and results will be submitted, though verbatim comments may be reported in full, and the data from this survey will only be used to help understand the needs of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople households

A General Information

A1 Name of planning authority:
INTERVIEWER please write in

A2 Date/time of site visit(s):
INTERVIEWER please write in

A3 Name of interviewer:
INTERVIEWER please write in

A4 Address and pitch number:
INTERVIEWER please write in

A5 Type of accommodation: *INTERVIEWER please cross one box only*

Council	Private rented	Private owned	Unauthorised	Bricks and Mortar
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A6 Name of Family:
INTERVIEWER please write in

A7 Ethnicity of Family:
INTERVIEWER please cross one box only

Romany Gypsy	Irish Traveller	Scots Gypsy or Traveller	Show Person
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Traveller	English Traveller	Welsh Gypsy	Non-Traveller
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify)			<input type="text"/>

A8 Number of units on the pitch:
INTERVIEWER please write in

Mobile homes	Touring Caravans	Day Rooms	Other (please specify)
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

NOT FOR CIRCULATION

A9 Is this site your main place of residence? If not where is?

INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only

Yes

No

If not main place of residence where is (please specify)

A10 How long have you lived here? If you have moved in the past 5 years, where did you move from? *INTERVIEWER: Please write in below*

Years	Months	If you have moved in the past 5 years, where did you move from? Include ALL moves
-------	--------	---

A11 Did you live here out of your own choice or because there was no other option? If there was no other option, why? *INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only*

Choice

No option

If no option, why?

A12 Is this site suitable for your household? If so why and if not why not? (For example close to schools, work, healthcare, family and friends etc.)

INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only

Yes

No

Reasons (please specify)

A13 How many separate families or unmarried adults live on this pitch?

INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

B Demographics

B1 Demographics — Household 1 *INTERVIEWER: Please write-in*

Person 1

Person 2

Person 3

Sex	Age	Sex	Age	Sex	Age
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Complete additional forms for each household on pitch *INTERVIEWER: Please write-in*

Person 4

Person 5

Person 6

Person 7

Person 8

Sex	Age	Sex	Age	Sex	Age	Sex	Age	Sex	Age
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

C Accommodation Needs

C1 How many families or unmarried adults living on this pitch are in need of a pitch of their own in the next 5 years? *INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only*

INTERVIEWER: AN ADULT IS DEFINED AS 16+

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Other *Please specify*

NOT FOR CIRCULATION

C2 How many of your children will need a home of their own in the next 5 years? If they live here now, will they want to stay on this site? If not, where would they wish to move? (e.g. other site, in bricks and mortar etc.) If they do not live on this site, where do they currently live and would they want to move on to this site or another local site if they could get a pitch? *INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other Please specify

Details (Please specify)

D **Waiting List**

D1 Is anyone living here on the waiting list for a pitch in this area?
INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	→	Continue to D2
No	<input type="checkbox"/>	→	Go to D4

D2 How many people living here are on the waiting list for a pitch in this area?
INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (Please specify)

Details (Please specify)

D3 How long have they been on the waiting list? *INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only*

0-3 months	3-6 months	6-12 months	1-2 years	2+ years
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other (Please specify)

Details (Please specify)

D4 If they are not on the waiting list, do any of the people living here want to be on the waiting list? (*INTERVIEWER* if they do - please take their contact details)

INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

No Other (Please specify)

Details (Please specify) and take contact details)

NOT FOR CIRCULATION

E

Future Accommodation Needs

E1 Do you plan to move from this site in the next 5 years? If so, why?

INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only

Yes If yes → Continue to E2
No If no → Go to E5

If so, why? (please specify)

E2 Where would you move to? *INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only*

Another site in this area (specify where)	A site in another council area (specify where)	Bricks and mortar in this area (specify where)	Bricks and mortar in another council area (specify where)	Other (e.g. land they own elsewhere) (Please specify)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please specify where they would move to
If they own land elsewhere - probe for details

E3 If you want to move would you prefer to buy a private pitch or site, or rent a pitch on a public or private site? *INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only*

Private buy

Private rent

Public rent

E4 Can you afford to buy a private pitch or site? *INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only*

Yes

No

E5 Are you aware of, or do you own any land that could have potential for new pitches? *INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only*

Yes

No

Please ask for details on where land/site is located and who owns the land/site?

NOT FOR CIRCULATION

F	Travelling
F1	<p>How many trips, living in a caravan or trailer, have you or members of your family made away from your permanent base in the last 12 months? <i>INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5+ </p> <p style="text-align: center;"> ↓ Go to F6a ↗ Continue to F2 </p>
F2	<p>If you or members of your family have travelled in the last 12 months, which family members travelled? <i>INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <input type="checkbox"/> All the family <input type="checkbox"/> Adult males <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;" type="text" value="If other, please specify"/> </p>
F3	<p>What were the reasons for travelling? <i>INTERVIEWER: Please cross all that apply</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Work <input type="checkbox"/> Holidays <input type="checkbox"/> Visiting family <input type="checkbox"/> Fairs <input type="checkbox"/> Other </p> <p style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center; color: #7f7f7f;">Details / specify if necessary. If fairs—probe for whether this involves work</p>
F4	<p>At what time of year do you or family members usually travel? And for how long? <i>INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <input type="checkbox"/> All year <input type="checkbox"/> Summer <input type="checkbox"/> Winter </p> <p style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center; color: #7f7f7f;">And for how long?</p>
F5	<p>Where do you or family members usually stay when they are travelling? <i>INTERVIEWER: Please cross all boxes that apply</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <input type="checkbox"/> LA transit sites <input type="checkbox"/> Private transit sites <input type="checkbox"/> Roadside <input type="checkbox"/> Friends/family <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 10px;" type="text" value="If other, please specify"/> </p> <p style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center; color: #7f7f7f;">INTERVIEWER: Ask F6a — F8 <u>ONLY</u> if F1 = 0. Otherwise, go to F9</p>
F6a	<p>Are there any reasons why you don't you travel at the moment?</p> <p style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center; color: #7f7f7f;">Details</p>
F6b	<p>Have you or family members ever travelled? <i>INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> —————> Continue to F7 No <input type="checkbox"/> —————> Go to F9 </p>
F7a	<p>When did you or family members last travel? <i>INTERVIEWER: Please write in</i></p> <p style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center; color: #7f7f7f;">Details</p>
F7b	<p>What were the reasons for travelling? <i>INTERVIEWER: Please cross all that apply</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Work <input type="checkbox"/> Holidays <input type="checkbox"/> Visiting family <input type="checkbox"/> Fairs <input type="checkbox"/> Other </p> <p style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center; color: #7f7f7f;">Details / specify if necessary. If fairs—probe for whether this involves work</p>

NOT FOR CIRCULATION

F8 Why do you not travel anymore? *INTERVIEWER: Cross all boxes that apply & probe for details*

- | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Children
in school | Ill health | Old age | Settled now | Nowhere
to stop | No work
opportunities | Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If other, please specify

Details about children in school, types of ill health, or looking after relative with poor health, and specific problems/issues relating to old age

F9 Do you or other family members plan to travel in the future?

INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only

- | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|---|-----------------|
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | → | Continue to F10 |
| No | <input type="checkbox"/> | → | Go to G1 |
| Don't know | <input type="checkbox"/> | → | Go to G1 |

F10 When, and for what purpose do you/they plan to travel?

Details

F11 Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your travelling patterns?

Details

NOT FOR CIRCULATION

G

Any other information

G1 Any other information about this site or your accommodation needs? INTERVIEWER:
Please write in

Details (e.g. can current and future needs be met
by expanding or intensifying the existing site?)

G2 Site/Pitch plan? Any concerns? INTERVIEWER: Please sketch & write in

Sketch of Site/Pitch — any concerns?

Are any adaptations needed?

Why does the current accommodation not meet the household's needs; and could their needs could be addressed in situ e.g. extra caravans. This could cover people wanting to live with that household but who cannot currently

Page 7

NOT FOR CIRCULATION

H

Bricks & Mortar Contacts

H1 Contacts for Bricks and Mortar interviews? *INTERVIEWER: Please write in*

Details

Council contact?

Would you like the council to contact you about any of the issues raised in this interview? Please note that although ORS will pass on your contact details to the Council we cannot guarantee when they will contact you?

INTERVIEWER: Please cross one box only

Yes

No

INTERVIEWER: Can I confirm your name and telephone number so that we can pass them on to the Council for this purpose only. Your details will only be used for this purpose and will not be passed onto anyone else.

Respondent's Name.....

Respondent's Telephone.....

Respondent's Email.....

Interview log

INTERVIEWER: Please record the date and time that the interview was carried out

Date.....

Time of interview.....

Appendix F: Technical Note on Household Formation and Growth Rates



Technical Note

Gypsy and Traveller Household Formation and Growth Rates

August 26th 2015

Opinion Research Services
Spin-out company of Swansea University



As with all our studies, this research is subject to Opinion Research Services' Standard Terms and Conditions of Contract.

Any press release or publication of this research requires the advance approval of ORS. Such approval will only be refused on the grounds of inaccuracy or misrepresentation.

© Copyright August 2015

Contents

Household Growth Rates.....	4
Abstract and conclusions.....	4
Introduction.....	4
Compound growth.....	6
Caravan counts	7
Modelling population growth.....	8
Household growth	12
Household dissolution rates	14
Summary conclusions	14

Household Growth Rates

Abstract and conclusions

1. National and local household formation and growth rates are important components of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation assessments, but little detailed work has been done to assess their likely scale. Nonetheless, nationally, a net growth rate of 3% per annum has been commonly assumed and widely used in local assessments – even though there is actually no statistical evidence of households growing so quickly. The result has been to inflate both national and local requirements for additional pitches unrealistically.
2. Those seeking to provide evidence of high annual net household growth rates for Gypsies and Travellers have sometimes sought to rely on increases in the number of caravans, as reflected in caravan counts. However, caravan count data are unreliable and erratic – so the only proper way to project future population and household growth is through demographic analysis (which, of course, is used to assess housing needs in the settled community).
3. The growth in the Gypsy and Traveller population may be as low as 1.25% per annum – a rate which is much less than the 3% per annum often assumed, but still at least four times greater than in the general population. Even using extreme and unrealistic assumptions, it is hard to find evidence that net Gypsy and Traveller population and household growth rates are above 2% per annum nationally.
4. The often assumed 3% per annum net household growth rate is unrealistic and would require clear statistical evidence before being used for planning purposes. In practice, the best available evidence supports a national net household growth rate of 1.5% per annum for Gypsies and Travellers.
5. Some local authorities might perhaps allow for a household growth rate of up to 2.5% per annum, to provide a ‘margin’ if their populations are relatively youthful; but in areas where on-site surveys indicate that there are fewer children in the Gypsy and Traveller communities, the lower estimate of 1.5% per annum should be used for planning purposes.

Introduction

6. The rate of household growth is a key element in all housing assessments, including Gypsy and Traveller accommodation assessments. Compared with the general population, the relative youthfulness of many Gypsy and Traveller populations means that their birth rates are likely to generate higher-than-average population growth, and proportionately higher *gross* household formation rates. However, while their *gross* rate of household growth might be high, Gypsy and Traveller communities’ future accommodation needs are, in practice, affected by any reduction in the number of households due to dissolution and/or by movements in/out of the area and/or by transfers into other forms of housing. Therefore, the *net* rate of household growth is the *gross* rate of formation *minus* any reductions in households due to such factors. Of course, it is the *net* rate that is important in determining future accommodation needs for Gypsies and Travellers.

7. In this context, it is a matter of concern that many Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs assessments have not distinguished *gross* and *net* growth rates nor provided evidence for their assumed rates of household increase. These deficiencies are particularly important because when assumed growth rates are unrealistically high, and then compounded over a number of planning years, they can yield exaggerated projections of accommodation needs and misdirect public policy. Nonetheless, assessments and guidance documents have assumed 'standard' *net* growth rates of about 3% without sufficiently recognising either the range of factors impacting on the *gross* household growth rates or the implications of unrealistic assumptions when projected forward on a compound basis year by year.
8. For example, in a study for the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister ('Local Authority Gypsy and Traveller Sites in England', 2003), Pat Niner concluded that *net* growth rates as high as 2%-3% per annum should be assumed. Similarly, the Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) (which continued to be quoted after their abolition was announced in 2010) used *net* growth rates of 3% per annum without providing any evidence to justify the figure (For example, 'Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the East of England: A Revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England July 2009').
9. However, the guidance of the Department of Communities and Local Government ('Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments: Guidance', 2007) was much clearer in saying that:

The 3% family formation growth rate is used here as an example only. The appropriate rate for individual assessments will depend on the details identified in the local survey, information from agencies working directly with local Gypsy and Traveller communities, and trends identified from figures previously given for the caravan count. [In footnote 6, page 25]
10. The guidance emphasises that local information and trends should always be taken into account – because the *gross* rate of household growth is moderated by reductions in households through dissolution and/or by households moving into bricks and mortar housing or moving to other areas. In other words, even if 3% is plausible as a *gross* growth rate, it is subject to moderation through such reductions in households through dissolution or moves. It is the resulting *net* household growth rate that matters for planning purposes in assessing future accommodation needs.
11. The current guidance also recognises that assessments should use local evidence for *net* future household growth rates. A letter from the Minister for Communities and Local Government (Brandon Lewis MP), to Andrew Selous MP (placed in the House of Commons library on March 26th 2014) said:

I can confirm that the annual growth rate figure of 3% does not represent national planning policy.

The previous Administration's guidance for local authorities on carrying out Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments under the Housing Act 2004 is unhelpful in that it uses an illustrative example of calculating future accommodation need based on the 3% growth rate figure. The guidance notes that the appropriate rate for individual assessments will depend on the details identified in the local authority's own assessment of need. As such the Government is not endorsing or supporting the 3% growth rate figure.'

12. Therefore, while there are many assessments where a national Gypsy and Traveller household growth rate of 3% per annum has been assumed (on the basis of 'standard' precedent and/or guidance), there is little to justify this position and it conflicts with current planning guidance. In this context, this document seeks to integrate available evidence about *net* household growth rates in order to provide a more robust basis for future assessments.

Compound growth

13. The assumed rate of household growth is crucially important for Gypsy and Traveller studies because for future planning purposes it is projected over time on a compound basis – so errors are progressively enlarged. For example, if an assumed 3% *net* growth rate is compounded each year then the implication is that the number of households will double in only 23.5 years; whereas if a *net* compound rate of 1.5% is used then the doubling of household numbers would take 46.5 years. The table below shows the impact of a range of compound growth rates.

Table 1
Compound Growth Rates and Time Taken for Number of Households to Double

Household Growth Rate per Annum	Time Taken for Household to Double
3.00%	23.5 years
2.75%	25.5 years
2.50%	28 years
2.25%	31 years
2.00%	35 years
1.75%	40 years
1.50%	46.5 years

14. The above analysis is vivid enough, but another illustration of how different rates of household growth impact on total numbers over time is shown in the table below – which uses a baseline of 100 households while applying different compound growth rates over time. After 5 years, the difference between a 1.5% growth rate and a 3% growth rate is only 8 households (116 minus 108); but with a 20-year projection the difference is 46 households (181 minus 135).

Table 2
Growth in Households Over time from a Baseline of 100 Households

Household Growth Rate per Annum	5 years	10 years	15 years	20 years	50 years	100 years
3.00%	116	134	156	181	438	1,922
2.75%	115	131	150	172	388	1,507
2.50%	113	128	145	164	344	1,181
2.25%	112	125	140	156	304	925
2.00%	110	122	135	149	269	724
1.75%	109	119	130	141	238	567
1.50%	108	116	125	135	211	443

15. In summary, the assumed rate of household growth is crucially important because any exaggerations are magnified when the rate is projected over time on a compound basis. As we have shown, when compounded and projected over the years, a 3% annual rate of household growth implies much larger future Gypsy and Traveller accommodation requirements than a 1.5% per annum rate.

Caravan counts

16. Those seeking to demonstrate national Gypsy and Traveller household growth rates of 3% or more per annum have, in some cases, relied on increases in the number of caravans (as reflected in caravan counts) as their evidence. For example, some planning agents have suggested using 5-year trends in the national caravan count as an indication of the general rate of Gypsy and Traveller household growth. For example, the count from July 2008 to July 2013 shows a growth of 19% in the number of caravans on-site – which is equivalent to an average annual compound growth rate of 3.5%. So, *if plausible*, this approach could justify using a 3% or higher annual household growth rate in projections of future needs.
17. However, caravan count data are unreliable and erratic. For example, the July 2013 caravan count was distorted by the inclusion of 1,000 caravans (5% of the total in England) recorded at a Christian event near Weston-Super-Mare in North Somerset. Not only was this only an estimated number, but there were no checks carried out to establish how many caravans were occupied by Gypsies and Travellers. Therefore, the resulting count overstates the Gypsy and Traveller population and also the rate of household growth.
18. ORS has applied the caravan-counting methodology hypothetically to calculate the implied national household growth rates for Gypsies and Travellers over the last 15 years, and the outcomes are shown in the table below. The January 2013 count suggests an average annual growth rate of 1.6% over five years, while the July 2013 count gives an average 5-year rate of 3.5%; likewise a study benchmarked at January 2004 would yield a growth rate of 1%, while one benchmarked at January 2008 would imply a 5% rate of growth. Clearly any model as erratic as this is not appropriate for future planning.

Table 3
National CLG Caravan Count July 1998 to July 2014 with Growth Rates (Source: CLG)

Date	Number of caravans	5 year growth in caravans	Percentage growth over 5 years	Annual over last 5 years.
Jan 2015	20,123	1,735	9.54%	1.84%
July 2014	20,035	2,598	14.90%	2.81%
Jan 2014	19,503	1,638	9.17%	1.77%
July 2013	20,911	3,339	19.00%	3.54%
Jan 2013	19,359	1,515	8.49%	1.64%
Jul 2012	19,261	2,112	12.32%	2.35%
Jan 2012	18,746	2,135	12.85%	2.45%
Jul 2011	18,571	2,258	13.84%	2.63%
Jan 2011	18,383	2,637	16.75%	3.15%
Jul 2010	18,134	2,271	14.32%	2.71%
Jan 2010	18,370	3,001	19.53%	3.63%
Jul 2009	17,437	2,318	15.33%	2.89%
Jan 2009	17,865	3,503	24.39%	4.46%
Jul 2008	17,572	2,872	19.54%	3.63%
Jan 2008	17,844	3,895	27.92%	5.05%

Jul 2007	17,149	2,948	20.76%	3.84%
Jan 2007	16,611	2,893	21.09%	3.90%
Jul 2006	16,313	2,511	18.19%	3.40%
Jan 2006	15,746	2,352	17.56%	3.29%
Jul 2005	15,863	2,098	15.24%	2.88%
Jan 2005	15,369	1,970	14.70%	2.78%
Jul 2004	15,119	2,110	16.22%	3.05%
Jan 2004	14,362	817	6.03%	1.18%
Jul 2003	14,700			
Jan 2003	13,949			
Jul 2002	14,201			
Jan 2002	13,718			
Jul 2001	13,802			
Jan 2001	13,394			
Jul 2000	13,765			
Jan 2000	13,399			
Jan 1999	13,009			
Jul 1998	13,545			

19. The annual rate of growth in the number of caravans varies from slightly over 1% to just over 5% per annum. We would note that if longer time periods are used the figures do become more stable. Over the 36 year period 1979 (the start of the caravan counts) to 2015 the compound growth rate in caravan numbers has been 2.5% per annum.
20. However, there is no reason to assume that these widely varying rates correspond with similar rates of increase in the household population. In fact, the highest rates of caravan growth occurred between 2006 and 2009, when the first wave of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs assessments were being undertaken – so it seems plausible that the assessments prompted the inclusion of additional sites and caravans (which may have been there, but not counted previously). Counting caravan numbers is very poor proxy for Gypsy and Traveller household growth. Caravans counted are not always occupied by Gypsy and Traveller families and numbers of caravans held by families may increase generally as affluence and economic conditions improve, (but without a growth in households)
21. There is no reason to believe that the varying rates of increase in the number of caravans are matched by similar growth rates in the household population. The caravan count is not an appropriate planning guide and the only proper way to project future population and household growth is through demographic analysis – which should consider both population and household growth rates. This approach is not appropriate to needs studies for the following reasons:

Modelling population growth

Introduction

22. The basic equation for calculating the rate of Gypsy and Traveller population growth seems simple: start with the base population and then calculate the average increase/decrease by allowing for births, deaths and in-/out-migration. Nevertheless, deriving satisfactory estimates is difficult because the evidence is often tenuous – so, in this context, ORS has modelled the growth of the national Gypsy and Traveller population based on the most likely birth and death rates, and by using PopGroup (the leading software for

population and household forecasting). To do so, we have supplemented the available national statistical sources with data derived locally (from our own surveys) and in some cases from international research. None of the supplementary data are beyond question, and none will stand alone; but, when taken together they have cumulative force. In any case the approach we adopt is more critically self-aware than simply adopting 'standard' rates on the basis of precedent.

Migration effects

23. Population growth is affected by national net migration and local migration (as Gypsies and Travellers move from one area to another). In terms of national migration, the population of Gypsies and Travellers is relatively fixed, with little international migration. It is in principle possible for Irish Travellers (based in Ireland) to move to the UK, but there is no evidence of this happening to a significant extent and the vast majority of Irish Travellers were born in the UK or are long-term residents. In relation to local migration effects, Gypsies and Travellers can and do move between local authorities – but in each case the in-migration to one area is matched by an out-migration from another area. Since it is difficult to estimate the net effect of such movements over local plan periods, ORS normally assumes that there will be nil net migration to/from an area. Nonetheless, where it is possible to estimate specific in-/out- migration effects, we take account of them, while distinguishing between migration and household formation effects.

Population profile

24. The main source for the rate of Gypsy and Traveller population growth is the UK 2011 Census. In some cases the data can be supplemented by ORS's own household survey data which is derived from more than 2,000 face-to-face interviews with Gypsies and Travellers since 2012. The ethnicity question in the 2011 census included for the first time 'Gypsy and Irish Traveller' as a specific category. While non-response bias probably means that the size of the population was underestimated, the age profile the census provides is not necessarily distorted and matches the profile derived from ORS's extensive household surveys.
25. The age profile is important, as the table below (derived from census data) shows. Even assuming zero deaths in the population, achieving an annual population growth of 3% (that is, doubling in size every 23.5 years) would require half of the "year one" population to be aged under 23.5 years. When deaths are accounted for (at a rate of 0.5% per annum), to achieve the same rate of growth, a population of Gypsies and Travellers would need about half its members to be aged under 16 years. In fact, though, the 2011 census shows that the midway age point for the national Gypsy and Traveller population is 26 years – so the population could not possibly double in 23.5 years.

Table 4

Age Profile for the Gypsy and Traveller Community in England (Source: UK Census of Population 2011)

Age Group	Number of People	Cumulative Percentage
Age 0 to 4	5,725	10.4
Age 5 to 7	3,219	16.3
Age 8 to 9	2,006	19.9
Age 10 to 14	5,431	29.8
Age 15	1,089	31.8
Age 16 to 17	2,145	35.7
Age 18 to 19	1,750	38.9

Age 20 to 24	4,464	47.1
Age 25 to 29	4,189	54.7
Age 30 to 34	3,833	61.7
Age 35 to 39	3,779	68.5
Age 40 to 44	3,828	75.5
Age 45 to 49	3,547	82.0
Age 50 to 54	2,811	87.1
Age 55 to 59	2,074	90.9
Age 60 to 64	1,758	94.1
Age 65 to 69	1,215	96.3
Age 70 to 74	905	97.9
Age 75 to 79	594	99.0
Age 80 to 84	303	99.6
Age 85 and over	230	100.0

Birth and fertility rates

26. The table above provides a way of understanding the rate of population growth through births. The table shows that surviving children aged 0-4 years comprise 10.4% of the Gypsy and Traveller population – which means that, on average, 2.1% of the total population was born each year (over the last 5 years). The same estimate is confirmed if we consider that those aged 0-14 comprise 29.8% of the Gypsy and Traveller population – which also means that almost exactly 2% of the population was born each year. (Deaths during infancy will have minimal impact within the early age groups, so the data provides the best basis for estimating of the birth rate for the Gypsy and Traveller population.)
27. The total fertility rate (TFR) for the whole UK population is just below 2 – which means that on average each woman can be expected to have just less than two children who reach adulthood. We know of only one estimate of the fertility rates of the UK Gypsy and Traveller community. This is contained in the book, ‘Ethnic identity and inequalities in Britain: The dynamics of diversity’ by Dr Stephen Jivraj and Professor Ludi Simpson published in May 2015. This draws on the 2011 Census data and provides an estimated total fertility rate of 2.75 for the Gypsy and traveller community
28. ORS’s have been able to examine our own survey data to investigate the fertility rate of Gypsy and Traveller women. The ORS data shows that, on average, Gypsy and Traveller women aged 32 years have 2.5 children (but, because the children of mothers above this age point tend to leave home progressively, full TFRs were not completed). On this basis it is reasonable to assume an average of three children per woman during her lifetime which would be consistent with the evidence from the 2011 Census of a figure of around 2.75 children per woman. In any case, the TFR for women aged 24 years is 1.5 children, which is significantly short of the number needed to double the population in 23.5 years – and therefore certainly implies a net growth rate of less than 3% per annum.

Death rates

29. Although the above data imply an annual growth rate through births of about 2%, the death rate has also to be taken into account – which means that the *net* population growth cannot conceivably achieve 2% per

annum. In England and Wales there are nearly half-a-million deaths each year – about 0.85% of the total population of 56.1 million in 2011. If this death rate is applied to the Gypsy and Traveller community then the resulting projected growth rate is in the region of 1.15%-1.25% per annum.

30. However, the Gypsy and Traveller population is significantly younger than average and may be expected to have a lower percentage death rate overall (even though a smaller than average proportion of the population lives beyond 68 to 70 years). While there can be no certainty, an assumed death rate of around 0.5% to 0.6% per annum would imply a net population growth rate of around 1.5% per annum.
31. Even though the population is younger and has a lower death rate than average, Gypsies and Travellers are less likely than average to live beyond 68 to 70 years. Whereas the average life expectancy across the whole population of the UK is currently just over 80 years, a Sheffield University study found that Gypsy and Traveller life expectancy is about 10-12 years less than average (Parry et al (2004) 'The Health Status of Gypsies and Travellers: Report of Department of Health Inequalities in Health Research Initiative', University of Sheffield). Therefore, in our population growth modelling we have used a conservative estimate of average life expectancy as 72 years – which is entirely consistent with the lower-than-average number of Gypsies and Travellers aged over 70 years in the 2011 census (and also in ORS's own survey data). On the basis of the Sheffield study, we could have supposed a life expectancy of only 68, but we have been cautious in our approach.

Modelling outputs

32. If we assume a TFR of 3 and an average life expectancy of 72 years for Gypsies and Travellers, then the modelling projects the population to increase by 66% over the next 40 years – implying a population compound growth rate of 1.25% per annum (well below the 3% per annum often assumed). If we assume that Gypsy and Traveller life expectancy increases to 77 years by 2050, then the projected population growth rate rises to nearly 1.5% per annum. To generate an 'upper range' rate of population growth, we have assumed a TFR of 4 and an average life expectancy rising to 77 over the next 40 years – which then yields an 'upper range' growth rate of 1.9% per annum. We should note, though, that national TFR rates of 4 are currently found only in sub-Saharan Africa and Afghanistan, so it is an implausible assumption.
33. There are indications that these modelling outputs are well founded. For example, in the ONS's 2012-based Sub-National Population Projections the projected population growth rate for England to 2037 is 0.6% per annum, of which 60% is due to natural change and 40% due to migration. Therefore, the natural population growth rate for England is almost exactly 0.35% per annum – meaning that our estimate of the Gypsy and Traveller population growth rate is four times greater than that of the general population of England.
34. The ORS Gypsy and Traveller findings are also supported by data for comparable populations around the world. As noted, on the basis of sophisticated analysis, Hungary is planning for its Roma population to grow at around 2.0% per annum, but the underlying demographic growth is typically closer to 1.5% per annum. The World Bank estimates that the populations of Bolivia, Cambodia, Egypt, Malaysia, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines and Venezuela (countries with high birth rates and improving life expectancy) all show population growth rates of around 1.7% per annum. Therefore, in the context of national data, ORS's modelling and plausible international comparisons, it is implausible to assume a net 3% annual growth rate for the Gypsy and Traveller population.

Household growth

35. In addition to population growth influencing the number of households, the size of households also affects the number. Hence, population and household growth rates do not necessarily match directly, mainly due to the current tendency for people to live in smaller (childless or single person) households (including, of course, older people (following divorce or as surviving partners)). Based on such factors, the CLG 2012-based projections convert current population data to a projected household growth rate of 0.85% per annum (compared with a population growth rate of 0.6% per annum).
36. Because the Gypsy and Traveller population is relatively young and has many single parent households, a 1.5% annual population growth could yield higher-than-average household growth rates, particularly if average household sizes fall or if younger-than-average households form. However, while there is evidence that Gypsy and Traveller households already form at an earlier age than in the general population, the scope for a more rapid rate of growth, through even earlier household formation, is limited.
37. Based on the 2011 census, the table below compares the age of household representatives in English households with those in Gypsy and Traveller households – showing that the latter has many more household representatives aged under-25 years. In the general English population 3.6% of household representatives are aged 16-24, compared with 8.7% in the Gypsy and Traveller population. Because the census includes both housed and on-site Gypsies and Travellers without differentiation, it is not possible to know if there are different formation rates on sites and in housing. However, ORS's survey data (for sites in areas such as Central Bedfordshire, Cheshire, Essex, Gloucestershire and a number of authorities in Hertfordshire) shows that about 10% of Gypsy and Traveller households have household representatives aged under-25 years.

Table 5
Age of Head of Household (Source: UK Census of Population 2011)

Age of household representative	All households in England		Gypsy and Traveller households in England	
	Number of households	Percentage of households	Number of households	Percentage of households
Age 24 and under	790,974	3.6%	1,698	8.7%
Age 25 to 34	3,158,258	14.3%	4,232	21.7%
Age 35 to 49	6,563,651	29.7%	6,899	35.5%
Age 50 to 64	5,828,761	26.4%	4,310	22.2%
Age 65 to 74	2,764,474	12.5%	1,473	7.6%
Age 75 to 84	2,097,807	9.5%	682	3.5%
Age 85 and over	859,443	3.9%	164	0.8%
Total	22,063,368	100%	19,458	100%

38. The following table shows that the proportion of single person Gypsy and Traveller households is not dissimilar to the wider population of England; but there are more lone parents, fewer couples without children, and fewer households with non-dependent children amongst Gypsies and Travellers. This data suggest that Gypsy and Traveller households form at an earlier age than the general population.

Table 6
Household Type (Source: UK Census of Population 2011)

Household Type	All households in England		Gypsy and Traveller households in England	
	Number of households	Percentage of households	Number of households	Percentage of households
Single person	6,666,493	30.3%	5,741	29.5%
Couple with no children	5,681,847	25.7%	2345	12.1%
Couple with dependent children	4,266,670	19.3%	3683	18.9%
Couple with non-dependent children	1,342,841	6.1%	822	4.2%
Lone parent: Dependent children	1,573,255	7.1%	3,949	20.3%
Lone parent: All children non-dependent	766,569	3.5%	795	4.1%
Other households	1,765,693	8.0%	2,123	10.9%
Total	22,063,368	100%	19,458	100%

39. ORS's own site survey data is broadly compatible with the data above. We have found that: around 50% of pitches have dependent children compared with 45% in the census; there is a high proportion of lone parents; and about a fifth of Gypsy and Traveller households appear to be single person households. One possible explanation for the census finding a higher proportion of single person households than the ORS surveys is that many older households are living in bricks and mortar housing (perhaps for health-related reasons).
40. ORS's on-site surveys have also found more female than male residents. It is possible that some single person households were men linked to lone parent females and unwilling to take part in the surveys. A further possible factor is that at any time about 10% of the male Gypsy and Traveller population is in prison – an inference drawn from the fact that about 5% of the male prison population identify themselves as Gypsies and Travellers ('People in Prison: Gypsies, Romany and Travellers', Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons, February 2004) – which implies that around 4,000 Gypsies and Travellers are in prison. Given that almost all of the 4,000 people are male and that there are around 200,000 Gypsies and Travellers in total, this equates to about 4% of the total male population, but closer to 10% of the adult male population.
41. The key point, though, is that since 20% of Gypsy and Traveller households are lone parents, and up to 30% are single persons, there is limited potential for further reductions in average household size to increase current household formation rates significantly – and there is no reason to think that earlier household formations or increasing divorce rates will in the medium term affect household formation rates. While there are differences with the general population, a 1.5% per annum Gypsy and Traveller population

growth rate is likely to lead to a household growth rate of 1.5% per annum – more than the 0.85% for the English population as a whole, but much less than the often assumed 3% rate for Gypsies and Travellers.

Household dissolution rates

42. Finally, consideration of household dissolution rates also suggests that the net household growth rate for Gypsies and Travellers is very unlikely to reach 3% per annum (as often assumed). The table below, derived from ORS's mainstream strategic housing market assessments, shows that generally household dissolution rates are between 1.0% and 1.7% per annum. London is different because people tend to move out upon retirement, rather than remaining in London until death. To adopt a 1.0% dissolution rate as a standard guide nationally would be too low, because it means that average households will live for 70 years after formation. A 1.5% dissolution rate would be a more plausible as a national guide, implying that average households live for 47 years after formation.

Table 7
Annual Dissolution Rates (Source: SHMAs undertaken by ORS)

Area	Annual projected household dissolution	Number of households	Percentage
Greater London	25,000	3,266,173	0.77%
Blaenau Gwent	468.2	30,416	1.54%
Bradford	3,355	199,296	1.68%
Ceredigion	348	31,562	1.10%
Exeter, East Devon, Mid Devon, Teignbridge and Torbay	4,318	254,084	1.70%
Neath Port Talbot	1,352	57,609	2.34%
Norwich, South Norfolk and Broadland	1,626	166,464	0.98%
Suffolk Coastal	633	53,558	1.18%
Monmouthshire Newport Torfaen	1,420	137,929	1.03%

43. The 1.5% dissolution rate is important because the death rate is a key factor in moderating the *gross* household growth rate. Significantly, applying a 1.5% dissolution rate to a 3% *gross* household growth formation rate yields a *net* rate of 1.5% per annum – which ORS considers is a realistic figure for the Gypsy and Traveller population and which is in line with other demographic information. After all, based on the dissolution rate, a *net* household formation rate of 3% per annum would require a 4.5% per annum *gross* formation rate (which in turn would require extremely unrealistic assumptions about birth rates).

Summary conclusions

44. Future Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs have typically been over-estimated because population and household growth rates have been projected on the basis of assumed 3% per annum net growth rates.
45. Unreliable caravan counts have been used to support the supposed growth rate, but there is no reason to suppose that the rate of increase in caravans corresponds to the annual growth of the Gypsy and Traveller population or households.

46. The growth of the national Gypsy and Traveller population may be as low as 1.25% per annum – which is still four times greater than in the settled community. Even using extreme and unrealistic assumptions, it is hard to find evidence that the net national Gypsy and Traveller population and household growth is above 2% per annum nationally. The often assumed 3% net household growth rate per annum for Gypsies and Travellers is unrealistic.
47. The best available evidence suggests that the net annual Gypsy and Traveller household growth rate is 1.5% per annum. The often assumed 3% per annum net rate is unrealistic. Some local authorities might allow for a household growth rate of up to 2.5% per annum, to provide a ‘margin’ if their populations are relatively youthful; but in areas where on-site surveys indicate that there are fewer children in the Gypsy and Traveller population, the lower estimate of 1.5% per annum should be used.