

Towards a baseline distribution of future pitch provision

Introduction

The Regional Assembly have requested joint advice on two spatial options (Options A and B) for the district-level distribution of permanent pitch requirements for 2006-11 and 2011-16.

This paper presents proposals for the Option A distribution which is defined in SEERA's brief as "a distribution which seeks to meet identified needs where they arise as identified through the GTAA and the existence of unauthorised encampments (although this may reinforce existing patterns of provision". It is often referred to as the baseline, needs-based distribution of permanent pitch requirements.

These proposals have been developed by the joint authorities' Officers Advisory Group, advised by a smaller sub-group of officers established for the purpose.

Available evidence and advice

The evidence we have been able to draw upon for our assessment comes from the twice-yearly caravan counts carried out for CLG (in January and July) and the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Gypsy and Traveller Study carried out in 2005 by David Couttie Associates (DCA).

The DCA study predates the publication of draft advice from Government on Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAAs). However, the final study report does present an accommodation 'needs model' that estimates additional pitch requirements for 2006-11 which is broadly in line with Government advice.

We have sought to understand and interpret the available evidence in the light of further advice set out in the CLG guidance on "Preparing Regional Spatial Strategy reviews on Gypsies and Travellers by regional planning bodies". This first required us to benchmark our available information against a checklist of 12 questions – the answers to which have helped inform our reasoned assessment of future pitch requirements presented below.

The detailed conclusions of our benchmarking study are given in Annex A. Our findings have subsequently been confirmed out by a similar audit carried out for SEERA by Pat Niner (whose team at the Centre for Urban & Regional Studies developed the CLG guidance). While the results of her assessment are reproduced in full in Annex B, the two most important conclusions she has drawn are that:

- DCA's assessment of future requirements in respect of unauthorised encampment "is likely to be a significant over-estimate of need" for permanent provision; and
- that DCA's estimate of future household growth is also "likely to be an over-estimate because of double-counting and high assumed (family formation) rates".

Caravans, households and pitches

The relationship between caravans, households and pitches is often confusing. The DCA study found that each Gypsy and Traveller household had, on average, 1.3 caravans and this figure is often used as a factor to translate from one to the other i.e. caravans *divided by* 1.3 = households.

And while the DCLG advice suggests that there is an average of 1.7 caravans on each pitch nationally, this proportion does vary between areas and, in line with Government advice, our work assumes that each Gypsy and Traveller household in need of permanent provision will require their own, single pitch.

Adjusting the DCA accommodation needs model

Section 5 of DCA's final report presents an assessment of the overall need for additional pitches for Gypsies and Travellers over the next five years. Detailed figures in the needs model are set out on page 78; these are described over the following pages and summarised in another table at the top of page 82.

The conclusion of DCA's needs assessment is that there is an overall requirement to provide an additional 80 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers over the five-year period from 2006-2011. In arriving at this conclusion, the model looks at the following key issues:

- the current backlog of unmet need for pitches;
- newly-arising needs for further pitch provision over the next 5 years;
- the flow of existing pitches that are likely to become available (i.e. vacant) to meet such needs; and
- having taken account of likely vacancies, the residual number of additional pitches that will be required to meet the outstanding needs.

The Assembly's brief for the work requires the joint authorities to consider all elements of the needs model and to make any appropriate adjustments that may be suggested as a result of considering the detailed benchmarking questions given in the CLG guidance (and Pat Niner's similar assessment for SEERA). In the light of this detailed review, the Officers Advisory Group believes a number of adjustments should be made to the DCA needs assessment to:

- clearly distinguish between needs for further permanent residential provision and for additional transit pitches – particularly with regard to unauthorised encampments;
- not over-estimate the likely future supply from existing pitches becoming vacant;
- not over-estimate likely levels of future household formation amongst Gypsies and Travellers; and
- to avoid some double counting between different elements of the model.

The table below sets out the allowances made in DCA's original needs model and the detailed adjustments that the Officers Advisory Group recommends should be made to arrive at a more robust view of the overall need for additional permanent pitch provision in East Sussex and Brighton & Hove, 2006-2011.

The revised needs assessment for permanent pitches

Line	Category	DCA model	Revised model	Comment
2	Number of existing pitches expected to become vacant on permanent sites within the next 12 months	6	-	Exclude. The data on stated 'intentions' to move from an existing permanent pitch to some unauthorised site is questionable. In any event, the allowance made here on the supply side is cancelled out by the concurrent allowance for the same moves that is also made on the demand side of the model – with the net impact of both these allowances on the final needs assessment being zero.
3	Number of households in permanent site accommodation planning to move to permanent housing in the next 12 months	2	2	Include. This allowance for vacancies appears to be in line with past rates and reasonable expectations.

4	New local authority pitches already planned in year 1	0	-	Exclude. There are currently no firm developments in the pipeline. And, even if there were, any such commitments (if and when realised) should count towards meeting the overall requirement rather than reducing it in advance of development occurring.
5	Existing applications for private site development/extension likely to gain planning permission during year 1	1	-	Exclude. If this pitch has already gained planning permission it is irrelevant to the calculation as it will already have become part of the total permanent supply. In addition, there is no justification for treating any such expectation as an annual supply figure. And, as stated re. Line 4 above, future permissions that come forward after April 2006 should count towards meeting the final provision figures (i.e. target requirements) that will be established in the SE Plan.
	Annual total pitches available	9	2	
6	Total pitches available over 5 years	45	10	Annual provision * 5.
7	Households seeking permanent site accommodation in the area	14	5	Reduce from 14 to 5. The DCA figure is based on site waiting list information provided at the time of the survey. It is considered to be an over-estimate because of likely overlap with the allowances made at Lines 8 (for unauthorised encampments) and 11 (for concealed households). However, the model should include an estimate to cover the needs of households planning to transfer from housing to permanent authorised sites. The survey offers a variety of potential figures for this but only 2 of such households identified in the survey had gone as far as registering their need on a site waiting list. Grossing this figure up by a factor of 2.25 (as the sample included 63 of 142 Gypsy and Traveller households living in permanent dwellings) gives an overall total of 5.
8	Households on unauthorised encampments	54	20 (B&H 8) (ESx 12)	Reduce from 54 to 20. Only a proportion of households on unauthorised encampments (UEs) will require permanent provision. B&HCC have suggested that the large numbers of UEs counted in July are a seasonal phenomenon and more indicative of a need for transit provision. Therefore, it is suggested that only 20% of UEs in B&H in July 2005 should translate into a need for permanent pitches (48 caravans / 1.3 = 37 households * 20% = 8 permanent pitches required). Monitoring evidence from the East Sussex database on long-term UEs over the last 2.5 years suggests a need to make permanent provision for 12 households. This represents just over 70% of the total of 17 households that it is estimated were living on UEs in the county in July 2005 (22 caravans / 1.3 = 17 households).
9	Households on unauthorised developments (for which planning permission is not expected)	8	8	Include. The July 2005 caravan count identified 10 caravans on such sites. This figure equates to 8 households (10 / 1.3 = 8).
10	Households currently overcrowded	0	-	Exclude. The survey did not provide information on overcrowding which is assumed to be covered by the allowance in Line 11 for concealed households.
11	Back log of concealed / new family formation within existing households	12	12	Include. This figure for concealed households (frustrated family formation) should be included unchanged, although there are concerns about possible double-counting with the Line 15 allowance for future family formation.
12	Total current residential demand backlog	88	45	Sum of Lines 7 – 11.
13	Less number of unused local authority pitches, and vacancies on privately owned sites available in the local authority / partnership area	2	-	Exclude. This allowance relates to a site in Brighton & Hove and forms part of the city's authorised supply of transit pitches.
14	Less number of households on unauthorised development pitches likely to gain planning permission	8	-	Exclude. Wealden DC has advised that the relevant applications are under appeal. Even if successful, these pitches should count towards meeting the overall provision for the district (and not be assumed to reduce that requirement).
	Current shortfall	78	45	Line 12 minus Lines 13 and 14.

15	Family formation 2006 – 2011	17	12	Reduce from 17 to 12. In line with Pat Niner's assessment, this allowance should be reduced to overcome likely double-counting with Line 11 and to bring household formation rates into line with more realistic expectations, especially given low average household sizes in the sample population. The reduced figure has been calculated by assuming a compound household growth rate of 3% pa in line with Government guidance.
16	Households moving from authorised to unauthorised sites, 2006-2011	30	-	Exclude. This allowance should also be excluded to balance the equivalent adjustment that has also been made on the supply side at Line 2 above.
	Newly arising need	47	12	Sum of Lines 15 and 16.

Taking account of all the above adjustments, the revised model implies an overall requirement to make provision for a total of 47 permanent residential pitches over the five-year period to 2011, made up as follows:

Current backlog of unmet needs	45
Newly arising needs	12
Gross need for additional permanent pitches	57
<i>Less expected vacancies on existing sites</i>	<i>10</i>
Net need for additional permanent pitches, 2006-2011	47

Distributing the baseline requirement for 2006-2011

More detailed spatial information is available for many of the elements included in our baseline assessment. This can be used to disaggregate the overall requirement for an extra 47 permanent pitches to each of the planning authority areas. Where no such spatial information is available, an alternative approach is proposed for distributing the allowances that need to be made for transfers from housing, concealed households and future family formation.

All aspects of the adjusted needs (and supply) model are considered below, with details given as to how the overall figure for each element should be distributed across the whole area.

Future vacancies in the existing stock

The revised model estimates that 10 vacancies will arise on existing permanent pitches over the next 5 years as a result of households transferring to housing. As shown in the following table, it is assumed that these vacancies will reflect the existing level and pattern of permanent provision.

	Current supply of permanent pitches		Estimated vacancies
	Number	Percent	
Eastbourne	0	0%	0
Hastings	0	0%	0
Lewes	0	0%	0
Rother	7	20%	2
Wealden	28	80%	8
East Sussex	35	100%	10

Households on unauthorised encampments

The baseline requirement includes an allowance of 20 pitches for permanent residential needs associated with unauthorised camping. Eight of these pitches relate to identified need in Brighton & Hove.

In East Sussex, the July 2005 count identified 22 caravans on unauthorised encampments. It is estimated (based on the survey results which found an average of 1.3 caravans per household) that these 22 caravans were occupied by 17 households. Long-term monitoring suggests that

around 12 of these households require permanent pitches. We can therefore use the original July 2005 counts as the basis for disaggregating the East Sussex element to particular districts as shown below.

	July 2005 caravan count on unauthorised encampments		Estimated need for permanent pitches
	Number	Percent	
Eastbourne	0	0%	0
Hastings	4	18%	2
Lewes	11	50%	6
Rother	0	0%	0
Wealden	7	32%	4
East Sussex	22	100%	12

Households on unauthorised developments for which planning permission is not expected

The July 2005 count identified 3 caravans in Lewes and 7 in Wealden on unauthorised developments which are not expected to gain planning permission. This translates to an estimate of 8 households (10 divided by 1.3 caravans per household) which, again, can be disaggregated using the original counts.

	July 2005 caravan count on unauthorised developments		Estimated need for permanent pitches
	Number	Percent	
Eastbourne	0	0%	0
Hastings	0	0%	0
Lewes	3	30%	2
Rother	0	0%	0
Wealden	7	70%	6
East Sussex	10	100%	8

Concealed households and households planning to transfer from housing to sites

The adjusted needs model estimates that there are some 12 concealed households in the area currently requiring a permanent pitch. It is also estimated that there another 5 households will need to transfer from their current dwelling to a permanent pitch on a caravan site over the next five years.

	Table 5.2 locational preferences	Estimated need for permanent pitches
Eastbourne	5.7%	1
Hastings	8.5%	1
Lewes	6.5%	1
Rother	16.0%	3
Wealden	42.5%	7
East Sussex	79.2%	13
Brighton & Hove	20.8%	4
GTAA area	100%	17

However we don't have any more detailed information available to help us disaggregate these figures. Officers have therefore agreed that the best approach here would be to use Gypsies' and Travellers' own expressed preferences regarding where they would most like to live as the basis for distributing all 17 pitches. These preferences are set out in Table 5-2 of the DCA report, with the resultant pitch numbers being given in the preceding table.

Future family formation, 2006-2011

Pat Niner highlights in her assessment a number of problems associated with the DCA estimate of future household formation to 2011 (described in para. 5.3.8 of the study) – that:

- the calculations are impossible to check;
- the household formation rates and resultant numbers appear very high – especially given the unusually small (not large) average household sizes; and
- the estimate is also likely to include some double-counting with the allowance also made for concealed households.

The alternative approach proposed for calculating the likely level of need arising from future family formation reflects the CLG guidance which suggests a typical compound household growth rate of 3% per year. This growth rate is applied to our adjusted estimate of all Gypsy and Traveller households needing permanent accommodation at the 2006 base date of 2006. The starting total of 80 households in 2006 therefore includes all the households with a current unmet need for a permanent pitch as well as those on existing authorised sites, as detailed below.

Estimate of total households requiring permanent pitches in 2006

	Permanent pitches in 2006	Households on unauthorised encampments	Households on unauthorised developments	Concealed households and transfers from housing	Est. of total households in 2006 needing permanent pitches
Eastbourne	0	0	0	1	1
Hastings	0	2	0	1	3
Lewes	0	6	2	1	9
Rother	7	0	0	3	10
Wealden	28	4	6	7	45
Brighton & Hove	0	8	0	4	12
East Sussex	35	12	8	13	68
GTAA area	35	20	8	17	80

The compound growth rate of 3% pa has been applied to the starting total of 80 households in 2006 to calculate additional needs arising from new family formation over the next five years to 2011.

Estimating family formation, 2006-2011

	Total households in 2006 needing permanent pitches	Total households (3% growth per year)					Estimated household growth, 2006-11
		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	
Eastbourne	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Hastings	3	3	3	3	3	3	0
Lewes	9	9	10	10	10	10	1
Rother	10	10	11	11	11	12	2
Wealden	45	46	48	49	51	52	7
Brighton & Hove	12	12	13	13	14	14	2
East Sussex	68	69	73	74	76	78	10
GTAA area	80	81	86	87	90	92	12

Option A – the needs-based distribution of the requirement for permanent pitches, 2006-2011

The different elements of the adjusted model are brought together in the tables below to present a needs-based distribution of the overall requirement for permanent provision to 2011 that SEERA require for Option A.

Gross need for permanent pitch provision, 2006-2011

	Backlog of existing need in 2006			Family formation, 2006-2011	Total gross requirements, 2006-2011
	Unauthorised encampments	Unauthorised developments	Concealed households & transfers from housing		
Eastbourne	0	0	1	0	1
Hastings	2	0	1	0	3
Lewes	6	2	1	1	10
Rother	0	0	3	2	5
Wealden	4	6	7	7	24
Brighton & Hove	8	0	4	2	14
East Sussex	12	8	13	10	43
GTAA area	20	8	17	12	57

The final Option A distribution presented below is produced by subtracting the allowance for expected vacancies from the gross requirement for additional pitches.

Option A – Proposed baseline provision for permanent pitches, 2006-2011

	Total gross requirements	Expected vacancies	Option A requirements	Option A distribution by percent
Eastbourne	1	0	1	2.1%
Hastings	3	0	3	6.4%
Lewes	10	0	10	21.3%
Rother	5	2	3	6.4%
Wealden	24	8	16	34.0%
Brighton & Hove	14	0	14	29.8%
East Sussex	43	10	33	70.2%
GTAA area	57	10	47	100%

Longer-term requirements to 2016

SEERA also require advice on the need for permanent pitch provision for the further five-year period to 2016. Assuming that the existing backlog of unmet needs has been met by 2011, and also assuming zero net migration as a result of Gypsy and Traveller households moving into and away from our area, additional provision for the period from 2011-2016 should only be required to cater for:

- further transfers of households moving from bricks and mortar housing to permanent sites; and
- future family formation amongst households on permanent sites.

As far as transfers from housing are concerned, it would seem most reasonable to make the same assumptions for the five years after 2011 as for the preceding five years – i.e. that there will be a demand for an extra five permanent pitches as a result of such transfers.

To estimate future family formation, the same approach has also been taken as for the earlier five-year period. However, this time, the 3% household growth rate has been applied to the total

number of Gypsy and Traveller households that we anticipate will be living on permanent pitches in this area by 2011.

Estimating family formation, 2011-2016

	Total households on permanent pitches in 2011	Total households (3% growth per year)					Estimated household growth, 2011-16
		2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	
Eastbourne	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Hastings	3	3	3	3	3	3	0
Lewes	10	10	11	11	11	12	2
Rother	10	10	11	11	11	12	2
Wealden	44	45	47	48	50	51	7
Brighton & Hove	14	14	15	15	16	16	2
East Sussex	68	70	72	74	77	79	11
GTAA area	82	84	87	90	92	95	13

Nb. The figure for total households in 2011 reflects the total number of permanent pitches in 2006 *plus* the additional (Option A) provision proposed for the next five years.

With an allowance for 5 households transferring from housing and new family formation amounting to around 13 households, the estimated gross requirement for additional pitch provision, 2011-2016, totals 18 pitches. However, we need to discount from this figure an allowance for vacancies arising as a result of Gypsy and Traveller households moving off sites into permanent housing.

For the previous period and based on the survey results, we estimated that 2 pitches out of the 35 permanent pitches available in 2006 would become vacant in this way each year. This equates to a vacancy rate of 5.7%.

Applying this same vacancy rate to our anticipated stock of 82 permanent pitches in 2011 suggests that nearly 5 pitches per year could be expected to become available as re-lets to meet any longer-term demands for additional provision. Over the 5 years to 2016, this would mean around 23 pitches becoming vacant which would obviate the need for any additional provision beyond 2011.

Paul Treadgold
Strategic Policy and Information Group Manager
East Sussex County Council

Annex A - the joint authorities benchmarking exercise

Q1 – Are all appropriate groups considered in the assessment?

Yes – as far as the main groupings of Gypsies and Travellers are concerned. The only group not covered are travelling showmen and circus people but there is no evidence to suggest any significant needs in East Sussex from this group.

As far as possible accommodation situations are concerned, the sample was not entirely satisfactory in respect of unauthorised sites. This is partly because only 1 of the 26 households included in the sample for this group was living in East Sussex; it is also because the survey sample did not distinguish between unauthorised encampments and unauthorised developments. It also states that 25 of the 26 households on unauthorised sites were living on 'unauthorised council sites' – a term that is not explained any further.

Q2 – Is the survey method used generally reliable?

Whilst we are reasonably happy with the size of the sample, our concerns in respect of the selection and structure of the survey sample have been highlighted in response to Q1. In other respects the methods applied seem appropriate.

Problems with the structure of the survey sample would have raised more significant issues if the survey data were the main source for assessing the future needs of households on unauthorised encampments. This, however, is not the case.

Q3 – What allowance is made for current overcrowding, or concealed households or doubling up on authorised sites?

The DCA study did not explicitly address the issue of over-crowding and frustrated household formation. It did, however, ask respondents if anyone in their household would be looking to set up their own independent household in the next 3 years. The answers from this question have effectively been used as a proxy for needs relating to concealed households and/or over-crowding.

However, there is also a risk of some over-estimation arising here as no consideration has been given to potential double-counting that might arise because of an overlap between this element and the allowances made for households registered on site waiting lists and for new household formation.

Q4 – What allowance is made for needs arising from current unauthorised developments?

DCA have included an estimate for such needs derived from the July 2005 Caravan Count. This allowance mainly relates to Wealden – and the district council have advised that the figure has barely changed since.

Q5 – What allowance is made for needs arising from unauthorised encampments?

The DCA report estimates that there were 54 such households in July 2005. This has been derived by dividing the caravan count of 70 for the combined area by the factor of 1.3.

While DCA's needs model assumes that all of these households require permanent provision, the DCLG guidance suggests that this would be to over-estimate requirements. In some areas, the guidance suggests it might be reasonable to assume that only 10-20% of encampment levels translate to a need for permanent pitches; in other areas, it acknowledges this might be too conservative.

The DCA report is also generally confused on this issue. While the key findings may be taken to suggest an additional need for transit provision over and above the assessed need for 80 additional permanent pitches in the next 5 years, Section 5.4 clearly indicates that transit provision should form part of that overall requirement.

Q6 – What allowance is made for future population growth and household formation?

The DCA report estimates that 17 new Gypsy and Traveller households will be formed over the next five years. This figure is derived (in a way that can't be checked) by survey data on the demographic characteristics of the sample population and on the propensity of younger adults to form new households.

No consideration has been given as to whether the allowance made for this element of future need overlaps with any of the other allowances in DCA's needs model (i.e. the allowance for 'concealed' households).

Q7 – What allowance is made for net movement between sites and housing?

On the supply side of the model and based on the survey evidence, it is assumed that 2 pitches will become vacant each year as a result of households transferring from permanent authorised sites to bricks and mortar housing.

An allowance is also made on the needs side of the model for households on site waiting lists. It is possible that some of these needs relate to households that are currently living in permanent dwellings.

Q8 – What allowance is made for net movement between the study area and elsewhere?

None – but the relatively small numbers of Gypsy and Traveller households in this area suggest that this is not significant.

Q9 – What allowance is made for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation aspirations?

Preferences and aspirations regarding the location and nature of additional provision are more relevant to the assessment for the Option B distribution and to the future preparation of local development documents.

Q10 – Are any other factors taken into account on the need/demand side of the model?

Information from local authorities on site waiting lists has been included – but without consideration appearing to have been given to possible overlaps with other aspects of the model, particularly in respect of concealed/overcrowded households and new household formation.

Q11 – What assumptions are made about the supply of pitches over the assessment period?

The DCA model has identified a future supply of 9 pitches a year as a result of:

- 6 households a year moving from authorised to unauthorised sites
- 2 households a year transferring to permanent housing
- 1 pitch per year gaining planning permission on private development sites.

However, the first allowance not only appears a little strange, it is also completely cancelled out by an equivalent allowance (for the same households) on the demand side model so that the overall net impact is zero!

There is also no reason to make any assumption as to future planning permissions. To include such figures at this stage of the model is to reduce the overall (net) requirement that will form the

basis of the ultimate provision (i.e. target) figures. But there is no certainty that such permissions will be realised and the result could well be under-provision.

Q12 – Overall, are there any obvious inadequacies, omissions or double-counting?

Although questions can be raised about most elements of the DCA needs model, it seems reasonable to conclude that they largely relate to a combination of quite modest under- and over-estimates that can reasonably be assumed to largely cancel each other out.

However, some slight adjustments can and should be made, as detailed in the next section. But the most significant judgement that needs to be made concerns the treatment of households on unauthorised encampments and the extent to which these speak of needs for permanent or transit provision.

Annex B – Pat Niner’s benchmarking assessment for SEERA

**PRO-FORMA FOR REVISED BENCHMARKING FOR GTAA_s
SOUTH EAST OF ENGLAND**

GTAA : East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Gypsy & Traveller Study – Final Report
2005

Q1 : Are all appropriate groups considered in the assessment?

No Travelling Showpeople in the survey. Not clear whether this is because there are none or just not included. No comments on Showpeople at all. No reference to Roma. Other groups, including housed included.

Effectively excludes Travelling Showpeople

Q2 : Is the survey method used generally reliable?

Reasonable sample achieved. No fieldwork problems encountered.

Reasonable to assume generally reliable.

Q3 : What allowance is made for current overcrowding, or concealed households or doubling up on authorised sites?

Concealed households identified by survey on authorised sites grossed up to total population. May be small double counting between concealed households and assumed future family formation – impossible to check from figures presented. Overcrowding taken into account although assumed to be zero.

Taken into account in reasonable way.

Q4 : What allowance is made for needs arising from current unauthorised developments?

Converts Count caravans on Gypsy-owned land to households and includes all as need. On supply side uses real figures from one LA for unauthorised developments likely to gain planning consent. This equates to the imputed figure for all developments, but there were caravans in more than one LA.

Slight under-estimate because of use of real and imputed figures at different points in the calculation.

Q5 : What allowance is made for needs arising from unauthorised encampment?

Converts July Count caravans on land not owned by Gypsies to households and includes **all** as requiring residential pitches. Later in the report the comments on transit site needs implies that some on unauthorised encampments would require transit accommodation.

Likely to be a significant over-estimate of need.

Q6 : What allowance is made for future population growth and household formation?
Grossed up survey information for new household formation 2006-2011 from age structures. Impossible to check because of way figures are presented in the report. May be some double counting with concealed households. 5 year family formation represents 28% of current provision or c5%pa. Together with concealed household allowance represents 48% or c9%pa. Very high household formation rates especially as household sizes are unusually large – only 3.2 persons on authorised and unauthorised sites. There is no allowance for household growth in houses. <i>Likely to be an over-estimate because of double counting and high assumed rates.</i>
Q7 : What allowance is made for net movement between sites and housing?
An allowance made for movement from sites to houses, but not for movement from houses to sites despite high expressed desires to move. Some movement from houses could be included in site waiting list figures which are used. <i>Likely to be an under-estimate for site demand (if not need).</i>
Q8 : What allowance is made for net movement between the study area and elsewhere?
None explicitly unless included in site waiting lists. <i>Impossible to say what the effect of omission is.</i>
Q9 : What allowance is made for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation aspirations?
No allowance made in the model itself although figures are provided for ideal accommodation choices. <i>Insofar as omits aspirations for site places among housed population would under-estimate site requirements.</i>
Q10 : Are any other factors taken into account on the need/demand side of the model?
Site waiting lists are used and may take account of some of the omitted factors. <i>Likely to improve estimates.</i>
Q11 : What assumptions are made about supply of pitches over the assessment period?
Assumptions on likely vacancies from movement desires from survey + new LA pitches planned (0), planning applications likely to be approved. These multiplied by 5 for 5 years. Also allows for currently vacant pitches into use and unauthorised developments likely to gain planning permission. <i>Some quibbles, but seems broadly reasonable.</i>

Q12 : Overall, are there any obvious inadequacies, omissions or double-counting?

There are a number of omissions and potentials for double counting. Two significant elements suggest an over-statement of need:

- * the inclusion of all unauthorised encampment households for residential need
- * the growth rates assumed by including both concealed households and family formation in the future.

Conclude this probably over-states requirements to a significant extent.

Comparison with the RSS formula

The estimated additional residential pitch requirement 2006-2011 = 80

The RSS formula applied exactly as formulated gives requirement = 25

Using the survey average number of caravans per household/pitch = 32

If the DCA calculated requirement is reduced by their transit element from the survey grossed to the total population, the amended requirement is 35 which gives some strength to the argument that requirement is over-stated.

PITCH REQUIREMENT ALLOCATION BETWEEN LPAs

Are pitch requirements allocated between LPAs?

Yes	
No	X

IF YES:

Would you say the division is primarily on the basis of need where it arises or need where it should be met?

Need where is arises	
Need where it should be met	
Hard to say	

What method was used to allocate pitches to LPAs? What assumptions were used etc?

Some information on ideal locations, but not translated into LPA pitch requirements.

TRANSIT SITE REQUIREMENTS

Are transit pitch requirements assessed?

Yes	X
No	

IF YES:

How are transit pitch requirements assessed?
Applies survey information on reasons for being in the area – not grossed up as all other figures are. A figure is arrived at, but the relationship between this and the residential requirements is left rather vague. Seems to me it should logically reduce the residential requirement.

Are any transit pitches allocated to locations? What criteria are used?
No

**RESEARCH TO SUPPORT THE PREPARATION OF RSS REVIEWS ON GYPSIES AND
TRAVELLERS BY REGIONAL PLANNING BODIES
DRAFT CHECKLIST FOR BENCHMARKING GTANAs**

Complete a checklist for each GTANA

BASIC INFORMATION

Title		
East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Gypsy & Traveller Study – Final Report 2005		
Author		
David Couttie Associates (DCA)		
Date (<i>month/year</i>) 2005		
Pre-guidance		
Post-guidance	X	
Coverage		
Geography (<i>write in LAs</i>)		
Brighton & Hove, Eastbourne, Hastings, Lewes, Rother, Wealden		
Topics (<i>note main topics in addition to accommodation, eg housing related support, education, health</i>)		
Virtually nothing beyond accommodation issues. Some comments on health and education and recommendations in these areas, but little hard evidence.		
Population groups (<i>eg do they include Roma, housed Travellers, New Travellers, Showmen</i>)		
Ethnic categories provided suggest they were aiming for all groups, but no Showmen in the survey and no comments on this at all in the report. No clear from the report whether this is because there are no Showmen, or not included. No Roma in survey or comments. Includes housed and sites Gypsies and Travellers, including New Travellers.		
Status (<i>eg part of mainstream accommodation study, free-standing G&T needs assessment, study rather than needs assessment</i>)		
GTAA		

APPROACH AND METHODS	
Types of data used (<i>tick as appropriate</i>)	
Secondary sources	Yes
Stakeholder interviews	No
Gypsy/Traveller interviews	Yes
Gypsy/Traveller focus groups	No
Other (<i>describe</i>)	No
Secondary sources (<i>list and describe use made of each</i>)	
<p>Counts used for demonstrating current provision and some trend information. Counts are used to calculate the base population for needs assessment, converting caravans to families/households by dividing by survey average number of caravans per household. This total is used to gross up survey results.</p> <p>Site waiting list figures used in needs model.</p> <p>Limited reference to number of vacancies on LA sites.</p>	
Stakeholder interviews (<i>list and describe main topics, uses etc</i>)	
None apparently carried out although stakeholders closely involved in setting up and publicising the survey.	
General approach (<i>quant/qual/mixed etc</i>)	
Exclusively quantitative. Analysis descriptive and very little about understanding what is happening etc.	
GYPSY AND TRAVELLER INTERVIEWS ETC	
Sample	
Sample frame	All known sites from Count and LA information. Housed from LA information + East Sussex County Council. NB sample frame for housed never used – basically no grossing up or contribution of housed to the needs assessment.
Sampling method	Talks about stratification for LA and type of accommodation, but no details.
Sample size	Target 120 exceeded – 128 interviews: housed 63, authorised sites 39, unauthorised sites 26 (no distinction between development and encampments).
Any comments on response/bias etc?	No comments. Provides a 95% confidence level confidence interval for the whole sub-regional sample and calculated percentages to one decimal place.
Questionnaire/topic guide	
Available to us?	No, but can tell most of it because questions reproduced in the analysis.

Team comment re length/level of detail Seems to cover the usual areas.
Any comments in report on way it worked No. Clear from very variable sample numbers for different questions that routing instructions were not always followed, and no attempt in the analysis to identify those who 'ought' to have answered.

Fieldwork

Who did the interviews? (<i>community interviewers etc</i>) Mill Field Services. Assume not community interviewers. All subject to CRB check.
Introduced or cold calling? Introduced by stakeholders. Previous publicity by LAs.
Any comments in report of fieldwork issues No fieldwork difficulties experienced. Interviews carried out over 2 week period 30/8 to 12/9 2005. No comments on possible significance of carrying out the survey at that time of year. 10% back checks – no details of how.

ANALYSIS : NEED, SUPPLY AND REQUIREMENTS

'Model' of need used for permanent/residential accommodation (*tick elements considered as appropriate and describe assumptions, definitions used etc*)

Family growth/ household formation (current & future)	Yes	Concealed households from site survey answers grossed to authorised site population. This is treated as a single year figure, but the question is next 3 years. Family formation 2006-2011 estimated from family age structure from survey. Reasoning is obscure and way figures are presented means it is impossible to check what has been done. May be some double counting between concealed and new formation? No reference at all to housed population growth.
Overcrowding	Yes	Uses answer to survey question re need for more space on authorised sites = 0. Only about a third of eligible households answered this question – not at all clear why so low a proportion.
Site conditions	No	Comments on extent of shared facilities, but on all sites including unauthorised. Not in model.
Housing waiting list	No	No
Site waiting list	Yes	Total list is included in the model. May be some double counting with unauthorised encampments, but not from housing as no other account taken of moves from housing to sites. May allow for some inward movement to the Study Area – no details.
Health etc needs	No	Some comments on the incidence of health

		problems and disability and need for adaptations. Not in model.
Need for special/adapted accommodation	No	See above
Movement from/to housing	Part	In report desired movement from sites to houses + unauthorised sites is lumped together. No way can check figures being used for sites to houses. Also as a separate item have an allowance for people wishing (rather than planning??) to move to a house. No allowance made for any movement from bricks and mortar to sites despite big expressed desire.
Other movement desires	Yes	Desired movement from authorised to unauthorised sites is included as both a demand and supply factor. [Not sure of the logic of this. Some should be movement to housing which should not be counted as a demand factor for site places??]
Unauthorised development	Yes	Converts Count caravans to households and assumes all need authorised place. In supply includes real figures for UDs likely to be give planning permission in one LA which is equivalent, but this does not include all UD caravans. Clash real and imputed figures. Slight under-estimate.
Unauthorised camping	Yes	Counts all from the Count figures for caravans on non-Gypsy owned land for July converted to households by average caravans per household. These are all included in the calculations for residential pitch requirement. This must overstate even if it is based on ideal type of accommodation answers (which is heavily towards sites) since some already have a base elsewhere. When discussing transit requirements, identifies some of these campers as passing through etc, visiting family. Does not reduce residential pitch assumption to take account of this. No discussion of using point-in-time information for a flow factor.
Gypsy/Traveller aspirations/preferences	No	Information presented on ideal accommodation. Not used in model. Relatively high demand for LA sites shown. Not picked up much in the recommendations.
Other	No	

‘Model’ of supply used for permanent/residential accommodation *(list elements of supply used, with definitions, assumptions etc)*

Error in main table of requirements in showing current supply of occupied pitches in caravans rather than converted to households as for remainder of table. This has no consequences for the calculations of requirements.

Allows for:

<p>* Number of pitches expected to be vacated in 12 months – grossed number of people likely to move to houses/unauthorised sites in 12 months (question asks for 3 years??) = 6</p> <p>* Number of households wishing to move to housing in 12 months (not entirely clear where this comes from and how it differs from above; seems to be ‘wishing’ rather than ‘planning’) = 2</p> <p>* New LA pitches currently planned = 0</p> <p>* Existing applications likely to gain planning permission in Year 1 = 1</p> <p>Then assumes that all these (9) vacancies will be replicated each year, so 9 x 5=45 [Not sure if this is likely to be an over-statement? Question is apparently 3 rather than single year, so not safe to multiply by 5?? Not clear to me the logic of assuming annual planning permissions?]</p> <p>At a later stage in the calculation adds:</p> <p>* Unused pitches likely to be brought back into use</p> <p>* Households on unauthorised developments likely to get planning permission</p>
<p>‘Model’ of need/supply for transient accommodation (<i>briefly describe approach taken, definitions and assumptions used</i>)</p> <p>Discusses transit need. Identifies from survey:</p> <p>* moving through area = 1</p> <p>* vulnerable families following eviction = 16</p> <p>* visiting area for work = 3</p> <p>* visiting family = 9</p> <p>Total 29 which is not grossed up as all other figures are.</p> <p>Comments that some of the transit need identified will be catered for in the residential requirements of 80 permanent pitches recommended. Does not amend these figures or explain further. [Not clear if transit element is seen as reducing residential need, or residential as reducing transit need]</p>
<p>Timescales (<i>years assessment of requirements covers</i>)</p> <p>5 years = 2006-2011. No comments on longer-term needs</p>
<p>Disaggregation in requirements</p>
<p>By Traveller group? (<i>list groups</i>)</p> <p>None in the model or in qualitative comment. [Could usefully be done because New Traveller and Romany likely to have some different needs.]</p>
<p>By accommodation type/tenure (<i>list categories</i>)</p> <p>Residential quantified; transit as above; nor reference to housing.</p>
<p>By LA?</p> <p>Not quantified. Some indications of preferred locations but no indication of how the information might be used.</p>
<p>TEAM COMMENTS ON METHODS ETC</p>
<p>Dealing with difficult issues (<i>describe and comment on approach taken</i>)</p>
<p>Establishing the base population/rounding up survey results</p> <p>Uses Count caravans converted to households by average number of caravans per household. No attempt to get a housed population, but housed almost ignored anyway despite largest group in survey. Mixing imputed and real totals does not work over unauthorised development since it implies all will get planning permission but this is one LA only.</p>
<p>Removing double counting</p> <p>I think there are several examples of double counting working in different directions:</p> <p>* using the waiting list might double count some new/concealed households, but does allow for movement from houses and elsewhere not taken into account otherwise. Equal out??</p> <p>* including all unauthorised encampments in residential figures, then commenting that some require transit accommodation suggests some double</p>

counting between these.
Taking account of migration in/out/within Not really taken into account. Ideal locations imply movement.
Travelling patterns Not commented on at all. Because report lumps together authorised and unauthorised sites, travelling is somewhat confused.
Movement to/from housing Some sites to houses; no houses to sites allowed for.
Other NA

General assessment
Strengths Assume it was a reasonable survey with a reasonable sample achieved.
Weaknesses Really frustrating report because it lumps together authorised and unauthorised sites so cannot really say much about authorised (or unauthorised) site residents and cannot check figures in model. Many niggles, eg way treat unauthorised encampments. No sense at all that they understand or can explain what they report or what its implications might be.
Robust and accurate??? I think this probably over-states requirements because it includes all unauthorised encampments in residential need. It also counts all moves to houses/unauthorised sites as both supply (vacancies) and demand (because to unauthorised). Can't check whether any of these moves would be to houses which should not count as a need. Probably outweighs omission of movement B&M to sites??

PITCH REQUIREMENTS

Summary of pitch requirements – whole study area/LA (*summarise findings or photocopy to show maximum disaggregation*)

See model on page 77 attached.

Supply = 45

Need = 88 less 10 vacant pitches and planning consents for U/Ds = 78

Family formation 2006-2011 = 17

Need from movement to unauthorised sites = 30

Requirement = $78 + 17 + 30 - 45 = 80$

RSS formula on the basis of their count figures would give:

Authorised sites = $79C = 46.47P$

U/D = $10C = 5.88P$

Requirements = $5.88 + (.4 \times 46.47) = c25$

If their average number of caravans per household (1.3) is used instead:

Authorised sites = $79C = 60.77P$

U/D = $10C = 7.69P$

Requirements = $7.69 + (.4 \times 60.77) = c32$

If removed grossed transit element calculated in report from their estimate of 80 gives:

Transit element = 29. Grossed = $29 \times 1.56 = 45$

$80 - 45 = 35$ which is very close to the formula calculation above.

Indication of other useful main findings (*eg support, education, health etc*)

Hard to distinguish much because of the way the figures are presented.

Ethnicity:

	Authorised	Unauthorised	Housed	All
Gypsy/ET	84	44	95	79
Irish Traveller	6	41	-	13
New Traveller	6	15	2	6
Other	3	-	3	2

Family composition:

	Sites (auth & unauth)	Houses
Adult over 60	3	6
Adult under 60	20	2
Couple, no children	22	19
Couple + children	47	57
Single parent + children	8	16
Av. household size	3.2	4.1

Checklist completed by	Pat Niner
Date	9 May 2007