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1. Executive Summary

Introduction and Methodology

1.1 The primary objective of the 2015 Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment (GTNA) is to provide a robust assessment of current and future need for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation in Basingstoke and Deane. The GTNA provides a robust and 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 to 2029.

1.2 The GTNA has sought to understand the accommodation needs of the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population in Basingstoke and Deane through a combination of desk-based research, stakeholder interviews and engagement with members of the Travelling Community. A total of 17 interviews were completed with Gypsies and Travellers living on authorised and unauthorised sites. Despite efforts to identify them no interviews were completed with Travellers living in bricks and mortar. A total of 20 telephone interviews were completed with Officers from Basingstoke and Deane Council, Officers from neighbouring local authorities, and other local stakeholders.

1.3 The baseline date for the study is July 2015.

Key Demographic Findings

1.4 Ethnicity data was captured from all of the households that were interviewed on the Gypsy and Traveller sites. The sites in Basingstoke and Deane are occupied by a mixture of English Travellers, Irish Travellers, Roma Gypsies and those with mixed ethnicity.

1.5 Demographic information showed a mixed range of ages across the sites, though a higher proportion of the site population were younger when compared to the overall population of Basingstoke and Deane (2011 Census).

1.6 In total the site interviews covered 52 residents living on Gypsy and Traveller sites. This was made up of 33 adults and 19 children and teenagers aged under 18. This equates to 64% adults, 36% children and teenagers. Although not a direct comparison, data from the Census for Basingstoke and Deane as a whole (the settled community and the Gypsy or Irish Traveller community) and for Gypsies or Irish Travellers has been compared to the site population. This shows a large difference between the site population and that of the Basingstoke and Deane population as a whole, and less of a difference between the site population and the Census Gypsy or Irish Traveller population for Basingstoke and Deane.
Additional Pitch Needs – Gypsies and Travellers

1.7 Based upon the evidence presented in this study the pitch provision needed for Gypsies and Travellers to 2029 in Basingstoke and Deane is for 16 additional pitches, as detailed in the table below. These figures should be seen as the projected amount of provision which is necessary to meet the statutory obligations towards identifiable needs of the Gypsy and Traveller population arising in Basingstoke and Deane. A detailed breakdown which sets out the components that make up this additional need, together with any other issues that have been taken into consideration are included in Chapter 7 of this report.

1.8 The study has assumed that the needs arising from 4 unauthorised pitches and 4 concealed households are met in the first 5 years. In addition total new household formation of 8 is apportioned over the time periods set out in the table below based on a net compound growth rate of 2.00%.

Figure 1 - Extra net pitch need in Basingstoke and Deane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-2020</th>
<th>2020-2025</th>
<th>2025-2029</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basingstoke and Deane</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.9 It is also important to consider the impact that a potential change in the definition of Gypsies and Travellers for planning purposes may have on the overall assessment of need if this would result in the exclusion of those who no longer travel. The site interviews indicated that only a small number of households on private sites travel on a regular basis for work or other purposes.

Transit Sites

1.10 There has been a decline in the number of unauthorised encampments and whilst the overall number would suggest that there is a need to consider transit provision, discussions with the Council indicated that a small number of local Travellers were responsible for almost two thirds of encampments over the past 18 months. It is understood that these Travellers have other local housing options.

1.11 The need for transit provision was raised by a number of stakeholders. In addition the 2007 GTAA recommended the need for 1 transit site in Basingstoke and Deane and the 2012 GTAA recommended that there was a need for 2 emergency stopping places. Neither of these has yet been provided. As the majority of the encampments by transient households are for less than 7 days it is not recommended that the Council should deliver a formal transit site, but should consider the provision of 3 emergency stopping places to meet the short-term and transient need of these Travellers.

Travelling Showpeople Requirements

1.12 Whilst it was not possible to interview the site residents, a statistical analysis of needs would have been inappropriate due to the small numbers of those residing on the site involved. In addition it should be noted that there has been no planning activity on the site since 2001. It is therefore recommended at this time that the Council do not need to make any further provision to meet the needs of Travelling Showpeople in Basingstoke and Deane. The situation at the yard should however be monitored on an annual basis.
2. Introduction

The Study

2.1 Opinion Research Services (ORS) were appointed by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council (the Council) in April 2015 to complete a robust and up-to-date needs assessment of accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople to 2029.

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 2004, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012, Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) 2014, and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) 2012.

2.3 The GTNA provides a robust assessment of need for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation in Basingstoke and Deane. It is a robust and credible evidence base which can be used to aid the implementation of development plan policies and the provision of Traveller pitches and plots for the period to 2029. As well as identifying current and future permanent accommodation needs, it will also seek to identify whether or not the Council needs to plan for the provision of transit sites 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) Needs Assessment (GTNA).

2.5 The baseline date for the study is July 2015.

Local Planning Policy in Basingstoke and Deane

2.6 The Council’s existing GTAA was published in July 2012, and was produced by Council Officers. Prior to 2012 the Council relied on a Hampshire wide study produced by David Couttie Associates covering the period from 2006-2011.

2.7 Both of the previous studies demonstrated that there was a relatively low level of demand for Gypsy and Traveller provision in the borough. The need identified in 2006-2011 was for 3 traveller pitches, whilst this increased to 7 traveller pitches and 2 transit pitches in the 2012-2017 study. The 2012 assessment did not identify any need for Travelling Showpeople sites in the borough.

2.8 The 2012 study informed the Submission Local Plan, which was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 9th October 2014. This contained a specific policy on Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, draft Policy CN5. The approach set out in Policy CN5 is to rely on a development management approach for identifying suitable traveller sites up until 2017 (i.e. permitting applications at suitable sites where there is
a demonstrable need and subject to meeting a detailed set of criteria), and address future needs through the provision of pitches on the Submission Plan’s larger strategic housing site allocations (SS3.9, SS3.10 and SS3.11).

2.9 Following the submission of the draft Local Plan, an Exploratory Meeting was held at the Inspector’s request. In relation to Policy CNS, the Inspector stated that as it stood the policy was a soundness concern. The Inspector set out 3 possible solutions:

(i) a policy which included full site locations for G&T pitches;

(ii) put a target in the Plan; or

(iii) set out a timetable for preparing a plan which would do so in the near future.

2.10 The Council therefore requires this updated GTNA so that the Inspector’s concerns can be properly addressed prior to the examination of the Submission Local Plan later in 2015. This report will provide a new evidence base that will be used to take forward work on a Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document.

Definitions

2.11 For the purposes of the planning system, the current definition\(^1\) for 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 or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of Travelling Showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.* (Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), March 2012).

2.12 Within the main definition of Gypsies and Travellers, there are a number of main cultural groups which include:

» Romany Gypsies

» Irish Travellers

» New (Age) Travellers.

2.13 Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers are recognised in law as distinct ethnic groups and are legally protected from discrimination under the Equalities Act 2010.

2.14 Alongside Gypsies and Travellers, a further group to be considered is Travelling Showpeople. They are defined as:

*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 family’s or dependant’s more localised pattern of trading, educational or health needs or old age have ceased*
to travel temporarily or permanently, but excludes Gypsies and Travellers as defined above.
(Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, DCLG, March 2012).

Legislation and Guidance for Gypsies and Travellers

2.15 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 pieces of legislation and guidance are relevant when developing policies relating to Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople:

» Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS), 2012
» National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2012
» Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
» Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments Guidance, 2007
» The Human Rights Act 1998 (when making decisions and welfare assessments)
» The Town and Country Planning Act, 1990
» Criminal Justice and Public Order Act, 1994
» Anti-social Behaviour Act, 2003
» Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004
» Housing Act, 2004 (which requires local housing authorities to assess the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Showpeople as part of their housing needs assessments. This study complies with this element of government guidance)
» Housing Act, 1996 (in respect of homelessness)

2.16 To focus on Gypsies and Travellers, the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 is particularly important with regard to the issue of planning for Gypsy and Traveller site provision. This repealed the duty of Local Authorities from the Caravans Act 1968 to provide appropriate accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers. However, at this time Circular 1/94 did support maintaining existing sites and stated that appropriate future site provision should be considered.

2.17 For site provision, the previous Government guidance focused on increasing site provision for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and encouraged Local Authorities to have a more inclusive approach within their Housing Needs Assessment. The Housing Act 2004 Section 225 requires Local Authorities to identify the need for Gypsy and Traveller sites, alongside the need for other types of housing, when conducting Housing Needs Surveys. Therefore, all Local Authorities were required to undertake accommodation assessments for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople either as a separate study such as this one, or as part of their main Housing Needs Assessment.

2.18 Local Authorities were encouraged rather than compelled to provide new Gypsy and Traveller sites by central Government. Circular 1/06 ‘Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites’, released by the DCLG in January 2006, replaced Circular 1/94 and suggested that the provision of authorised sites should be encouraged so that the number of unauthorised sites would be reduced.
2.19 The Government announced that Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites (Circular 01/06) was to be repealed, along with the Regional Spatial Strategies which were used to allocate pitch provision to local authorities. The DCLG published ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’ in March 2012 which set out the Government’s policy for traveller sites. It should be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework.

2.20 A letter from the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for the Department for Communities and Local Government in March 2014 helped to clarify the Government’s position on household formation rates and also suggested that current planning guidance will soon be updated and stated:

‘Following the recent consolidation of planning guidance we will be seeking to consult on updating and streamlining the remaining elements of traveller planning practice guidance and also on strengthening traveller planning policy. We will ensure that any new guidance supports councils to accurately assess their needs and would remove ambiguous references to the 3% growth rate figure, which, I stress, is only illustrative. This would, once published, have the effect of cancelling the last Administration’s guidance.’

‘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, though in some cases we are aware that inspectors have, in considering the level of unmet local need when demonstrating specific traveller appeals, used the 3% growth rate figure in the absence of a local authority’s own up-to-date assessment of need.’

2.21 More recently (Sept–Nov 2014) DCLG launched a consultation on proposed changes to government policy on Planning and Travellers. This consultation addressed a number of issues including ensuring that the planning system applies fairly and equally to both the settled and traveller communities; further strengthening protection of sensitive areas and Green Belt; and addressing the negative impact of unauthorised occupation. It also set out how local authorities should assess future Traveller accommodation needs in Annex A of the consultation document and this is very similar to the approach set out in this study. The consultation ended in November 2014 and the Council will need to be aware of the implications should subsequent changes to national policy and guidance be made.

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS)

2.22 PPTS, which came into force in March 2012, sets out the direction of Government policy. 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.

http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/
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 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.

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

In practice, the document states that (PPTS Paragraph 8):

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.

PPTS goes on to state (Paragraph 9) 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.
Local Authorities now have a duty to ensure a 5 year land supply to meet the identified needs for Traveller sites. However, PPTS also notes in Paragraph 10 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.

Tackling Inequalities for Gypsy and Traveller Communities

In April 2012 the Government issued a further document relating to Gypsies and Travellers titled ‘Progress report by the ministerial working group on tackling inequalities experienced by Gypsies and Travellers’ (DCLG April 2012).

The aforementioned report contains 28 commitments to help improve the circumstances and outcomes for Gypsies and Travellers across a range of areas including:

» Identifying ways of raising educational aspirations and attainment of Gypsy, Roma and Traveller children.
» Identifying ways to improve health outcomes for Gypsies and Travellers within the proposed new structures of the NHS.
» Encouraging appropriate site provision; building on £60 million Traveller Pitch Funding and New Homes Bonus incentives.
» Tackling hate crime against Gypsies and Travellers and improving their interaction with the criminal justice system.
» Improving knowledge of how Gypsies and Travellers engage with services that provide a gateway to work opportunities, and working with the financial services industry to improve access to financial products and services.
» Sharing good practice in engagement between Gypsies and Travellers and public service providers.

Funding

In 2011 Government introduced financial incentives for new affordable pitch provision in the form of the New Homes Bonus. For all new pitches on Local Authority or Registered Provider-owned and managed sites, Local Authorities are eligible for a New Homes Bonus equivalent to Council Tax (based on the national average for a Band A property), plus an additional affordable homes premium of £350 per annum for six years. This equates to around £8,000 per pitch.

Direct grant funding was also available for Gypsy and Traveller sites. The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) took over delivery of the Gypsy and Traveller Sites Grant programme from DCLG in April 2009. Since then they have invested £16.3million in 26 schemes across the country to provide 88 new or additional pitches and 179 improved pitches, through bids from Local Authorities, Housing Associations and Traveller community groups working with Registered Providers.
The HCA has now confirmed allocations for all of its £60 million of future funding through the Traveller Pitch Funding and New Homes bonus incentives which will support 96 projects around the country for the provision of new Gypsy and Traveller sites and new pitches on existing sites, as well as the improvement of existing pitches. For the HCA 2015-18 Affordable Housing Programme there is no ring-fenced funding, but proposals for Gypsy and Traveller pitches will be considered within the programme. The table below shows the current allocation outside of London.

**Figure 2 - HCA Grant Allocations for New Pitches (Source: HCA 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority Area</th>
<th>Amount of money</th>
<th>Number of new pitches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East and South East</td>
<td>£6,218,381</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>£14,126,576</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East, Yorkshire and The Humber</td>
<td>£15,328,694</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>£3,850,763</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and South West</td>
<td>£16,713,954</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£56,238,368</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,099</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While all HCA funds for Gypsy and Traveller pitches have now been allocated, further funding may become available as a result of slippage over the course of the programme. Local authorities and Registered Providers are advised to continue to work closely with HCA area teams to develop their proposals should any further funding become available as a result of some funded schemes not proceeding.

In addition to HCA funding and the New Homes Bonus, other sources of funding should be considered, for example S106 funding that has been identified to fund the provision of new pitches in other local authorities, working closely with Registered Providers, and encouraging the development or expansion of other private sites or yards.
3. Methodology

3.1 This section sets out the methodology that has been followed to deliver the outputs for this study. Over the past 10 years ORS has developed a methodology which provides the required outputs from a Gypsy and Traveller (and Travelling Showpeople) Needs Assessment and this has been updated in light of PPTS, as well as recent changes set out by the Planning Minister in March 2014, with particular reference to new household formation rates, and the recent DCLG consultation in 2014. This is an evolving methodology that has been adaptive to recent changes in planning policy as well as the outcomes of Local Plan examinations and planning appeals that ORS have been involved in. More recently ORS were approached by the Welsh Government to provide advice to support the development of new Gypsy and Traveller Guidance for Wales on the basis of our detailed work to identify an evidence base for household formation rates for the Gypsy and Traveller population in the UK. ORS also have considerable experience in undertaking GTAA studies across the UK, having completed studies for over 100 local authorities since PPTS was published in 2012.

3.2 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

3.3 A Glossary of Terms can be found in Appendix A.

Stage 1: Desk-Based Research

3.4 At the outset of the project ORS researched the background to the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population in Basingstoke and Deane. This comprised a review of a range of important secondary data from the following available sources:

» Census data.
» Details of all authorised sites and yards.
» Biannual Traveller Caravan Counts.
» Records of any unauthorised sites and encampments.
» Relevant information from planning, housing, education, community safety, environmental health and health services.
» Information on planning applications and appeals.
» Information on any other current enforcement actions.
» Existing GTAAs and other relevant local studies.
» Existing policy, guidance and best practice.
3.5 This data was used to inform the stakeholder interviews and fieldwork and has also been reviewed in conjunction with the outcomes of the other elements of the study to allow ORS to complete a thorough assessment of the needs of Travelling Communities in Basingstoke and Deane.

Stage 2: Stakeholder Engagement

3.6 This study included extensive local stakeholder engagement. This involved a series of in-depth telephone interviews with Planning, Housing and Environmental Officers from the Council, as well as the Council’s Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer and the County Council’s Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer; interviews with Councillors with responsibility for Housing and Regeneration; a representative Hampshire Police; and a representative from the Showmen’s Guild.

3.7 Contact was made with the Gypsy Council but they did not respond to the request. Despite this ORS are confident that the outcomes of the study are robust due to other successful stakeholder engagement.

3.8 The stakeholder interviews covered the following key topics:

» What dealings or relationships people have with Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

» Experiences of any particular issues in relation to Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

» Awareness of any Gypsy and Traveller sites and Travelling Showpeople yards either with or without planning permission and whether this varies over the course of a year.

» Any trends people may be experiencing with regard to Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (e.g. increase in privately owned sites or temporary sites).

» What attracts Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople to an area.

» Identification of any seasonal fluctuations that may occur.

» Awareness of any occurrences of temporary stopping by Travellers.

» Identifying the relationship between the settled and travelling communities.

» Awareness of any Travellers currently residing in bricks and mortar accommodation.

» Awareness of any cross boundary issues.

» Any other comments on the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople community in the study area.

3.9 In addition a link to a short online questionnaire was sent to all Borough Councillors and a representative of all Town and Parish Councils in Basingstoke and Deane Borough.

Stage 3: Working Collaboratively with Neighbouring Planning Authorities

3.10 Interviews were also conducted with Officers from neighbouring and nearby planning authorities. The interviews ensure that the GTNA addresses wider issues that may impact on the outcomes of the study. These stakeholders were identified as part of the desk-based review and in conjunction with Officers from
the Council. Interviews were conducted with Officers from the following local authorities and covered the same broad issues as the local stakeholder interviews:

» East Hampshire
» Hart
» Reading
» Test Valley
» West Berkshire
» Wiltshire
» Winchester
» Wokingham

Map 1 - Neighbouring Local Authorities Interviewed

Stage 4: Survey of Travelling Communities

Through the desk-based research and stakeholder interviews ORS sought to identify all authorised and unauthorised sites and encampments in Basingstoke and Deane. This work identified no public sites, 7 private sites (13 pitches), 2 sites tolerated for planning purposes (3 pitches) and 3 unauthorised sites (4 pitches). In addition 1 tolerated Travelling Showpeople yard was identified (2 plots). Full details of the sites can be found in Appendix B.
ORS sought to undertake a full demographic study of all occupied pitches and plots as part of our approach to undertaking the GTNA as our experience suggests that a sample based approach very often leads to an under-estimate of current and future needs which can be the subject of challenge at subsequent appeals and examinations. All occupied pitches and plots were visited by experienced ORS researchers who conducted interviews with as many residents as possible to determine their current demographic characteristics, whether they have any current or likely future accommodation needs and how these may be addressed, and whether there are any concealed households or doubling-up. The interview was based around an approach that was agreed with the Council and was consistent with that used in other ORS studies across England and Wales. The Visit Record Form can be found in Appendix C. This approach also allowed the interviewers to identify information about the pitches and plots that could help support any future work on possible site expansion by undertaking an overall assessment of each site or yard.

Where it was not possible to undertake an interview, researchers captured as much information as possible site from site owners or from residents on adjacent pitches or plots.

All of the site fieldwork was undertaken during June and July 2015 and despite this being during the travelling season the majority of the pitches on sites were occupied.

Stage 5: Bricks and Mortar Households

In our experience many Planning Inspectors and Appellants question the accuracy of GTNA assessments in relation to those Gypsies and Travellers living in bricks and mortar accommodation who may wish to move on to a site. ORS feel that the only practical approach is to take all possible measures to identify as many households in bricks and mortar who may want to take part in an interview to determine their future accommodation needs, including a wish to move to a permanent pitch in the study area.

Contacts in bricks and mortar were sought through a wide range of sources including speaking with people living on existing sites to identify any friends or family living in bricks and mortar who may wish to move to a site, intelligence from the Council and other local stakeholders. Adverts were also placed prominently on the Travellers Times website. In addition contact was made through Facebook with members of the Hampshire Romany’s Group.

Through this approach we endeavoured to do everything within our means to publicise that a local study was being undertaken in order to give all households living in bricks and mortar who may wish to move on to a site the opportunity to make their views known to us.

As a rule we do not extrapolate the findings from our fieldwork with Gypsies and Travellers living in bricks and mortar households up to the estimated Gypsy and Traveller bricks and mortar population as a whole, and work on the assumption that those wishing to move will make their views known to us based on the wide range of publicity that we put in place.

Details can be found in Appendix D
Stage 6: Current and Future Pitch/Plot Needs

3.19 The methodology used by ORS to calculate future pitch and plot needs has been developed over the past 10 years and has drawn on lessons from both traditional housing needs assessments and also best practice from Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessments conducted across the country.

3.20 To identify need Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 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 for residential pitches is to compare the supply of pitches available for occupation with the current and future needs of the population. The key factors in each of these elements are set out below and will be set out in more detail in Chapter 7 of this report:

Supply of Pitches

» Current vacant pitches.
» Pitches currently with planning consent due to be developed within the study period (unimplemented sites).
» Pitches to be vacated by households moving to bricks and mortar.
» Pitches to be vacated by households moving from the study area (out-migration).

Current Need

3.21 Total current need, which is not necessarily the need for additional pitches because they may be able to be addressed by space available in the study area, is made up of the following. It is important to address issues of double counting:

» Households on unauthorised sites or encampments for which planning permission is not expected.
» Concealed households/doubling-up/over-crowding.
» Households in bricks and mortar wishing to move to sites or yards.
» Households on waiting lists for public sites.

Future Need

3.22 Total future need is the sum of the following three components:

» Households living on sites with temporary planning permissions.
» Population and household growth.
» Movement to and from sites.

3.23 Household formation rates are often the subject of challenge at appeals or examinations. We agree with the position now being taken by DCLG (as set out in the Introduction to this report) and firmly
believe that any household formation rates should use a robust local evidence base, rather than simply relying on precedent. This is set out in more detail later in Chapter 7 of this report.

3.24 All of these components of supply and need are presented in easy to understand tables which identify the overall net need for current and future accommodation for both Gypsies and Travellers, and for Travelling Showpeople. 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 2029.

Stage 7: Conclusions

3.25 This stage of the study will draw together the evidence from Stages 1 to 6 to provide an overall summary of the accommodation needs for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in Basingstoke and Deane.
4. Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites and 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 and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. A pitch is an area which is large enough for one household to occupy and typically contains enough space for one or two caravans, but can vary in size. A site is a collection of pitches which form a development exclusively 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 typically exclusively occupied by Travelling Showpeople. Throughout this study, the main focus is upon how many extra pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and plots for Travelling Showpeople are required in Basingstoke and Deane.

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 licensees (similar to social housing).

4.3 The alternatives 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.
Further considerations for the Gypsy and Traveller population are unauthorised developments and encampments. Unauthorised developments occur on land which is owned by the Gypsies 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 occur on land which is not owned by the Gypsies and Travellers.

**Sites and Yards in Basingstoke and Deane**

In Basingstoke and Deane there are no public sites and 7 private sites with permanent planning permission which have a total of 13 pitches. There are no sites with temporary planning permission. There are also 3 pitches on 2 sites that are tolerated for planning purposes, 4 pitches on 3 unauthorised sites, and 2 tolerated plots on a small Travelling Showpeople yard. There is no public or private transit provision. Further details can be found in Chapter 6 and Appendix B.

**Figure 3 - Total amount of authorised provision in Basingstoke and Deane (July 2015)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sites/Yards</th>
<th>Pitches/Plots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private with permanent planning permission</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sites with temporary planning permission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sites (Council and Registered Providers)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Provision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Transit Provision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling Showpeople Provision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Map 2 - Indicative Location of Sites and Yards in Basingstoke and Deane (July 2015)**
4.7 Since the publication of the previous needs Assessment in 2012 the Council have granted planning permission for a total of 5 new Gypsy and Traveller pitches on 3 sites. These are at Meadowview caravan Site (2 pitches – occupied), Land Adjoining Forest Farm (1 pitch - occupied), and Land South of Harroway Organic Gardens (2 pitches – not yet implemented).

**Caravan Count**

4.8 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 DCLG. This is a statistical count of the number of caravans on both authorised and unauthorised sites across England. With effect from July 2013, DCLG has renamed the ‘Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Count’ as the ‘Traveller Caravan Count.’ This includes caravans lived in by both ethnic Gypsies and Travellers and non-Gypsies and Travellers.

4.9 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 that 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.
5. Stakeholder Engagement

Introduction

5.1 To be consistent with the guidance set out in PPTS and the methodology used in other GTNA studies undertaken by ORS, a stakeholder engagement programme was completed to complement the information gathered through the interviews with members of travelling communities.

5.2 The Council identified stakeholders including Registered Housing Providers; Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople representatives; key partners; and relevant Council Officers and Members. Officers from neighbouring local authorities East Hampshire, Hart, Reading, Test Valley, West Berkshire, Wiltshire, Winchester and Wokingham together with Hampshire County Council Traveller Service and Ethnic Minority and Traveller Achievement Service (EMTAS) were also interviewed. A full list of those who were interviewed can be found in Appendix E.

5.3 Organisations such as Ormiston, Friends and Families Trust and the Society of Independent Roundabout Proprietors, although willing to take part, said they do not operate in the area or there are other organisations representing Travelling communities in the area. ORS also made every effort to contact the Gypsy Council but they did not respond to the request to complete an interview.

5.4 ORS reviewed the list of contacts for consistency with other studies to ensure that it was comprehensive and fair. The number and range of stakeholders interviewed is viewed to be satisfactory and consistent with similar GTNAs that ORS have completed. Themes covered in the interviews included: current accommodation provision and facilities; perception of need; cross border issues and unauthorised encampments.

5.5 Importantly, this element of the study provided an opportunity for the research team to speak to stakeholders who may house Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in bricks and mortar housing. This is important as it enables identifying accommodation needs resulting from this group which may otherwise be hidden. Although RPs were contacted none were willing to be interviewed.

5.6 There are issues in relation to 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. The views expressed in this Section of the report represent a balanced summary of the responses given by stakeholders. In all cases they reflect the views of the individual concerned, rather than the official policy of their employer/organisation.
Basingstoke and Deane - Main Findings

Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers

5.7 David Couttie Associates (DCA) undertook a Hampshire and Isle of Wight GTNA in 2007. The report recommended the provision of 44 new pitches (9 in the North Area, with 3 in Basingstoke and Deane); this covered the period 2006-2011. DCA also recommended the development of 4 managed transit sites across the whole area (including 1 transit site in Basingstoke and Deane) by 2011.

5.8 Another GTNA was undertaken by the Council in 2012 to cover the period 2012-2017. The need identified was for 7 additional permanent residential pitches and 2 temporary stopping places by 2017. Stakeholders also said that broad locations for new permanent sites are identified in the Council’s Local Plan (Policies SS3.9, SS3.10 and SS3.11). In relation to Travelling Showpeople a Hampshire wide study was undertaken in 2008 and Travelling Showpeople were included in the Basingstoke and Deane GTNA 2012. These identified no additional need for plots or yards in the area.

5.9 There are no public or transit sites in Basingstoke and Deane. Stakeholders said that there are a number of privately owned family sites the majority of whom are thought to be owned by English or Romany Gypsies; planning permissions were said to be obtained retrospectively in the majority of cases. It was mentioned the most recent application is for a private site in Chineham. Although stakeholders had not visited the sites they were believed to be meeting the needs of residents. It was mentioned by one stakeholder that on some of the private sites there are issues of overcrowding because children are growing up and need their own accommodation. It was also said that the quality of any private site is dependent on how much the land cost and how much money was left for its development. Stakeholders were not aware of any yards in the area for Travelling Showpeople (although there is a small yard in Chineham). Stakeholders were not aware of any tolerated sites or sites with temporary planning permission in the area.

5.10 Some stakeholders highlighted the Peak Copse site in Dummer which had been owned and managed by Hampshire County Council but stated that this had been closed for some years because of anti-social behaviour issues.

5.11 Stakeholders gave no evidence to suggest that having no public or transit sites in the area is having an impact on neighbouring boroughs. However, it was suggested that having some kind of transit provision would be helpful, as there is little provision across Hampshire.

5.12 Based on previous GTNAs the majority of stakeholders believe there is a need for some new public sites and transit provision in the area. In relation to transit provision some stakeholders raised concerns over the management of a new transit site; therefore emergency stopping places were suggested as a resolution to encampments.

5.13 The majority of stakeholders had heard anecdotally of housed Travellers who would prefer site accommodation but were not able to provide any contacts to interview. Stakeholders also noted that there is a significant shortage of affordable land within the Borough and any sites needed for Gypsies and Travellers are likely to compete with the need for housing and employment.
Bricks and Mortar

5.14 Basingstoke and Deane operates a housing register and properties are bid for through the Council’s Homebid portal. As far as is known there are no Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople on the Council’s waiting list. Some Stakeholders said there are housed Travellers in Basingstoke, Bramley and Tadley and when reviewing Gypsy and Traveller policy five years ago a housed Gypsy or Traveller couple were involved; it was not known whether contact could be made with them.

5.15 ORS have made every attempt to involve housed Travellers in this study but the majority of stakeholders were of the view that engagement would be unlikely because they do not want to be identified and/or there is a level of distrust/suspicion of public authorities. All those interviewed were asked whether they could help ORS to contact Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople living in bricks and mortar housing in the area. However, only 4 organisations identified households and passed on letters and no responses were received.

5.16 Stakeholders were not aware of any specific support for Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople living in bricks and mortar. It was mentioned that RPs lack the specialist knowledge and understanding of the culture of Gypsies and Travellers and it is often presumed that once these communities move into bricks and mortar they will no longer follow their traditional culture.

5.17 The NHS has recently undertaken a Hampshire wide research into the health and wellbeing needs of these communities living in bricks and mortar accommodation⁴.

5.18 ORS are aware that RPs monitor ethnicity, but reasons for not being able to identify Gypsies and Travellers living in bricks and mortar housing often include:

- There being no specific category e.g. Gypsies/Irish Travellers on application forms;
- Monitoring is only possible where people self-declare their ethnicity;
- IT systems are not able to capture the information;
- Information cannot be extrapolated from administrative records.

Unauthorized Encampments

5.19 Hampshire Traveller Service reported that whilst unauthorised encampments are reducing across Hampshire, the one area which remains consistent is Basingstoke and Deane. The following information concerning unauthorised encampments in Borough were recorded by the Council:

---

⁴ Research into the health and wellbeing needs of Gypsies and Travellers living in ‘bricks and mortar’ accommodation in East Hampshire, Hart and New Forest District Council areas A Report from Shared Intelligence & Gypsylife June 2015
Figure 4 - Encampments in Basingstoke and Deane (July 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Encampments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.20 Stakeholders said there is no transit provision in the area. If some kind of transit provision were provided it was believed the number of encampments would reduce, site safety would improve, there would be less impact on local residents and savings could be made on resources e.g. time and money spent in relation to enforcement and clean up.

5.21 The Council has a dedicated Traveller Liaison Officer and a Protocol to undertake welfare assessments when unauthorised encampments occur.

5.22 Some stakeholders said encampments have decreased over the years and are often the same local families living in bricks and mortar or on sites in the wider Hampshire area returning to a transient life during the summer months. Other reasons suggested by stakeholders are that Travellers are coming because they are visiting relatives/friends, for family occasions e.g. weddings/funerals, looking for work opportunities, or just passing through the area.

5.23 Repeat locations where encampments have occurred include:

» Jays Close, Basingstoke;
» Carpenters Down, Basingstoke;
» Crockford Lane, Basingstoke;
» Beggarwood;
» Chineham;
» Popley;
» Business Park, Lime Tree Way, Basingstoke.

5.24 Business parks are said to be popular because they are in quiet areas, have hard standings and are not used at weekends.

**Accommodation for Travelling Showpeople**

5.25 It was not known whether there are any Travelling Showpeople living in the Basingstoke and Deane area and therefore stakeholders had little knowledge about the accommodation needs of the Community.

5.26 As part of the stakeholder engagement ORS spoke with a representative of the Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain who confirmed that they are not aware of any yards in the Basingstoke and Deane area. The Guild reported that many yards across Britain are overcrowded and there is a lack of yard accommodation in the south east of England in general.
5.27 Showpeople need sites that are accessible to road networks as they need to move their equipment in and out and sites need to be affordable to buy and develop. Affordability and identification of appropriate land has been the main barrier to new yards because land which is affordable is often in rural areas and considered unsuitable in planning terms. The Guild’s view is to look at existing yards to see whether surrounding land can be purchased in order to ease overcrowding and enable small expansions for family growth; this was considered less onerous than seeking new land for yards.

5.28 The Showmen’s Guild reported that Travelling Showpeople are unlikely to be living in bricks and mortar accommodation. This is because Showpeople need space to park, store and maintain their equipment.

Cross Border Issues and the Duty to Cooperate

5.29 The main travelling routes suggest by Stakeholders include the M3, A339 and A33. There was little evidence to suggest that Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople are moving between boroughs other than the mention of some unauthorised encampments being a result of Travellers visiting Basingstoke and Deane in the summer months from sites within the Hampshire area.

5.30 Stakeholders reported that there is some partnership working. Examples given included:

» Council Enforcement Officers sharing updates of encampments across Hampshire and Berkshire;
» Meetings about cooperation held between Basingstoke and Deane and West Berkshire because of sites including Paices Hill in Aldermaston.
» Basingstoke and Deane working with Hart and Rushmoor on community safety matters;
» The Hampshire Strategic Housing Officers Group;
» The BDBC BME Group which includes Council Officers and key partners e.g. the Police;
» The Police sharing intelligence with divisions in Hampshire but not across constabulary borders.

5.31 The Showmen’s Guild said they would like to be involved in any cross border working with regard to meeting any unmet need from Travelling Showpeople in the wider Hampshire/Berkshire area.

5.32 Stakeholders suggested that there is additional scope for the Council to engage in joint working with neighbouring authorities. The following benefits to joint working were highlighted:

» To enable opportunities to cross analyse information of needs evidenced in GTAAs and discuss joint opportunities to meet unmet needs;
» To share best practice and provide a consistent approach to policy formulation and review;
» To raise employment opportunities through joint work on LDPs;
» To provide a joint approach to transit provision which may decrease encampments and ease tensions between the settled community and Travellers.
Stakeholders were mainly of the view that Basingstoke and Deane is complying with the Duty to Cooperate.

**Future Priorities**

In relation to the future priorities for the Council the majority of stakeholders confirmed that it depended on the results of this GTNA. If a need for pitches is the outcome then enough sites should be provided to meet identified need especially for those who are local. However, some stakeholders raised concerns over the location of sites near existing residents and whether the Council has the political will to develop new public sites. It appears that the existing stance to enable those who can afford to buy land and submit planning applications meets their unmet need but this does not meet the needs of those who cannot afford to buy land. Because some stakeholders felt the Council is not seen to be providing for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the same way as those who cannot afford to buy a house or rent privately.

It was suggested that the Council should consider local residents and whether the impact of illegal sites/encampments would create the same issues if new sites were developed near them.

It was suggested that more needs to be done to reduce the amount of encampments in the area. The majority of stakeholders believe there is a need for transit provision, but there is concern over site management based on the experiences from the Peak Copse site at Dummer.

A minority of stakeholders believe there is no need for transit provision because they feel the area has few encampments and encampments are caused by those who already have bricks and mortar accommodation, possibly within Hampshire. Some stakeholders suggested that emergency stopping places could be the resolution to encampments.

**Neighbouring Authorities**

As stated in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, Local Authorities have a duty to cooperate (S.110 Localism Act 2011) on strategic planning issues that cross administrative boundaries. In order to explore issues relating to cross border working, ORS interviewed BDBC officers, Hampshire County Council and 8 local authorities that neighbour the Borough:

- East Hampshire;
- Hart;
- Reading;
- Test Valley;
- West Berkshire;
- Wiltshire;
- Winchester;
- Wokingham.

**Hampshire**

**Accommodation**

The County Council (CC) have recently transferred their sites into private ownership (3 sold and one leased). Each site is now managed by an individual Gypsy and Traveller company (but all are operated by the same person). The CC has contact with Traveller communities in relation to planning matters and unauthorised encampments on local authority, private and CC land. The CC operates an unauthorised...
encampment/gypsy liaison service in respect of occupations of its own land and that of local authorities in the area. As far as is known the sites once in CC ownership are well run and are not known to have any concealed households or issues relating to overcrowding.

5.40 The CC is not required to undertake a GTNA but will engage with local authorities and provide advice/guidance and liaison when councils undertake their Assessments. It is believed that the current provision of sites in Hampshire may not be meeting the current needs identified in GTNAs. The enabling of windfall private sites, although meeting some need, will not meet the needs of all Gypsies and Travellers and there is a need for councils across Hampshire to work in partnership to help address this.

Cross Boundary Issues

5.41 There are opportunities offered by HCC to support and explore joint working across Hampshire regarding the provision of permanent and transit sites and emergency stopping places. It was mentioned that the Peak Copse site at Dummer, a closed site in Basingstoke and Deane, will not be bought back into use; the site is often mentioned by those who are travelling through the area. The CC has no plans to refurbish the site and it has been earmarked for other uses. At present there is no publicly owned transit provision in Hampshire, although the CC is aware of some authorised pitches for transit use on private sites.

5.42 In relation to unauthorised encampments the CC say numbers are decreasing by as much as a 25% over the last 2 years and this is said to be a national trend. It was said in Basingstoke and Deane those who are transient are more likely to be local Gypsies and Travellers travelling around the area perhaps because of planning issues on private sites or they have relatives living in the area.

5.43 The CC is not aware of any partnership working, other than the research into the health and wellbeing needs of Gypsies and Travellers living in ‘bricks and mortar’ accommodation⁵.

East Hampshire

Accommodation

5.44 There are a number of private Gypsy and Traveller pitches and plots for Travelling Showpeople in the area. There are some unauthorised sites and no tolerated sites. The Council has an estimated need for 2 transit pitches but there is currently no provision in the area. The Hampshire Assessment 2013 estimated an additional need of 22 pitches to 2027 and 6 plots for Travelling Showpeople to 2017.

5.45 The Council’s Joint Core Strategy was adopted in 2014 and Policy CP15 ‘Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople’ sets out this level of need required in East Hampshire over the plan period 2011-2028. The East Hampshire Site Allocations Plan (Local Plan Part 2) does not include allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and this will be covered in the Local Plan Part 3. In order to find sites to meet this need the Council has been working on a Call for Sites.

⁵ Research into the health and wellbeing needs of Gypsies and Travellers living in ‘bricks and mortar’ accommodation in East Hampshire, Hart and New Forest District Council areas A report from Shared Intelligence & Gypsylife June 2015
Cross Boundary Issues

5.46 The Council would welcome further opportunities for joint working with authorities across Hampshire as there is said to be merit in discussing these issues as part of a wider arena. The Council has not been asked to meet any need from neighbouring authorities. The Council does not appear to have a high level of unauthorised or regular encampments in its area.

Hart

Accommodation

5.47 There are two large private sites (40 pitches) which were previously owned and managed by HCC. In addition to this there are a number of small private sites which include three transit pitches. There are known to be 2 Travelling Showpeople yards. As far as is known the sites/yards are meeting the needs of the current residents although the 2 previously owned HCC sites have yet to be licensed and there are some concerns as to how the sites will operate. There are no tolerated sites, sites with temporary planning permission or unauthorised developments in the area.

5.48 Hart Council published their GTNA in 2013; the Assessment was undertaken by URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited. The GTNA estimated a need for 24 permanent pitches and 2 transit pitches (2012-2017) and stated “It is most likely that the new provision will be private, enabled by supportive planning policies”. Since the Assessment was carried out 2 new private sites have been granted planning permission. The GTNA stated that there is unmet demand for one Travelling Showpeople plot and this has been met by extending an existing yard.

Cross Boundary Issues

5.49 As far as is known there are no formal joint working groups or partnerships although there are opportunities to share information and intelligence between local authorities regarding unauthorised encampments. Although there are no specific partnership working groups it is said there is local support and advocacy groups for Travellers e.g. Hart Voluntary Action.

5.50 It was reported there are low numbers of unauthorised encampments in the area and whilst traditionally it had been English Gypsies, more recently when encampments occur they are Irish Travellers looking for work or travelling through the area. The opinion is that there is little need for transit provision in Hart or nearby areas.

5.51 In terms of the priorities it is believed that because of the lack of suitable space and land, the Council will encourage those encamping in the area to move on as soon as possible. In addition to this the Council will prioritise the updating of their GTNA) and the licensing of the 2 ex-County Council sites.

Reading

Accommodation

5.52 There are no public or private sites in Reading. There is one Travelling Showpeople yard which has been granted a Certificate of Lawfulness. There are no unauthorised developments, tolerated sites or sites with
temporary planning permission in the area as far as are known. The Council lacks suitable land for sites due to tight administrative boundaries and risk of flooding.

5.53 The Council has a planning policy and a section in its Adopted Sites and Detailed Policy document which refers to the Berkshire wide GTNA which was undertaken in 2006. The estimated need identified in the Assessment was for 7 permanent Gypsy and Traveller sites and 2 plots for Travelling Showpeople up to 2016. The Council is working collaboratively with adjoining authorities to actively identify, plan and bring forward suitable sites to meet the need identified in the wider area. The Council has worked with neighbouring authorities on a Berkshire GTNA Methodology which will be used for undertaking a new GTNA in the future.

5.54 The Council is aware that the majority of its Gypsy and Traveller population lives in bricks and mortar through work that different departments undertake (e.g. EMTAS) but does not undertake any specific monitoring of numbers.

Cross Boundary Issues

5.55 The Council works jointly with neighbouring authorities whom there are clear cross boundary links such as West Berkshire and Wokingham and this is a reflection of stretched resources.

5.56 The Council has had a number of encampments over the years and it is reported that one reason is the reputation of the Royal Berkshire Hospital’s Antenatal and Maternity units. There is no transit provision in the Council’s area.

5.57 The Council is not aware of any current joint working groups specifically relating to Gypsy and Traveller issues, although the needs of these communities and site identification are often discussed at duty to cooperate meetings which have recently been organised by Wokingham.

Test Valley

Accommodation

5.58 There are 12 private Gypsy and Traveller sites, 11 of which are permanent and one with temporary permission at appeal for 2 years. There are five private Travelling Showpeople yards (20 plots). As far as is known the sites/yards are meeting the needs of the current residents although two of the yards are at full capacity with planning applications submitted to expand on land within the applicants control. There are no tolerated sites or unauthorised developments.

5.59 The Hampshire GTNA 2013 estimated a current need of 2 pitches and future need of 4 pitches to 2017, 3 pitches to 2022 and 3 pitches to 2027, and 4 Plots for Travelling Showpeople to 2017.

5.60 The Council is preparing a draft Gypsy and Traveller DPD to meet the future needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Preferred proposals include:

» Land at Scallows Lane, Wellow (Gypsies and Travellers = 5 pitches);
» Land at Bunny Lane, Timsbury (Gypsies and Travellers = 5 pitches);
» Land at Gardeners Lane, East Wellow (Travelling Showpeople = 3 plots).
The Council does not monitor information regarding Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople other than to record details of those on the Council’s Housing Register.

**Cross Boundary Issues**

The Council would welcome opportunities to explore joint working with Basingstoke and Deane regarding the provision of transit sites and emergency stopping places. The Council has not been asked to meet any need from neighbouring authorities.

The Council is only aware of encampments when they are reported to the Council and they are thought to occur because of the lack of available sites in the area. There tends to be unauthorised encampments around Andover in recognition of the A303 corridor and also around the south of the area given employment opportunities in Southampton and Salisbury. The Council has no transit provision but is looking to prepare a Transit Sites and Emergency Stopping DPD to identify sites.

The Council will prioritise the delivery of the draft Gypsy and Traveller DPD and would welcome opportunities for joint working with neighbouring authorities to identify a strategy towards the provision of transit sites and emergency stopping places.

**West Berkshire**

**Accommodation**

There is one public site (16 pitches), two private sites (25 pitches) and one private Travelling Showpeople yard in the area (this has a planning condition limiting occupation to 4 caravans for four months of the year). There is also a private transit site (15 pitches). As far as is known the sites/yards are meeting the needs of those using them. 24 of the private pitches and the 15 private transit pitches are located at Paices Hill which is adjacent to the boundary with Basingstoke. There is one unauthorised site (1 pitch) and there are no tolerated sites or sites with temporary planning permission in the area.

ORS undertook the Council’s GTNA (2015) and has undertaken a Call for Sites as part of the Local Plan in order to meet the needs identified in the forthcoming GTNA.

There are few Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople living in bricks and mortar accommodation and no known Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople wishing to move from bricks and mortar housing to sites in the area. There is a floating support service provided by Two Saints for people living in bricks and mortar accommodation as well as living on sites in West Berkshire.

**Cross Boundary Issues**

The Council highlighted the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) at Aldermaston as a cross-boundary issue and which can have an impact on planning matters in both West Berkshire and Basingstoke and Deane. For example restrictions on where new sites could be located because they fall within the AWE Exclusion Zones.

In relation to planning matters, there are no joint working partnerships specifically for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople between Berkshire and Hampshire although under the duty to cooperate
meetings, should issues arise they can and are discussed with neighbouring authorities. Berkshire does have a planning group that meets regularly to discuss Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

5.70 In relation to unauthorised encampments the Council is made aware of them when they are reported and it is understood that encampments do not regularly occur in the area. When there are encampments it is said that this is likely to be due to Travellers passing through or looking for work and/or visiting relatives; general areas include the M4 and M34 junctions.

5.71 A key priority for the Council will be to allocate sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople to meet the needs identified in the forthcoming GTAA.

Wiltshire

Accommodation

5.72 ORS completed the Wiltshire GTNA in 2014. The GTNA identified 5 public sites; 38 private sites with permanent planning permission; and 4 private sites with temporary planning permission. There is currently no public transit provision. A total of 11 unauthorised sites were identified, 6 of which are classified by the Council as tolerated. 4 private Travelling Showpeople yards with permanent planning permission and 1 tolerated unauthorised yard were also identified. The GTNA identified need for 90 additional pitches to 2029, and a need for 7 plots for Travelling Showpeople.

5.73 The GTNA also recommended that the Council should to provide a number of shorter-term stopping places at locations across Wiltshire rather than provide a transit site, and also to explore how best to meet the very short-term needs of those travelling to specific events and festivals. It was therefore recommended that the Council considers the provision of Emergency Stopping Places at locations near to Trowbridge, Salisbury and to the north of the County.

5.74 The Council is aware of the needs identified and is looking to provide sufficient sites. Although some of the need identified can be met by private windfall sites, the overall need evidenced requires allocation of a sufficient number of sites in a DPD, and potentially new public pitch provision.

5.75 As part of the GTNA attempts were made to include Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople living in bricks and mortar in order to identify those who wished to move to a site (including emerging and concealed households). As far as could be identified there was little need shown from those living in bricks and mortar.

Cross Boundary Issues

5.76 The Council would welcome opportunities to explore joint working with local authorities bordering Wiltshire as there is a need to identify an approach in terms of gathering data and sharing information with regard to encampments and the need to provide transit or emergency stopping places on known travelling routes. It is thought there is little impact from Basingstoke and Deane and therefore there is less need to work in partnership other than if the A303 is identified as a key travelling route for Travellers.
Winchester

Accommodation

5.77 The one public site at Tynefield (18 pitches) has been sold by HCC into private ownership; the Hampshire Traveller Accommodation Assessment shows a total of 16 private sites (41 pitches) in the area. There are 10 yards with 28 plots for Travelling Showpeople. There are no tolerated sites although there are a number of sites with temporary planning permission which were included as meeting needs in the GTAA; should they not be granted permission this will increase need in the area. The Hampshire Assessment 2013 estimated an additional need for 26 pitches (2012-2027) and approximately 9 Plots for Travelling Showpeople. The need is said to be from the growing local population living on existing sites and is not being generated by new Gypsies and Travellers to the area.

5.78 The Council is preparing a Development Management and Allocations DPD now known as Local Plan Part 2. This will incorporate both detailed development management style policies and allocate (non-strategic) sites to meet objectively assessed development needs including Gypsies and Travellers. The Council jointly commissioned (with East Hampshire District Council and South Downs National Park Authority) an assessment of potential traveller sites in 2014, which included a Call for Sites. The consultation report has been delayed meaning that a Part 3 Plan, specifically relating to the identification and assessment of Gypsy and Traveller sites, may need to be carried out, depending on what the site assessment report recommends.

Cross Boundary Issues

5.79 The Council worked jointly with neighbouring authorities on their GTNA but there is little evidence to suggest that there is an impact on Winchester from Basingstoke and Deane or vice versa. The Council’s priority is to work with authorities who have close links to them such as the South Downs National Park and East Hampshire.

5.80 The Council had 40 encampments during the summer of 2012 but does not believe they have a high level of encampments compared to some areas in Hampshire. It is believed that the main travelling routes are the M27 corridor along the South Coast to events such as Wickham Horse Fair and to a lesser extent travel routes along the M3 and A303 which may affect Basingstoke and Deane.

5.81 The Council is not aware of any current joint working groups specifically relating to Gypsy and Traveller issues, although the needs of these communities and site identification are often discussed at Duty to Cooperate meetings. The Council’s priority will be to seek and identify suitable sites in order to demonstrate a 5 year supply of sites and work in partnership with other local authorities on transit issues.

Wokingham

Accommodation

5.82 There are 2 public sites providing 35 pitches and 18 private sites providing 77 pitches and a long established Travelling Showpeople yard in the area. There are 4 unauthorised sites (3 of which are tolerated) and a small number of private sites with temporary planning permission.
ORS undertook the Council’s GTNA (2015). The estimated need was for 52 Gypsy and Traveller pitches between 2014 and 2029; no need was evidenced for Travelling Showpeople plots or transit provision. Following the GTNA the Council has started preparation of a Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan. As yet no sites have been allocated. The Council has also been proactive in regularising unauthorised sites and ensuring occupancy conditions are met through a proactive approach to planning applications; they are also dealing with overcrowding issues on the Council owned sites. The Council believes it has sufficient sites to meet need in the period 2014-2019 and further sites will come through the Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan process for the period to 2029.

There were no households identified in the GTNA living on the public sites who said that they wanted to move to bricks and mortar accommodation but the study did identify a need for 2 pitches from those living in bricks and mortar wishing to move to a site in the area.

Cross Boundary Issues

The Council would welcome opportunities to share appeal decisions and details of new provision made in neighbouring authority areas. This is because it is difficult to find out if Gypsies or Travellers who are applying for planning permission already have pitches in other areas or are on other local authority site waiting lists.

The Council has occasional short term unauthorised encampments usually because Travellers are passing through to another location, and also encampments by Travellers attending funerals, weddings and other family events and also for employment opportunities.

The Council has had some issues with encampments at two locations which are close to the A33. It is believed these locations were chosen due to the road links to other areas and facilities available in the local area.

To meet the needs of those who are transient the Council has recently approved 3 transit pitches on one private site.

In terms of partnership working the Council worked with neighbouring authorities (Reading, Bracknell, West Berkshire and Windsor and Maidenhead) on a Joint GTAA methodology.

The priority for the Council will be to progress the Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan in order to have a positive policy framework in place.

Recommendations

There is no public transit provision across Hampshire and only a few transit pitches on private sites. It is not possible to direct encampments to privately owned sites without the permission of the owner. Councils have greater flexibility through developing their own transit provision. It is therefore recommended that the Council considers the transit provision, and in particular establishing emergency stopping places, with other local authorities in Hampshire.

The following recommendations could help improve services and strengthen joint working for the Council:
» Ensure the results of the GTNA are shared and discussed with Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the area and the dialogue is kept up;

» Ensure needs evidenced in the GTNA are met and any progression of new public permanent or transit provision be made includes the involvement of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the area;

» Work with neighbouring boroughs on a joint approach to recording and dealing with encampments in order to share a data base of information to inform Assessments in the future;

» Work with RPs in the area to improve ethnic and cultural understanding, monitoring and systematic recording of needs;

» Work with neighbouring boroughs to improve partnership working by the setting up a joint Hampshire Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Forum;

» If need is evidenced for transit provision the Council would be advised to set up a Hampshire wide Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Group involving key partners e.g. Police, Health and Fire services.

» Work with neighbouring boroughs once the GTNA has been published to share experiences and plan for future site identification and discuss ways of sharing the impact of any unmet need across a wider area;

» Although the Council already operates “No cold calling zones” it may wish to consider additional PR In order to decrease cash in hand work opportunities in the area.
Councillor and Parish Council Responses

5.94 To complement the Stakeholder Interviews a link to a short online questionnaire was sent to representatives from each Parish Council and to all Borough Councillors. A total of 14 online responses were received from 12 Parish Councils; and a total of 7 online responses were received from Borough Councillors. In addition a written response was received from 1 Borough Councillor.

Figure 5 – Summary of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough Council Ward</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baughurst &amp; Tadley North</td>
<td>Cabinet Member – Communities &amp; Service Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramley &amp; Sherfield</td>
<td>Borough Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chineham</td>
<td>Borough Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch Warren &amp; Beggarwood</td>
<td>Deputy Leader/Cabinet Member – Housing &amp; Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamber &amp; Silchester</td>
<td>Borough Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooksdon</td>
<td>Borough Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherborne St John</td>
<td>Borough and Parish Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadley South</td>
<td>Borough Councillor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish Council</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chineham</td>
<td>Parish Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccinswell, Sydmonton &amp; Bishops Green</td>
<td>Ex-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsclere</td>
<td>Parish Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laverstoke &amp; Freefolk</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapledurwell and Up Nately</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newnham &amp; Nateley Scures</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamber</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamber</td>
<td>Parish Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamber</td>
<td>Parish Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherborne St John</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadley</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston Corbett &amp; Weston Patrick</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitchurch</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.95 The questionnaire included questions on the following broad subject areas:

» Dealings or relationships with Gypsies and Travellers
» Awareness of any particular issues in relation to Gypsies and Travellers
» Awareness of any Gypsy and Traveller sites
» Any trends with regard to Gypsies and Travellers
» What attracts Gypsies and Travellers to the area
» Any kinds of seasonal fluctuations
» Awareness of temporary stopping by travellers
» Relationship between the settled and travelling community
A summary of views and responses that were submitted by Borough Councillors and Parish Council can be found below. Key concerns were in relation to unauthorised encampments; retrospective planning permission; failures to comply with planning regulations; definitions of Travellers; the attractiveness of large areas of open space and agricultural land; and a general lack of awareness of Travellers living in bricks and mortar.

**Dealings with Gypsies & Travellers**

- Local opposition to pitches that have recently been granted planning permission.
- Unauthorised encampments on open spaces and costs of clearing sites.
- Constant planning applications for caravans on previously undeveloped land.
- Ongoing issues with Travellers trying to build and claim land in Sandy Lane
- Enforcement action of planning violations due to placement of mobile homes.
- Intimidation from burning / fires close to property - trees caught on fire.
- Purchase of woodland for a caravan pitch and subsequent illegal felling of plantation.
- Continuing number of retrospective planning applications.

**Awareness of any particular issues in relation to Gypsies and Travellers**

- People getting their pitches approved by claiming to be Travellers.
- Unauthorised encampments and associated noise from dogs, fires and litter.
- Fly tipping, illegal waste, sheep worrying and criminal damage. Also cases of poaching, hare coursing and grazing of horses on private land.
- Retrospective planning applications from people not felt to be Travellers.
- Failure of site owners to comply with planning regulations and conditions.
- Use of local services in Basingstoke by Travellers living on the Paices Hill site in West Berkshire.

**Awareness of any Gypsy and Traveller sites**

- General awareness in those areas where there are permitted pitches.
- Issues relating to pitches on Sandy Lane.
- Issues relating to sale of land for potential pitches on Cufaude Lane.
- Issues relating to the illegal felling of trees on the Dixon Road site that was refused planning permission.
- Various encampments on the Chineham Business Park - same family from site to site.
Any trends with regard to Gypsies and Travellers

» In the last twelve months and with the new measures in Rooksdown Lane the open spaces have encountered issues.
» An increase in privately owned sites and more development before planning permission.
» An increase in illegal encampments and complaints in the past 2 years.
» Travellers purchasing agricultural land and then attempting to change use to residential either illegally or via the planning system.
» An increase in the number of privately owned sites.

What attracts Gypsies and Travellers to the area

» Open countryside and lots of opportunities to set up camp illegally.
» Good access to M3 and M4 motorways.
» Travelling routes, casual work opportunities and local connections.
» I understand that at least one of the regular visitors has a house in Basingstoke but moves around during the summer
» Current availability of agricultural land sites for sale.
» Traditionally an area for Gypsies. On the borders of West Berkshire and Hampshire.

Any kinds of seasonal fluctuations

» More encampments in the summer.
» Not aware of seasonal fluctuations. Occupants just want to have a home in the area.
» Travellers leaving the area for a month or two to seek work fruit picking.

Awareness of temporary stopping by Travellers

» Many respondents were not aware of temporary stopping by Travellers.
» Instances of unauthorised encampments in several areas.
» Some instances of households moving on to private sites temporarily.
» Improved security measures on sites previously used by encampments have helped.
» There have been occurrences of temporary stopping on public land in the parish. In recent years this has been confined to highway verges.

Relationship between the settled and travelling community

» Difference of opinion across the areas where responses were received.
» The relationships have generally been very strained and instances where the settled community have felt threatened by Travellers on the temporary pitches or have then observed the rubbish and fly tipping left behind.

» General tolerance as long as there are no problems.

» Generally good.

» I doubt if residents would be pleased if a travelling community suddenly took up residence in the parish other than approved circus groups.

» Not particularly friendly.

» No problems, we get on well.

» Residents are always alarmed by temporary stopping and demand that BDBC or HCC take prompt action.

Aware of any Travellers residing in bricks and mortar

» General lack of awareness of bricks and mortar households.

» The Gypsy community in this parish have already moved from bricks & mortar.

» I am not aware of members of this community in bricks and mortar accommodation.

» I believe some family members are in social housing sites - mixed with owner occupiers.

» The Parish Council would not know, or wish to know, whether or not residents living in houses regard themselves as Travellers.

Any other comments

» Current Gypsy & Traveller law does not differentiate between genuine Travellers and those of Gypsy ethnicity who have already settled.

» The Council should take faster enforcement action.

» There is generally a good relationship between settled Travellers and non- Travellers.

» Concerns based on experience with Peak Copse that was an authorised site close to the M3 that had problems and HCC eventually closed it down due to violence between families living there.

» Need for wider consultation on planning applications.

» Concerns about additional land owned by Travellers that they may seek to develop in the future.
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, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population living on sites and yards in Basingstoke and Deane. This aimed to identify current households with housing needs and to assess likely future housing need from within existing households, to help judge the need for any future site provision. As noted in the introduction, “Gypsy and Traveller” refers to:

*Persons of nomadic habit of life, whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family’s or dependants’ educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of Travelling Showpeople or circus people travelling together as such* (Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, DCLG, March 2012).

6.2 Through the desk-based research and stakeholder interviews ORS sought to identify all authorised and unauthorised sites and yards in the study area. This identified no public sites on which to conduct interviews, 7 private sites with permanent planning permission, 2 tolerated sites, 3 unauthorised sites, and 1 tolerated Travelling Showpeople yard. The table below identifies the sites and yards that ORS staff visited during the course of the fieldwork.

**Figure 6 - Sites and Yards Visited in Basingstoke and Deane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Sites</th>
<th>Planning Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackberries, Monk Sherborne</td>
<td>BDB/71415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddwoods, Tadley</td>
<td>BDB/62071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Lodge, Tadley</td>
<td>BDB/63111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Adjoining Forest Farm, Tadley</td>
<td>13/02746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land South of Harroway Organic Gardens, Whitchurch</td>
<td>BDB/75288 &amp; 13/00977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowview Caravan Site, Bishops Green</td>
<td>BDB/72823 &amp; 13/01309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable View, Tadley</td>
<td>BDB/62071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tolerated Sites</th>
<th>Planning Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land East of Church Brook, Tadley</td>
<td>15/00396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot 1, Forest Farm, Tadley</td>
<td>BDB/75913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unauthorised Sites</th>
<th>Planning Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crux Easton, Ashmansworth</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Cufaude Lane, Bramley</td>
<td>13/00988 &amp; 15/01946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands View, Tadley</td>
<td>13/00729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Showpeople Yard</th>
<th>Planning Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swings and Roundabouts, Chineham</td>
<td>BDB/31539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORS sought to undertake a full demographic study of all pitches and plots as part of our approach to undertaking the GTAA as our experience suggests that a sample based approach very often leads to an under-estimate of current and future needs which can be the subject of challenge at subsequent appeals and examinations. A summary of the findings from each site/yard can be found under the headings below.

6.4 Through the site surveys data was collected for households living on all of the pitches that were occupied (there were 2 unimplemented pitches at Land South of Harroway Organic Gardens).

Private Sites

Blackberries

6.5 Staff from ORS visited the Blackberries site in July 2015. The site has planning permission for 1 pitch and was occupied at the time of the study. There were no concealed or doubled-up households identified and the occupants comprised 2 adults and 2 children or teenagers (aged under 18). The residents do not travel and live on the site by choice.

Eddwoods

6.6 Staff from ORS visited the Eddwoods site in June 2015. The site has planning permission for 2 pitches and was occupied at the time of the study. There were 2 concealed or doubled-up households identified and the households living on the site comprised 3 adults and 4 children or teenagers (aged under 18). The residents do not travel and live on the site by choice.

Forest Lodge

6.7 Staff from ORS visited the Forest Lodge site in July 2015. The site has planning permission for 1 permanent pitch and was occupied at the time of the study. There were no concealed or doubled-up households and the occupants comprised 3 adults and no children or teenagers. The residents do not travel and are considering moving to a new private site in Basingstoke at some point in the future.

Land Adjoining Forest Farm

6.8 Staff from ORS visited the Land Adjoining Forest Farm site in July 2015. The site has planning permission for 1 pitch and was occupied at the time of the study. Whilst it was not possible to complete a full interview it was possible to identify that the site was occupied by a couple in their 30’s.

Land South of Harroway Organic Gardens

6.9 Staff from ORS visited the Land South of Harroway Organic Gardens site in June 2015. The site has planning permission for 2 permanent pitches and was unimplemented at the time of the study. The site was granted planning permission for a change of condition to amend the site layout in January 2014 and has 3 years from this date to commence development. Given that a Section 106 Agreement has been signed by the applicants it is expected that this development will commence within the required period of 3 years.
Meadowview Caravan Site

Staff from ORS visited the Meadowview Caravan Site in July 2015. The site has planning permission for 3 permanent pitches and was occupied at the time of the study. There were no concealed or doubled-up households identified and the residents comprised 6 adults and 3 children and teenagers (aged under 18). The families travel occasionally to visit fairs and also stated that there is sufficient room on the site to meet any future household needs.

Stable View

Staff from ORS visited the Stable View site in June 2015. The site has planning permission for 3 pitches and the residents have lived on the site for 9 years. The site was occupied at the time of the fieldwork and 2 concealed or doubled-up households were identified who will need a pitch of their own. The households on the site comprised 6 adults and 6 children and teenagers (aged under 18). They travel occasionally during the summer months to visit fairs and live on the site by choice.

Tolerated Sites

Land East of Church Brook

Staff from ORS visited the Land East of Church Brook site in July 2015. The site has deemed consent for 2 pitches and planning permission for a utility block. The site was occupied at the time of the fieldwork and no concealed or doubled-up households were identified. The site was occupied by 4 adults and 2 children and teenagers (aged under 18). The residents stated that they can meet their own future needs on the site.

Plot 1, Forest Farm

Staff from ORS visited the Plot 1 at Forest Farm in June 2015. The occupants had previously submitted a planning application for 1 pitch but this was withdrawn in 2012. The site has been occupied by the current residents for 25 years and they comprise 2 adults and no children or teenagers. They do not travel and live on the site out of choice.

Unauthorised Sites

Crux Easton

Staff from ORS visited the Crux Easton site in July 2015. The site is a long-standing roadside encampment that has been there for approximately 5 years. The site was occupied by 2 adults and no children or teenagers. The residents stated that the site is not suitable to meet their needs but that they have nowhere else to go.

Land at Cufaude Lane

Staff from ORS visited the site on Cufaude Lane in June 2015. At the time of the fieldwork the site was not occupied but planning records indicate that retrospective planning permission for 1 pitch was applied for
and refused in 2013. A subsequent retrospective planning application in 2015 indicated that the site was still occupied.

**Woodlands View**

6.16 Staff from ORS visited the Woodlands View site in June 2015. The residents have lived on the site for 2½ years and whilst they had applied for planning permission the application was withdrawn in June 2015. The site was occupied at the time of the fieldwork and comprised 2 adults and 3 children and teenagers (aged under 18). There were no concealed or doubled-up households and the family do not travel.

**Travelling Showpeople**

**Swings and Roundabouts**

6.17 Staff from ORS visited the Swings and Roundabouts yard in August 2015. It is a small storage yard with planning permission for no more than 2 caravans and for storage and maintenance of equipment. At the time of the site visit the yard was not occupied and there were 2 caravans and a small amount of equipment on the yard.

**Figure 7 - Site Visit Summary for Basingstoke and Deane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Permitted Pitches</th>
<th>Tolerated Pitches</th>
<th>Unauthorised Pitches</th>
<th>Interviews Completed</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children (Under 18)</th>
<th>Concealed Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sites</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sites with Permanent Permission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackberries, Salters Heath Road, Monk Sherborne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddwoods, Tadley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Adjoining Forest Farm, Sandy Lane, Tadley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Lodge, Sandy Lane, Tadley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land South Of Harroway Organic Gardens, Whitchurch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowview Caravan Site, Bishops Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable View, Sandy Lane, Tadley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sites with Temporary Permission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tolerated Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land East Of Church Brook, Tadley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot 1, Forest Farm, Sandy Lane, Tadley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unauthorised Developments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crux Easton, Ashmansworth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Cufaude Lane, Bramley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands View, Sandy Lane, Tadley</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Travelling Community Characteristics**

6.18 Ethnicity data was captured from all of the households that were interviewed on the Gypsy and Traveller sites. There was a mixture of English, Irish, Roma and Mixed Ethnicity Travellers living on the sites.

6.19 The fieldwork also sought to identify the demographics of Gypsies and Travellers living in Basingstoke and Deane. Detailed demographic information was obtained for each interview conducted on the sites. This
showed a mixed range of ages across the sites, though a much larger proportion of the population were younger and female when compared to the overall population of Basingstoke and Deane (2011 Census).

In total there were 52 residents identified living on the occupied Gypsy and Traveller sites. This was made up of 33 adults and 19 children and teenagers aged under 18. This equates to 63.5% adults, 36.5% children and teenagers aged under 18. Although not a direct comparison, data from the Census for Basingstoke and Deane as a whole (the settled community and the Gypsy or Irish Traveller community) and for Gypsies or Irish Travellers within the Borough has been compared to the site population. This shows a large difference between the site population and that of the Basingstoke and Deane population as a whole, and less of a difference between the site population and the Census Gypsy or Irish Traveller population for Basingstoke and Deane.

**Figure 8 - Demographic Comparison in Basingstoke and Deane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age 0-17</th>
<th>Age 18+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Interviews</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Gypsy or Irish Traveller</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census All Basingstoke and Deane</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Current and Future Pitch Provision

Pitch Provision

7.1 This section focuses on the additional pitch provision which is needed by Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council currently and to 2029. This includes both current unmet need and need which is likely to arise in the future. This time period allows for robust forecasts for future provision, based upon the evidence contained within this study and also secondary data sources.

7.2 We would note that 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 needed in the area, but also whether there is a need for any transit sites and/or emergency stopping place provision.

7.4 To identify current and future need, PPTS requires an assessment for current and future pitch needs, but does not provide a suggested methodology for undertaking this calculation. 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 for residential pitches is to compare the supply that is available for occupation with the current and future needs of the households. The key factors in each of these elements are set out in the sections below.

Supply

7.5 The supply of available pitches is made up of the following:

» Current vacant pitches.

» Pitches currently with planning consent due to be developed within the study period (unimplemented sites).

» Pitches to be vacated by households moving to bricks and mortar.

» Pitches to be vacated by households moving from the study area (out-migration).

Current Need

7.6 Total current need is not necessarily the need for additional pitches because it may be able to be addressed by space available in the study area. It is important to address issues of double counting. For example potential in-migrants may already be included on a waiting list, or households on a waiting list may already be living as a concealed household on a permitted site, or on an unauthorised encampment in the area. Total current need is made up of the following:
» Households on unauthorised sites or encampments for which planning permission is not expected.
» Concealed households/doubling-up/over-crowding.
» Households in bricks and mortar wishing to move to sites.
» Households on waiting lists for public sites.

Future Need

Total future need is the sum of the following three components. Again it is important to address issues of double counting as, for example, potential in-migrants or concealed households may already be on a waiting list:

» Households living on sites with temporary planning permissions.
» New household formation.
» In-migration.

In order to determine the overall net pitch need for the Borough ORS will firstly carry out the calculation as set out below for Gypsies and Travellers, and then separately set out issues relating to the possible need for additional transit provision in the study area. A separate review of need will also be undertaken for Travelling Showpeople.

**Net Pitch Need = (Current Need + Future Need) - Supply**

Current Gypsy and Traveller Site Provision - Supply

To assess the current Gypsy and Traveller provision it is important to understand the total number of existing pitches and their planning status. Council records indicate that there are no authorised public sites in Basingstoke and Deane, 7 private sites with permanent planning permission, 2 tolerated sites and 3 unauthorised sites. There is no public or private transit provision.

**Figure 9 - Total number of authorised sites in Basingstoke and Deane as at July 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Pitches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private with permanent planning permission</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sites with temporary planning permission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sites (Council and Registered Providers)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Provision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Transit Provision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next stage of the process is to assess how much space is, or will become, available on existing sites in order to determine the supply of available pitches. The main ways of finding this is through:

» **Current vacant pitches** – There are no public sites in Basingstoke and Deane and therefore no vacant public pitches. There were also no vacant pitches on the private sites in the area.
Pitches currently with planning consent due to be developed within the study period – There are 2 unimplemented pitches on a private site with planning consent in Basingstoke and Deane (Land South of Harroway Organic Gardens). The Council has taken a cautious approach regarding the inclusion of unimplemented pitches on private sites for which planning consent is granted on the basis that these provide accommodation specifically for the applicant. Consequently for the purposes of this study, it is not considered that these 2 unimplemented pitches will be available for immediate general occupation. Should additional information or evidence be provided through discussions with the land owners that these pitches could be made available for general occupation, they could then form a component of supply.

Pitches to be vacated by households moving to bricks and mortar – No households indicated a desire to move to bricks and mortar accommodation.

Pitches to be vacated by people moving from the study area (out-migration) – There was no evidence of pitches likely to be vacated by households moving from the study area in the short to medium-term.

This gives a figure for overall supply of zero pitches during the first 5 years of the study.

Figure 10 - Summary of Pitch Supply in Basingstoke and Deane as at July 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sites/Yards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current vacant pitches</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimplemented pitches with planning consent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitches vacated by households moving to bricks and mortar</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-migration</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SUPPLY</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Pitch Provision: Current Need

The next stage of the process is to assess current need and determine how many households are currently seeking pitches in the area.

Current Unauthorised Sites

A problem with many Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments is that they often count all caravans on unauthorised sites and encampments as requiring a pitch in the area when in practice many are simply visiting or passing through, and some may be on sites that are tolerated for planning purposes. In order to remedy this, ORS’ approach is to treat need as only those households on unauthorised sites already in the planning system (i.e. sites/pitches for which a planning application has been made or are likely to be made); those otherwise known to the Council as being resident in the area; or those identified through the household survey as requiring pitches.

The study has identified 3 unauthorised sites with a total of 4 pitches in Basingstoke and Deane. One is a long-standing roadside encampment, 1 is a long-standing development which has had planning applications withdrawn, and the other is a site that was refused retrospective planning permission. Given that 2 of the
sites are occupied and have a planning history, and the other is a long-standing roadside encampment there are 4 unauthorised pitches in Basingstoke and Deane.

**Figure 11 - Summary of Unauthorised Pitches in Basingstoke and Deane as at July 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Pitches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crux Easton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Cufaude Lane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands View</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also 3 pitches on 2 long-term unauthorised developments that are tolerated for planning purposes as they have been in place for over 10 years. These will not be counted as need but will be included in the base for new household formation. These are at Land East of Church Brook and Plot 1, Forest Farm.

**Concealed Households**

The site interviews sought to identify concealed or doubled-up households on authorised sites that require a pitch immediately. A concealed household is one living in a multi-family household in addition to the primary family, such as a young couple living with parents, who need their own separate family accommodation, but are unable to do obtain it because of a lack of space on public or private sites, or a single family member or individual living within an existing family unit in need of separate accommodation. The demographic information collected during the site interviews identified 4 concealed or doubled households in Basingstoke and Deane.

**Figure 12 - Total number of Concealed/Doubled-Up Households in Basingstoke and Deane as at July 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Pitches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eddwoods</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable View</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bricks and Mortar**

Identifying households in bricks and mortar has been frequently highlighted as an issue with Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments. The 2011 UK Census of Population identified a total of just 60 Gypsy or Irish Traveller households in Basingstoke and Deane. It is unknown what proportion of these were living on sites and what proportion were living in bricks and mortar as the data from the 2011 Census does not break down accommodation type to this level.

As noted earlier, ORS went to all possible lengths to identify Gypsies and Travellers living in bricks and mortar and worked with stakeholders, Council officers, and on-site interviewees to identify households to interview. This process resulted in no contacts to interview. In addition at the time of this report no responses had been received as a result of posting on the Hampshire Romany’s Facebook Group.
ORS also note that in a number of recent studies work has been undertaken with Gypsy and Traveller representatives to identify households in bricks and mortar. For a number of these studies the representatives reported over 100 known households in housing and they encouraged them to come forward to take part in the survey. In the majority of cases the actual number who eventually took part in the surveys ranged from zero to six households per area, and a very small proportion of these wished to move back to sites. However in a recent study for a London Borough a similar approach resulted in the identification of over 30 contacts who were interviewed. Therefore, while there is anecdotal evidence of many Gypsies and Travellers in housing, in most cases households appear to be content to remain there and when provided with the opportunity by representatives to register an interest in returning to sites, few choose to do so.

**Waiting Lists**

There are no public sites in Basingstoke and Deane so there is no waiting list for public pitches.

**Additional Pitch Provision: Future Need**

The next stage of the process is to assess future need and determine how many households are likely to be seeking pitches in the area in the future. There are three key components of future need.

- Households living on sites with temporary planning permissions.
- Population and household growth.
- Movement to and from sites and migration.

**Temporary Planning Permissions**

There are currently no sites in Basingstoke and Deane with temporary planning permission.

**Population and Household Growth**

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 Accommodation Assessments, 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. The main conclusions are set out here and the full Technical Note can be found in Appendix F.

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 the 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.

Research undertaken by ORS has identified that in fact, the growth in the national Gypsy and Traveller population may be as low as 1.50% 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.

7.26 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 Travellers.

7.27 However, some local authorities might allow for a higher household growth rate per annum, to provide a ‘margin’ if their populations are relatively youthful. In areas where on-site surveys indicate that there are fewer children in the Gypsy and Traveller population, the lower estimate of 1.50% per annum should be used for planning purposes.

7.28 The (compound) net household formation rate that will be used for this study is based on demographic evidence from the site surveys. The base for this calculation includes all current authorised households, all households identified as current need, including concealed households, as well as households living on unauthorised pitches.

7.29 The Technical Note supports a national net growth rate for the Gypsy and Traveller population of 1.50% using a population base from the 2011 Census where, nationally, approximately 36% of the Gypsy and Traveller population were aged under 18. The site survey for Gypsies and Travellers in Basingstoke and Deane indicates that approximately 36.5% of the on-site population are children and teenagers aged under 18. Given that this is the same as the proportion that were used to calculate the national net growth rate ORS consider that it is appropriate to allow for future projected household growth for the Gypsy and Traveller population in Basingstoke and Deane to occur at an annual net growth rate of 1.50%. In addition as it was not possible to identify any household living in bricks and mortar to interview it is recommended that a buffer of an addition 0.50% giving an overall household formation rate of 2.00%. This generous rate will provide enough new pitches to accommodate all newly-forming households have their future needs met.

7.30 Based on a new compound household formation rate of 2.00% we estimate that a total of 8 additional pitches will be required during the study period as a result of new household formation, assuming that each forming household will requires a pitch of its own. This has used a base figure of 24 pitches which includes full occupancy of all of the pitches on private sites, all households on the tolerated and unauthorised sites and all concealed/doubled-up households.

Figure 13 – Compound Annual Growth @2.00% (Base: 24 Households)
Movement to and from sites and migration activity

7.31 Assessments should also allow for likely 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 zero net migration of Gypsies and Travellers across the UK, but assessments such as this need to take into account local migration effects on the basis of the best local evidence available.

7.32 Unless such evidence indicates otherwise, net migration to the sum of zero will be used for the study – which means that net pitch requirements are driven by locally identifiable need rather than speculative modelling assumptions. But where there are known likely in-migrant households they will be included in the needs figures – while stressing the potential for double-counting across more than one local authority area. Likewise, where there is likely to be movement away the study area, the net effects will be taken into consideration when calculating current and future needs.

7.33 Nationally there are three main sources of in-migration that could account for additional accommodation need. The first is out-migration from London. However, in ORS’s current or recent assessments in London (including Bexley, Camden; Hackney, Haringey, Lambeth, Lewisham and for the London Legacy Development Corporation) all show additional need – and work is being progressed to meet these needs.

7.34 The second potential source of in-migration is from local authorities with significant areas of Green Belt. A Ministerial Statement in July 2013 reaffirmed that:

‘The Secretary of State wishes to make clear that, in considering planning applications, although each case will depend on its facts, he considers that the single issue of unmet demand, whether for traveller sites or for conventional housing, is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the ‘very special circumstances’ justifying inappropriate development in the Green Belt.’

7.35 This position was reaffirmed in the DCLG consultation on the revised policy for Gypsies and Travellers (September 2014), which suggests placing further restrictions on the development of Traveller sites in the Green Belt:

‘Subject to the best interests of the child, unmet need and personal circumstances are unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt and any other harm so as to establish very special circumstances.’

7.36 However, this does not remove the requirement for local authorities with Green Belt to assess their needs and provide pitches/plots where this is possible. Where this is not possible Paragraphs 178 and 179 of the NPPF set out that ‘Joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas’. It is not the place of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment to assume one authority will meet the needs of another; and authorities unable to meet their own needs should work with neighbours to do so. This process is well established in general housing provision.

7.37 The final main source of in-migration to the study area is from the closure of unauthorised sites and encampments. There are several well documented cases of large-scale movements of Gypsies and
Travellers following enforcement action against unauthorised sites – for example, from Dale Farm in Essex. There is no evidence of the closure of large unauthorised sites around Basingstoke and Deane.

7.38 If in-migration to a study area is a source of demand for pitches, out-migration is a source of supply. The potential for the supply of some pitches arising from out-migration includes households moving to other areas from private sites with general planning consent for Gypsy or Traveller occupation and selling the sites to other Gypsy and Travellers or for housing development; and households moving away from private sites with personal planning consents, so that the sites revert to their previous status.

7.39 Evidence drawn from stakeholder and site interviews in Basingstoke and Deane has been carefully considered and has not identified any specific sources of movement due to in-migration or out-migration, other than natural pitch turnover. Beyond this, rather than assess in-migrant households seeking to develop new sites in the area, it is recommended that each case is assessed as a desire to live in the area and that site criteria rules are followed for each new site. It is therefore important for the Council to continue to follow its existing criteria-based planning policies for any new potential sites which do arise.
Overall Need for Basingstoke and Deane

7.40 Each element of the calculation for the need has been examined and the next stage of the process is to balance need against supply to provide an overall need for Basingstoke and Deane. As set out at the start of this section the following calculation is carried out to derive the overall net pitch requirement.

\[
\text{Net Pitch Need} = (\text{Current Need} + \text{Future Need}) - \text{Supply}
\]

7.41 The estimated additional provision that is needed over the period to 2029 will be 16 additional pitches to address the needs of all identifiable Gypsy and Traveller households. This includes the existing households on unauthorised sites, concealed or doubled-up households and the expected growth in household numbers due to new household formation.

Figure 14 - Additional Pitches Needed in Basingstoke and Deane from 2015-2029

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Need/Supply</th>
<th>Current and Future Need</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Net Pitch Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supply of Pitches</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional supply from vacant pitches</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement to bricks and mortar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional supply from unimplemented sites⁶</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional supply new sites</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Supply</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Need</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorised developments or encampments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed households</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net movement from bricks and mortar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Need</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Need</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitches with temporary planning permission</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net migration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New household formation (2.00%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Future Needs</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Need Split to 2029

7.42 In terms of providing results by time periods, ORS has assumed that the needs of all unauthorised pitches and concealed/doubled-up households are addressed in the first 5 years. In addition new household formation is apportioned over time based on a net compound growth rate of 2.00%. The figure for 2015-20 is made up of 4 from unauthorised pitches, 4 from concealed/doubled-up households and 2 from new household formation. The remainder of the net new household formation is split between years 6-10 and 11-14 based on a net compound growth rate of 2.00%.

⁶ Whilst there were 2 pitches on an unimplemented site these have not been included as general supply
Figure 15 - Additional Pitch Provision in Basingstoke and Deane to 2029

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-2020</th>
<th>2020-2025</th>
<th>2025-2029</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basingstoke and Deane</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transit/Emergency Stopping Site Provision

Transit sites serve a specific function of meeting the needs of Gypsy and Traveller households who are visiting an area or who are passing through. A transit site typically has a restriction on the length of stay of around 13 weeks and has a range of facilities such as water supply, electricity and amenity blocks. An alternative to a transit site is an emergency stopping place. This type of site also has restrictions on the length of time for which a Traveller can stay on it, but has much more limited facilities with typically only a source of water and chemical toilets provided. Some authorities also operate an accepted encampment policy where households are provided with access to lighting, drinking water, refuse collection and hiring of portable toilets at a cost to the Travellers.

The Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 is particularly important with regard to the issue of Gypsy and Traveller transit site provision. Section 62A of the Act allows the Police to direct trespassers to remove themselves, their vehicles and their property from any land where a suitable pitch on a relevant caravan site is available within the same Local Authority area (or within the county in two-tier Local Authority areas). A suitable pitch on a relevant caravan site is one which is situated in the same Local Authority area as the land on which the trespass has occurred, and which is managed by a Local Authority, a Registered Provider or other person or body as specified by order by the Secretary of State. Case law has confirmed that a suitable pitch must be somewhere where the household can occupy their caravan. Bricks and mortar housing is not a suitable alternative to a pitch.

Therefore, a transit site both provides a place for households in transit to an area and also a mechanism for greater enforcement action against inappropriate unauthorised encampments.

In order to identify whether there is a need for the Council to provide transit accommodation analysis has been undertaken of the Council’s records of unauthorised encampments between January 2014 and June 2015 on land not owned by travellers. In addition the total number of encampments by year has been looked at from 2011-12 to 2014-15, and the outcomes of the previous GTNA and recent stakeholder interviews have been taken into consideration.

This shows that whilst there has been a decline in the number of encampments from a peak of 126 in 2013-14 to 59 in 2014-15, there are still regular numbers of encampments each month, with an average of 8 each month over the 18 month period that data was available for.

Following discussions with the Council’s Principle Environmental Health Officer it was identified that 8 local groups of Travellers who are well known to the Council were responsible for almost two thirds (51 of 79) of the encampments over the 18 month period between January 2014 and June 2015. It is understood that these groups of Travellers do have other local housing options and are living on roadside encampments through choice and not through need.
This significantly reduces the number of encampments who are thought to be more transient and who are passing through Basingstoke and Deane over the period January 2014 to June 2015 from 79 to just 28, an average of less than 2 each month. This would still suggest that there is a need for the Council to consider some kind of transit provision.

The need for transit provision was raised by a number of stakeholders. In addition the 2007 GTNA recommended the need for 1 transit site in Basingstoke and Deane and the 2012 GTNA recommended that there was a need for 2 emergency stopping places. Neither of these has yet been provided.

As the majority of the encampments by transient households are for less than 7 days it is not recommended that the Council should deliver a formal transit site, but should consider the provision of 3 emergency stopping places to meet the short-term and transient need of these travellers.

### Figure 15 - All Unauthorised Encampments in Basingstoke and Deane by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basingstoke and Deane</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 16 - All Unauthorised Encampments in Basingstoke and Deane by Month (Jan 14 – Jun 15)

Need for Travelling Showpeople Plots

There is one small Travelling Showpeople yard in Chineham. This was granted full planning permission in 2001 for no more than 2 caravans and the storage and maintenance of equipment. An application for an additional caravan was also refused in 2001 due to insufficient information being provided to support the application. There has been no more planning activity since 2001.
7.53 Whilst it was not possible to interview the site residents, a statistical analysis of needs would have been inappropriate due to the small numbers of those residing on the site involved. In addition it should be noted that there has been no planning activity on the site since 2001. It is therefore recommended at this time that the Council do not need to make any further provision to meet the needs of Travelling Showpeople in Basingstoke and Deane. The situation at the yard should however be monitored on an annual basis.
8. Conclusions

Gypsy and Traveller Future Pitch Provision

8.1 Based upon the evidence presented in this study the estimated additional pitch provision needed for Gypsies and Travellers in Basingstoke and Deane to 2029 is for 16 pitches. These figures should be seen as the projected amount of provision which is necessary to meet the statutory obligations towards identifiable needs of the population arising in the area. The table below shows the provision required to 2029. This is based upon addressing the unauthorised pitches and concealed households in the first 5 years and then projecting forward household growth based on a net compound growth rate of 2.00%. The figure for 2015-20 is made up of 4 from unauthorised pitches, 4 from concealed households and 2 from new household formation. The remainder of the net new household formation is split between years 6-10 and 11-14 based on a net compound growth rate of 2.00%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-2020</th>
<th>2020-2025</th>
<th>2025-2029</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basingstoke and Deane</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transit Sites

8.2 There has been a decline in the number of unauthorised encampments in Basingstoke and Deane in recent years. Whilst the overall number would suggest that there is a need to consider transit provision, discussions with the Council indicated that a small number of local groups of Travellers were responsible for almost two thirds (51 of 79) of the encampments over the past 18 months. It is also understood that these groups of Travellers do have other local housing options and are living on roadside encampments through choice and not through need.

8.3 The need for transit provision was raised by a number of stakeholders. In addition the 2007 GTNA recommended the need for 1 transit site in Basingstoke and Deane and the 2012 GTNA recommended that there was a need for 2 emergency stopping places. Neither of these has yet been provided.

8.4 As the majority of the encampments by transient households are for less than 7 days it is not recommended that the Council should deliver a formal transit site, but should consider the provision of 3 emergency stopping places to meet the short-term and transient need of these travellers.

Travelling Showpeople Requirements

8.5 Whilst it was not possible to interview the site residents, a statistical analysis of needs would have been inappropriate due to the small numbers of those residing on the site involved. In addition it should be
noted that there has been no planning activity on the site since 2001. It is therefore recommended at this time that the Council do not need to make any further provision to meet the needs of Travelling Showpeople in Basingstoke and Deane. The situation at the yard should however be monitored on an annual basis.
### Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenity block/shed</td>
<td>A building where basic plumbing amenities (bath/shower, WC, sink) are provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricks and mortar</td>
<td>Mainstream housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan</td>
<td>Mobile living vehicle used by Gypsies and Travellers. Also referred to as trailers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalet</td>
<td>A single storey residential unit which can be dismantled. Sometimes referred to as mobile homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed household</td>
<td>Households, living within other households, who are unable to set up separate family units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubling-Up</td>
<td>Where there are more than the permitted number of caravans on a pitch or plot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Stopping Place</td>
<td>A temporary site with limited facilities to be occupied by Gypsies and Travellers while they travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household formation</td>
<td>The process where individuals form separate households. This is normally through adult children setting up their own household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-migration</td>
<td>Movement into or come to live in a region or community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plans</td>
<td>Local Authority spatial planning documents that can include specific policies and/or site allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-migration</td>
<td>Movement from one region or community in order to settle in another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal planning permission</td>
<td>A private site where the planning permission specifies who can occupy the site and doesn’t allow transfer of ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch/plot</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private site</td>
<td>An authorised site owned privately. Can be owner-occupied, rented or a mixture of owner-occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site</strong></td>
<td>An area of land on which Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople are accommodated in caravans/chalets/vehicles. Can contain one or multiple pitches/plots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/Public/Council Site</strong></td>
<td>An authorised site owned by either the local authority or a Registered Housing Provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporary planning permission</strong></td>
<td>A private site with planning permission for a fixed period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tolerated site/yard</strong></td>
<td>Long-term tolerated sites or yards where enforcement action is not expedient and a certificate of lawful use would be granted if sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit provision</strong></td>
<td>Site intended for short stays and containing a range of facilities. There is normally a limit on the length of time residents can stay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unauthorised Development</strong></td>
<td>Caravans on land owned by Gypsies and Travellers and without planning permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unauthorised Encampment</strong></td>
<td>Caravans on land not owned by Gypsies and Travellers and without planning permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waiting list</strong></td>
<td>Record held by the local authority or site managers of applications to live on a site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yard</strong></td>
<td>A name often used by Travelling Showpeople to refer to a site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix B: Sites and Yards in Basingstoke and Deane (July 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Yard</th>
<th>Authorised Pitches/Plots</th>
<th>Unauthorised Pitches/Plots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sites with Permanent Permission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackberries, Monk Sherborne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddwoods, Sandy Lane, Tadley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Adjoining Forest Farm, Sandy Lane, Tadley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Lodge, Sandy Lane, Tadley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land South of Harroway Organic Gardens, Whitchurch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowview Caravan Site, Bishops Green</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable View, Sandy Lane, Tadley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sites with Temporary Permission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tolerated Sites – Long-term without Planning Permission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land East of Church Brook</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot 1, Forest Farm, Sandy Lane, Tadley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unauthorised Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crux Easton, Ashmansworth</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Cufaude Lane, Bramley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands View, Sandy Lane, Tadley</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PITCHES</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Transit Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Transit Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tolerated Travelling Showpeople Yards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swings and Roundabouts, Chineham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Site Record Form

INTERVIEWER READ OUT: Good Morning/afternoon/evening. My name is < > from Opinion Research Services, working on behalf of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council. The council are undertaking a study of Gypsy & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople accommodation needs in this area. We would like you to take part because it is important that we interview a wide cross-section of people. Your family will not be identified and all the Information collected will be anonymous and only used to help understand the needs of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gypsy &amp; Traveller Accommodation Assessment – Site/Pitch Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Local Authority: Basingstoke and Deane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Site Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Site Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Interviewer(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address and Pitch Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Site: Council / Housing Association / Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity of Family</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romany Gypsy / Irish Traveller / Scots Gypsy or Traveller / Show Person / New Traveller / English Traveller / Welsh Gypsy / Other (specify) / Non-Traveller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you lived here? And if you have moved in the past 5 years where did you move from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many units on the pitch?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics – household 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many separate families or unmarried adults live on this pitch?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the pitch over-crowded or doubled-up and is there a need for additional pitches?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many of your children will need a home of their own in the next 5 years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they live here now, will they want to stay on this site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not, where would they wish to move? (e.g. other Basingstoke site/outside of Basingstoke site/)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other type of accommodation (including bricks and mortar) in Basingstoke/out of Basingstoke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they do not live on this site, would they want to move on this site or another Basingstoke site if they could get a pitch?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many people living here are on the waiting list for a pitch in Basingstoke?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have they been on the waiting list?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do any of the people living here want to be on the Waiting List?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you live here out of your own choice or because there was no other option? If no option why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this site suitable for your household? If so why and if not why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you plan to move from this site in the next 5 years? And why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where would you move to? <em>(Basingstoke site, out of Basingstoke site, other type of accommodation (including bricks and mortar) in Basingstoke, other type of accommodation outside of Basingstoke etc.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you want to move would you prefer a buy a private pitch or site, or rent a pitch on a public site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you afford to buy a private pitch or site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you consider renting a pitch on a managed private site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether households travel? Who, where, why and how often in the past 12 months?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not travelling, why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts for Bricks &amp; Mortar Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other information about this site or your accommodation needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Pitch Plan</th>
<th>Sketch of Site/Pitch – any concerns? Opportunities for expansion/intensification?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Bricks & Mortar Adverts

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:

Basingstoke and Deane, Bedford, Carmarthenshire, Luton, North Somerset, Powys, the Royal Borough of Greenwich and the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead.

Your views are very important to us.

If you would like to speak to ORS about your needs please contact Claire Thomas on 01792 535337 or email claire.thomas@ors.org.uk
I hope you don’t mind me posting this message.

I work for a company called Opinion Research Services (ORS). We are 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.

We are currently undertaking an assessment for Basingstoke and Deane Council and would like to speak to any Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople who live in this area 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.

Your views are very important to us.

If you would like to speak to ORS about your accommodation needs please respond to this post, message me directly, or contact my colleague Imogen Statham on 01692 558340 or email her at imogen.statham@ors.org.uk.

Many thanks.

Steve.

[Image of a website interface with a discussion thread and profile photo]
Appendix E: List of organisations interviewed or written responses

» Basingstoke and Deane Members and Officers x 6
» 8 Neighbouring Authorities x 9
» Hampshire Gypsy Traveller Service x 1
» Hampshire EMTAS service x 1
» Hampshire Police (Basingstoke) x 1
» Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service (Basingstoke, Deane & Rushmore) x 1
» Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain x 1
Appendix F: Technical Note on Household Formation and Growth Rates
Technical Note

Gypsy and Traveller Household Formation and Growth Rates

March 31st 2015
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 March 2015
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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.
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.

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’).

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.*

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.

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Growth Rate per Annum</th>
<th>Time Taken for Household to Double</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>23.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>25.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>28 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>31 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>40 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>46.5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

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

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.

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.

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of caravans</th>
<th>5 year growth in caravans</th>
<th>Percentage growth over 5 years</th>
<th>Annual over last 5 years.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>20,035</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2014</td>
<td>19,503</td>
<td>1,638</td>
<td>9.17%</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2013</td>
<td>20,911</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2013</td>
<td>19,359</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>8.49%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2012</td>
<td>19,261</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>12.32%</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2012</td>
<td>18,746</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>12.85%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2011</td>
<td>18,571</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>13.84%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2011</td>
<td>18,383</td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2010</td>
<td>18,134</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>14.32%</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
<td>18,370</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>19.53%</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2009</td>
<td>17,437</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>15.33%</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2009</td>
<td>17,865</td>
<td>3,503</td>
<td>24.39%</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2008</td>
<td>17,572</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>19.54%</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2008</td>
<td>17,844</td>
<td>3,895</td>
<td>27.92%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2007</td>
<td>17,149</td>
<td>2,948</td>
<td>20.76%</td>
<td>3.84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The annual rates of growth in the number of caravans varies from slightly over 1% to just over 5% per annum, but 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). It is also possible, of course, that the growth of caravan numbers reflects the provision on some sites of rental accommodation for non-Gypsy and Traveller migrant workers.

In any case, 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.

### Modelling population growth

#### Introduction

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

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

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.

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 0 to 4</td>
<td>5,725</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 5 to 7</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 8 to 9</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 10 to 14</td>
<td>5,431</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 15</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 16 to 17</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18 to 19</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 20 to 24</td>
<td>4,464</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 29</td>
<td>4,189</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30 to 34</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Birth and fertility rates

25. 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.)

26. 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. Unfortunately, we know of no reliable national data on the fertility rates of the UK Gypsy and Traveller community so the modelling has to be inferential in using plausible (but never perfect) comparative data. One source is Hungary, where considerable detailed analysis has shown that its Roma population has a TFR of about 3. (For more information see: http://www.romaniworld.com/cessmod01.htm and http://www.tarki.hu/adatbank-h/kutjel/pdf/a779.pdf).

27. While it would be unsatisfactory to rely only on the Hungarian data (however well researched), it is significant that ORS’s own survey data is consistent with a TFR of about 3. 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). It is reasonable, then, to assume an average of three children per woman during her lifetime. 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

28. 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.

29. 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.

30. 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

31. 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.

32. 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.

33. 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

34. 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).

35. 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.

36. 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of household representative</th>
<th>All households in England</th>
<th>Gypsy and Traveller households in England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of households</td>
<td>Percentage of households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 24 and under</td>
<td>790,974</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 34</td>
<td>3,158,258</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 35 to 49</td>
<td>6,563,651</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 50 to 64</td>
<td>5,828,761</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65 to 74</td>
<td>2,764,474</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 75 to 84</td>
<td>2,097,807</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 85 and over</td>
<td>859,443</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,063,368</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>All households in England</th>
<th>Gypsy and Traveller households in England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of households</td>
<td>Percentage of households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single person</td>
<td>6,666,493</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with no children</td>
<td>5,681,847</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with dependent children</td>
<td>4,266,670</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with non-dependent children</td>
<td>1,342,841</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent: Dependent children</td>
<td>1,573,255</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent: All children non-dependent</td>
<td>766,569</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other households</td>
<td>1,765,693</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,063,368</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).

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. It is also well documented that adult Gypsy and Traveller males travel far more frequently than females for work purposes. 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 2014) – 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.

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

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 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)

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

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 and conclusions

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.

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.

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.

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.