

Annex E: Submission Draft Policy H7

Policy H7: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople¹

Local Planning Authorities will make provision in Local Development Documents to deliver 1,064 net additional permanent residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers in the period 2006-2016, and 302 for Travelling Showpeople, as set out in Table H7a which details pitch requirements by local authority. Local Planning Authorities will also make appropriate provision in Local Development Documents to meet requirements for transit and temporary stopping purposes.

Table H7a: Permanent residential pitch baseline and net additional requirements 2006-2016

Unitary/ District Authority	Gypsies & Travellers		Travelling Showpeople	
	2006 baseline	Requirement	2006 baseline	Requirement
Total South East	1,800*	1,064	431	302
Bracknell Forest	15	15	17	2
Reading	0	7	11	2
Slough	40	7	0	1
West Berkshire	39	18	5	3
Windsor and Maidenhead	49	9	12	2
Wokingham	71	21	1	2
Berkshire Unitaries	214	77	46	12
Aylesbury Vale	41	39	4	6
Chiltern	12	9	1	16
Milton Keynes	18	36	0	3
South Bucks	87	15	0	1
Wycombe	36	15	10	2
Buckinghamshire & MK	194	114	15	28
Brighton and Hove	0	13	0	2
Eastbourne	1	3	3	1
Hastings	1	2	0	1
Lewes	11	10	0	1
Rother	8	7	1	1
Wealden	22	20	1	3
East Sussex B&H	43	55	5	9
B'stoke & Deane	0	11	2	17
East Hampshire	10	6	18	12
Eastleigh	2	4	3	6
Fareham	1	4	0	5
Gosport	2	2	0	3
Hart	40	13	9	8
Havant	2	4	0	5
Isle of Wight	0	27	0	0
New Forest	42	9	27	11
Portsmouth	0	10	0	7
Rushmoor	0	2	17	4
Southampton	14	12	8	9

Test Valley	13	18	14	18
Winchester	34	21	19	16
Hampshire IoW	160	143	117	121
Ashford	48	30	4	3
Canterbury	50	30	10	4
Dartford	45	22	3	4
Dover	18	23	0	2
Gravesham	13	12	0	1
Maidstone	113	35	8	3
Medway	14	30	15	3
Sevenoaks	82	19	1	1
Shepway	1	12	0	1
Swale	48	28	3	2
Thanet	0	17	1	2
Tonbridge and Malling	30	18	3	1
Tunbridge Wells	16	14	0	1
Kent	478	290	48	28**
Cherwell	48	15	14	11
Oxford City	0	9	1	3
South Oxfordshire	37	12	22	7
Vale of White Horse	37	12	3	4
West Oxfordshire	80	14	18	12
Oxfordshire	202	62	58	37
Elmbridge	23	12	2	3
Epsom and Ewell	30	6	4	1
Guildford	32	27	12	12
Mole Valley	20	7	1	1
Reigate & Banstead	12	9	12	4
Runnymede	56	10	42	10
Spelthorne	22	8	0	6
Surrey Heath	32	16	0	8
Tandridge	33	8	37	4
Waverley	52	33	6	3
Woking	24	10	0	1
Surrey	336	146	116	53
Adur	12	15	0	0
Arun	17	17	6	2
Chichester	64	54	18	3
Crawley	0	19	0	1
Horsham	44	50	1	5
Mid Sussex	36	20	0	2
Worthing	0	2	0	1
West Sussex	173	177	25	14

*Subject to any final checking and corrections by local authorities. In addition there were 116 authorised transit pitches in mid 2006

**Showpeople allocations for N&W Kent include a technical correction agreed at officer level with Kent CC but not yet formally considered at political level. This has no wider effect on the Kent total, nor on allocations in E Kent or elsewhere in the region.

Supporting text

1. The South East is home to around a fifth of England's Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (GTTS). Most tend to live fairly settled lives, often alongside other residents both on authorised caravan sites and Showpeople's yards, and in housing. But due to a combination of a growing GTTS population and the lack of new sites provided in the last two decades, delivery of new pitches has become a national priority. In the South East 22% of GTTS caravans have no authorised place to stop, and their occupants are thus legally homeless. The shortage of authorised sites makes it more difficult for an already socially excluded part of the community to access employment, health care, education and other services.
2. The level of provision is derived from survey-based needs assessments carried out by local authorities in consultation with GTTS communities, and advice from local authorities on how the assessments should be interpreted for their areasⁱⁱ. GTTS reside in and move through all parts of the SE, with local concentrations of Gypsies and Travellers in Kent and Surrey, and of Travelling Showpeople in Hampshire and Surrey. The pitch allocations mostly reflect historic GTTS settlement patterns, but a quarter of the total requirement has been regionally redistributed to widen opportunities where provision is currently limitedⁱⁱⁱ.
3. The combined requirements of this policy will provide for an increase in authorised pitch numbers of two-thirds by 2016, but the extent of backlog means there is an immediate need to provide additional pitches. This is both a significant step forward and a delivery challenge, although the total requirement is modest at around 20 pitches or 0.5 hectares per LPA (0.5% of the land-take for housing). At current costs and funding levels Gypsy and Traveller Site Grant is unlikely to enable more than a third of the residential pitches required. Regional partners, councils and the GTTS community will need to work together to ensure effective delivery. Allocations will be updated following a regional review of GTTS provision commencing in 2011-12. Where LDDs look beyond 2016, onward requirements can be calculated on the basis of 3% compound growth for Gypsies and Travellers, and 1.5% for Travelling Showpeople^{iv}.
4. The Homes and Communities Agency has an important role in improving value for money in public pitch provision, and greater involvement by registered affordable housing providers including consideration of the potential of intermediate tenures is desirable. Publicly funded Gypsy and Traveller pitches count as affordable housing, and provision via Section 106 legal agreement or by developers within new developments is encouraged. However, the primary means of delivery will be through local authority development control powers and the identification of suitable, available and viably developable land through LDDs, for take-up by GTTS otherwise able to provide for themselves.
5. The siting, scale and design of new GTTS sites^v is a matter for local authorities in consultation with GTTS, noting their expressed preference to live in reasonable proximity to services and employment opportunities, and to live on smaller sites in family groups. Collaborative working between councils is encouraged. Where formally agreed between the councils concerned and set out in their LDDs,

allocations may be combined and redistributed between partner authorities where it would improve delivery outcomes. In principle pitches could be provided on any land that is allocated or suitable for residential development, or capable of being made so. Where land availability poses significant constraints and there are no suitable, viable and deliverable alternatives, unmet GTTS need may constitute exceptional circumstances that could justify relaxation of Green Belt policy or use of sites within protective designations such as AONB.

6. Travelling for both work and cultural reasons remains an important part of GTTS lifestyles. An increase in suitable, authorised stopping places is also a high priority, and is important to improve relations between settled and travelling communities. The evidence currently available^{vi} at regional level is insufficiently robust to provide transit allocations for individual planning authorities. Councils working together on a county-group basis should take immediate steps to compile and assess all available local indicators of transit need, for consideration alongside regional evidence to identify and provide the appropriate quantity, form and distribution of transit and emergency-stopping places. As a starting point Table H7b provides county-group data on unauthorised encampments and where available a summary of transit commentary from local authority needs assessments. A regional transit study will examine travelling patterns and high-level evidence of transit need.
7. Regional partners and local authorities will monitor pitch permissions and completions and progress on site specific LDD allocations, to track progress and improve the evidence base for LDDs and the next regional review. Monitoring will differentiate between residential pitch and transit provision, between affordable and private provision, and between provision for Gypsies and Travellers and for Travelling Showpeople. Temporary permissions should be noted separately. Councils that do not already do so should instigate robust monitoring of unauthorised developments and unauthorised encampments, noting the number of caravans and collating time-series data coordinated with CLG Caravan Count recording. Collection of data about travelling groups is desirable, including home/origin, destination and if applicable their preferred area for permanent provision.

Table H7b: Indicators of need for transit provision by county group

County group	Indicative transit advice/assessment	Unauthorised encampment caravans [§]		
		Winter	Summer	Change
Berkshire Unitaries	No advice	23	16	-7
Buckinghamshire & Milton Keynes	No advice	5	19	14
East Sussex, Brighton & Hove	2 sites	24	84	60
Hampshire, Isle of Wight	4 sites	40	113	74
Kent & Medway	7 sites / stopping places	62	38	-25
Oxfordshire	No advice	17	17	1
Surrey	No advice	2	15	13
West Sussex	25 transit pitches	34	50	17
SOUTHEAST		205	352	147

[§]Number of caravans, averaged from CLG Caravan Count data 2004-2007 inclusive. Figures do not sum due to rounding.

ⁱ As defined in Circulars 1/2006 *Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites* and 4/2007 *Planning for Travelling Showpeople* respectively.

ⁱⁱ Factors taken into account include family and population growth; the existence of unauthorised sites; current pitch supply, turnover and overcrowding; and where available migration intentions and transfer to and from pitches and other forms of accommodation.

ⁱⁱⁱ Redistribution takes broad account of relative access to opportunities including services and employment, and the relative extent of potentially developable land. In practice this generally (but not always) tends to modestly increase requirements in areas where current provision is relatively low. An element of redistribution was strongly supported by both GTTS and SE residents.

^{iv} Both figures are growth net of pitch turnover, to be calculated from the sum of the 2006 pitch baseline and the full 2006-2016 allocation, compounded annually.

^v See Circulars 1/2006 and 4/2007; and the *Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide* (CLG 2008). The following may also be helpful: *Travelling Showpeople's Sites—A Planning Focus* (Showmen's Guild of Great Britain, 2007)

^{vi} Not addressed in half the region's GTAAs. Other sources considered include CLG Caravan Count, and where available and provided, council enforcement records and police data.