



Coastal West Sussex Authorities Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment: Update Report



December 2014



Opinion Research Services The Strand, Swansea SA1 1AF
enquiries: 01792 535300 · info@ors.org.uk · www.ors.org.uk



Peter Brett Associates LLP, 10 Queen Square Bristol, BS1 4NT

enquiries: 0117 9281560 bristol@peterbrett.com

Opinion Research Services and Peter Brett Associates LLP disclaim any responsibility to the Client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with the Client and generally in accordance with the appropriate ACE Agreement and taking account of the manpower, resources, investigations and testing devoted to it by agreement with the Client. This report is confidential to the Client and Opinion Research Services and Peter Brett Associates LLP accept no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

Update Report

The Study

1. Opinion Research Services (ORS) and Peter Brett Associates (PBA) were commissioned by the Coastal West Sussex (CWS) councils and the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA), with support from West Sussex County Council, to undertake a Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment. The report was published in April 2013.

Corrections

2. Since the publication of the report, a number of errors have been brought to light which are corrected in this Update Report. In particular a small number of sites were placed in the wrong planning authority in the original document, most notably for sites in the South Downs National Park Authority. **Appendix A** contains the corrected list of sites. It should be noted that this update relates only to Gypsy and Traveller provision and not to Travelling Showpeople provision.
3. ORS have also taken the opportunity to update the wider interpretation of needs modelling. In March 2014 Brandon Lewis MP, the Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Department for Communities and Local Government, wrote to Andrew Selous MP to clarify issues around household formation rates for Gypsies and Travellers. This report updates the needs assessment in light of this clarification and in particular clarification about the use of a 3.00% new household formation rate.
4. It is important to note that this Update Report is correcting the report as of 2012 and not updating to now, so it excludes any changes since 2012 in relation to household formation or planning permissions for example.

Current and Future Pitch Provision

5. This section in the GTAA (April, 2013) focuses on the extra pitch provision which is required in the Coastal West Sussex Authorities (the Authorities) currently and over the next 15 years by 5 year segments. This time period allows for robust forecasts of the requirements for extra provision based upon the evidence contained within this survey and also secondary data sources.
6. This section concentrates not only upon the total extra provision which is required in the area, but whether this provision should be in the form of public or private sites, a need for any transit sites and/or emergency stopping place provision.
7. The March 2012 CLG document 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites', requires an assessment for future pitch requirements, 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 of pitches available for

occupation with the current and future needs of the households. The key factors in each of these elements are set out below:

Supply of pitches

8. Pitches which are available for use can come from a variety of sources. These include:
 - » Currently vacant pitches;
 - » Any pitches currently programmed to be developed within the study period;
 - » Pitches vacated by people moving to housing;
 - » Pitches vacated by people moving out of the study area; and
 - » Pitches vacated due to the dissolution of households (normally through the death of a single person household).

Current Need

9. There are four key components of current need. Total current need (which is not necessarily need for additional pitches) is simply:
 - » Households on unauthorised developments for which planning permission is not expected;
 - » Concealed households;
 - » Households in brick and mortar wishing to move to sites; and
 - » Households on waiting lists for public sites.

Future Need

10. There are three key components of future need. Total future need is simply the sum of the following:
 - » Households living on sites with temporary planning permissions;
 - » New household formation expected during the study period; and
 - » Migration to sites from outside the study area.

Current Gypsy and Traveller Site Provision

11. As was noted in the Coastal West Sussex GTAA (2013), there are 64 pitches on public sites, 67 pitches on private sites, and 14 pitches on unauthorised sites in the Coastal West Sussex area – 7 of which are tolerated for planning purposes. Of the 67 pitches on private sites a total of 60 have permanent permission and 7 have temporary planning permission.
12. The next stage of the process is to assess how much space is, or will become available on existing sites. The main ways of finding this is through:
 - » Current empty pitches;
 - » New sites or site extensions which are likely to gain planning permission;

- » Migration away from the area;
 - » Movement to bricks and mortar; and
 - » Dissolution of households.
13. Currently, all authorised public site pitches are occupied, so there is no available space. For private sites, most are for one family and have no available space on them. Evidence from the household survey phase of this study indicates that one small private site may no longer be in use, but overall private sites are occupied to their capacities and therefore no space has been counted as being available.
14. For households on public sites, 4 currently wish to move to bricks and mortar while another 3 households are seeking to move to bricks and mortar from private sites. Therefore, in total there are 7 households who wish to leave sites for bricks and mortar and these households represent the 7 pitches considered as part of the supply below in Figures 1 and 8.
15. For out-migration to other areas households will also wish to move in the opposite direction. Therefore, we have treated these as being part of the future need section of the calculation.
16. The dissolution of a household occurs when all the members leave the household. Common ways for a household to dissolve are for a person living on their own to die or to move to an existing household, or for a couple to separate and both move away. The dissolution of households must be considered alongside new household formation. For the purpose of this update household dissolution is included as a component of *net* new household formation when considering future need and is not included in this part of the need calculation.
17. The supply of pitches by planning authority is summarised in the table below.

Figure 1
Supply of Pitches by Planning Authority

Planning Authority	Number of Pitches
Adur	2
Arun	1
Chichester	2
South Downs National Park Authority	2
Worthing	0
Total	7

Additional Site Provision: Current Need

18. The next stage of the process is to assess how many households are currently seeking pitches in the area. Groups of people who are likely to be seeking pitches will include those:
- » Households on unauthorised developments for which planning permission is not expected;
 - » Concealed households;
 - » Households in bricks and mortar wishing to move to sites; and

- » Households on waiting lists for public sites.

Current Unauthorised Developments

19. As noted earlier, 19 of the 95 on-site interviews with Gypsies and Travellers occurred on unauthorised developments or encampments. Of these, 11 households were passing through the area, did not see the sites as their permanent address, and are not seeking permanent accommodation in the area. However, 5 in Chichester and 1 in SDNPA did see the site as being their permanent address and are not seeking to move elsewhere. The addresses match with known unauthorised sites in the area. In addition SDNPA made ORS aware of another single unauthorised pitch that was occupied at the time of the 2013 study but was not included in the need estimate so we have allowed for 7 pitches to accommodate households on unauthorised sites. This figure excludes any long-term unauthorised developments such as 5 pitches in Chichester and 2 pitches in the SDNPA area of Worthing which are likely to gain certificates of lawful occupation if they were to be sought.

Figure 2
Unauthorised Pitches by Planning Authority

Planning Authority	Number of Pitches
Adur	0
Arun	0
Chichester	5
South Downs National Park Authority	2
Worthing	0
Total	7

Concealed Households

20. Concealed households are a central issue to many Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments, but are very rarely clearly defined. The Office for National Statistics and the 2011 UK Census of Population defines a concealed family as one living in a multi-family household in addition to the primary family, such as a young couple living with parents. In terms of Gypsies and Travellers this is often referred to as doubling up, with more than one household on a single pitch. This definition does not allow for single persons to be concealed households unless they are a lone parent. Another common definition of a concealed household is those living within an existing household, but in need of accommodation of their own.
21. ORS are constantly seeking to find ways to identify concealed households during the course of our fieldwork, and in some areas we find high numbers and in others we find low numbers. In this study we did find evidence of concealed households but also identified that these are all currently on the waiting lists for public sites. As such they have been included in this element of need as opposed to being included as concealed households in order to avoid double counting.

Bricks and Mortar

22. We would note that identifying households in bricks and mortar has been frequently highlighted as an issue with Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments. Opinion Research Services worked closely with local stakeholders, the local authorities and on-site interviewees to identify households in bricks and mortar. In total 11 households were interviewed during the course of the household survey, but of these only two stated that they would wish to move onto private sites in the Coastal West Sussex Area and none expressed a desire to move on to public sites in the area.
23. It could be argued that local authorities should invest more resources seeking to identify and interview all households in bricks and mortar. However, the NPPF from paragraph 158 onwards outlines the case for using a proportionate evidence base, while the new National Planning Policy Guidance March 2014, Section 3 paragraph 1 states that:
- Plan makers should avoid expending significant resources on primary research (information that is collected through surveys, focus groups or interviews etc. and analysed to produce a new set of findings) as this will in many cases be a disproportionate way of establishing an evidence base. They should instead look to rely predominantly on secondary data (e.g. Census, national surveys) to inform their assessment which are identified within the guidance.*
24. Therefore, the assessment of all other household groups is currently being undertaken from secondary data sources, and it would seem disproportionate to try and speak to all Gypsy and Traveller households in bricks and mortar unless they are clearly identifiable. However, ORS do go to disproportionate lengths to try to contact housed Gypsies and Travellers and did so in this case. This level of response is common to that ORS have experienced in a large proportion of the 120+ GTAA studies we have completed since 2012 and would suggest in our view that the vast majority of the Gypsy and Traveller population living in bricks and mortar wish to remain there. It should also be noted at this point that CLG are currently consulting on changes to policy and guidance for addressing the needs of Gypsies and Travellers. One proposal is to amend the definition of a Gypsy and Traveller for the purpose of assessing current and future need. If this change is introduced this may change how meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in bricks and mortar needs to be addressed in the future.

Figure 3

Bricks and Mortar Households Wishing to Move to Pitches by Planning Authority

Planning Authority	Number of Pitches
Adur	0
Arun	0
Chichester	2
South Downs National Park Authority	0
Worthing	0
Total	2

Waiting Lists for Public Sites

25. The method of registering a desire to obtain a pitch on a public site is through placing your name on the waiting list held by West Sussex County Council. At the time of the original assessment, there were 60 households on the waiting list for a site in West Sussex. Of these 28 wish to move to sites outside of Coastal

West Sussex, leaving 32 who are on the list for one or more sites in Coastal West Sussex. The table below shows which sites households have requested to move to. We would note that both Easthampnett and Westbourne are located in Chichester, Ryebank is located in Arun and Withy Patch in Adur.

Figure 4

Waiting lists for Public Sites in Coastal West Sussex in November 2012 (Source: West Sussex County Council)

Site	Number of households
Any West Sussex site	7
Any West Sussex site apart from Withy Patch (Adur)	1
Any site in Coastal West Sussex	2
Ryebank (Arun) or Easthampnett (Chichester)	4
Easthampnett (Chichester)	6
Withy Patch (Adur) or Easthampnett (Chichester)	1
Ryebank (Arun) or Easthampnett (Chichester) or Westbourne (Chichester)	2
Ryebank (Arun) or Westbourne (Chichester)	2
Withy Patch (Adur)	2
Ryebank (Arun) or Withy Patch (Adur)	1
Ryebank (Arun)	4
Total	32

26. It should also be noted that households can register for a pitch on one or more sites in the area and this is why some of the sites are duplicated in the table and analysis of the list shows that there are less individual households on the list than the total of 32. Clearly then any 1 household only requires 1 pitch, even if they are on the waiting list for more than 1 site. It is also the case that not all households on the waiting list expressed a desire to move specifically to Coastal West Sussex.
27. Based on the information that was available, and our experience from undertaking similar studies across the UK, ORS have taken a sensible and pragmatic approach to identifying any need that may arise in Coastal West Sussex from households on the waiting list.
28. For the 7 households who wanted to move to any site in West Sussex and 1 household to any site apart from Withy Patch we have taken half of this number (4) on the assumption that the remainder would be accommodated on other sites in West Sussex. This leaves 28 households seeking accommodation on Coastal West Sussex sites. We have included the 28 households on the waiting list for additional pitches as a baseline for additional need. Further analysis has then been undertaken to identify those individual households who are in need of a pitch in Coastal West Sussex and to eliminate any double counting.
29. ORS have recently reviewed the West Sussex Council waiting list on behalf of Mid Sussex District Council as part of a separate study in West Sussex. This indicated that the majority of households on the waiting list for a site in Mid Sussex were living outside the area and some of those on-site were appearing as a component of need in other local planning authorities needs assessments. The updated evidence from the waiting list indicated that the original estimate of need for Mid Sussex outside of the South Downs National Park Authority was too high and that a lower figure should be used. It was acknowledged in the original assessment that there was potential for over counting of needs from the waiting list and the survey of households on the waiting list confirmed that this was the case. The exact figure used was a judgement decision as we considered that only counting the needs of households based in Mid Sussex was likely to

underestimate the total needs of those who wish to live in the area. Therefore, we halved the original estimate of 19 pitches need from the waiting list to 10 pitches to remove potential double counts across different areas. We considered that this position represented a pragmatic solution to identify the needs of households seeking to live on site in Mid Sussex based on the survey of those on the waiting list, without the double counting which was in the original 2013 assessment.

30. Adopting the same approach for Coastal West Sussex would see the number of households fall by half to 14, with 2 in Adur, 5 in Arun and 7 in Chichester with none in Worthing or SDNPA. It is this position that we have adopted for this update report.

Figure 5

Waiting List Households by Planning Authority

Planning Authority	Number of Pitches
Adur	2
Arun	5
Chichester	7
South Downs National Park Authority	0
Worthing	0
Total	14

Additional Site Provision: Future Need

31. The next stage of the process is to assess how many households are likely to be seeking pitches in the area in the future. The number of households seeking pitches will include those:
- » Households living on sites with temporary planning permissions;
 - » New household formation expected during the study period; and
 - » Migration to sites from outside the study area.

Temporary Planning Permissions

32. Coastal West Sussex currently has 5 sites with temporary planning permissions, 3 in Chichester and 2 in the South Downs National Park. This represent a revised position form the original needs assessment based upon more accurate information. In total these contain 7 pitches and in all cases the permissions will expire within the next 5 years, they have therefore been counted as need within this assessment, but not as supply of pitches.

Figure 6

Temporary Planning Permission Pitches by Planning Authority

Planning Authority	Number of Pitches
Adur	0
Arun	0
Chichester	5
South Downs National Park Authority	2
Worthing	0
Total	7

New Household Formation

33. Many studies of Gypsies and Travellers have assumed a net growth in the number of households of 3% per annum. The Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) which were either produced, or are in production, across the whole country until their planned abolition was announced in 2010 all used a household formation rate of 3% per annum for Gypsies and Travellers. However, none of the published documents provide any detailed demographic evidence for this position. Instead the 3% simply forms part of the calculation.
34. In a study on behalf of Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in 2003 (Local Authority Gypsy and Traveller Sites in England Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2003), Pat Niner identified that household growth rates of 2%-3% a year were appropriate when projecting future formations.
35. In October 2007 the Department for Communities and Local Government issued guidance for conducting Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments: Guidance). On page 25 this provides a worked example using a 3% per annum household formation rate, but notes in footnote 6 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.'

36. Therefore, the current guidance is clear that each individual assessment should use local evidence for future household formation rates. This position was confirmed in a letter from the Planning Minister, Brandon Lewis MP to Andrew Selous MP which was placed in the House of Commons library on March 26th 2014 and stated:

'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.'

37. Over the past 2 years, ORS have been undertaking detailed demographic work for Gypsy and Traveller populations and have produced a detailed separate paper 'Household Formation Rates for Gypsies and Travellers: Technical Note' which demonstrates that the likely rate of growth for the population of Gypsies and Travellers across the whole of England based upon the best available local evidence is much lower than 3%. A copy of this can be found in **Appendix B**.
38. The age profile for the population of Coastal West Sussex indicates that the population is relatively old when compared to most Gypsy and Traveller populations and the original assessment allowed for a growth rate of 2% net per annum. We have repeated this level of household growth in this assessment. We would also note that the household formation rate has been applied to both the on-site and waiting list population.

39. A 2% growth rate per annum would see the overall population grow by approximately 34% over 15 years due to the impact of compound growth. The table below shows the implications of this growth for the Coastal West Sussex authorities. This figure is 5 pitches less than in the original assessment.

Figure 7
Household Formations by Planning Authority 2012-2027

Planning Authority	Number of Pitches Plus Net Bricks and Mortar Movement Plus Waiting List	Number of Projected Formations
Adur	12 (12-2+2)	4
Arun	28 (24-1+5)	10
Chichester	102 (95+0+7)	35
South Downs National Park Authority	12 (14-2+0)	4
Worthing	0	0
Total	154	53

In-Migration from Other Sources

40. The most complicated area for a study such as this is to estimate how many households will require accommodation from outside the area. Potentially, Gypsies and Travellers could move to Coastal West Sussex from anywhere in the country. It has been noted by Planning Inspectors that a weakness of many Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments conducted across the country has been that they either allowed for out-migration without in-migration, which led to under-counting of need, or they over-counted need by assuming every household visiting the area required a pitch.
41. Based on our experience from undertaking other studies across the UK ORS typically allow for a balanced level of migration unless local or regional evidence suggests otherwise. The advantage of allowing for net migration to sum to zero is that it avoids the problems seen with other Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments where the modelling of migration clearly identifies too low or too high a level of total pitch provision. An assumption of net nil migration implies that the net pitch requirement is driven by locally identifiable need.
42. This issue has been raised at a number of planning appeals and inquiries and ORS have demonstrated that in order to include a component for net in-migration need there is also the requirement to identify where out-migration will occur from.
43. There are three main sources of out-migration. Historically, London has seen a loss of Gypsy and Traveller sites and this has seen population displaced to areas across the country. However, ORS are currently working with a number of London Boroughs including Camden, Lambeth, Bexley and also the London Legacy Development Corporation to undertake their GTAA's. In all cases the authorities have been advised by their Planning Inspectors to undertake these studies and to meet the needs identified before their Local Plans can be found to be sound. Therefore, the Planning Inspectorate is requiring London Boroughs to assess needs and provide sites, which should prevent, or significantly limit any future out-migration.
44. The second potential source of out-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.’

45. However, while this reaffirmation of policy states that Green Belt development is likely to be inappropriate, it does not remove the requirement for local authorities with Green Belt to assess their needs and to provide pitches. There is a requirement for local authorities who have difficulties in meeting their own local need in their own area to work with neighbouring authorities through the Duty to Cooperate process to have these needs met. It is not the place of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment to assume a particular authority will meet the needs of another and instead any authority unable to meet their own needs should work with neighbours to meet these. This process is already well established in general housing provision.
46. The final main source of out-migration is from the closure of unauthorised sites and encampments. There are several well documented cases of large-scale movement of Gypsies and Travellers following enforcement action against unauthorised sites – Dale Farm being a good example.
47. Based on local evidence that did not identify any in-migration or out-migration ORS will therefore assume nil net migration for the purpose of this update report. Beyond this, rather than assess in-migrant households seeking to develop new sites in the area, ORS would propose 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 important for the Authorities to have clear criteria-based planning policies in place for any new potential sites which do arise.

Overall Needs for Coastal West Sussex

48. The estimated extra site provision that is required now and in the near future for the five planning authorities will be **76 additional pitches** to address the needs of all identifiable households. This includes the existing households on sites with temporary planning permission, those on unauthorised sites, those on the waiting list for a public site, those currently seeking to move from bricks and mortar and growth in household numbers due to household formation.
49. Overall, this represents a fall in 14 pitches for need when compared with the original needs assessment. This is due to the updated treatment of waiting list needs which this Update Report includes.

Figure 8
Extra Pitches which are required in Coastal West Sussex Authorities from 2012-2027

Reason for Requirement/Vacancy	Gross Requirement	Supply	Net Requirement
Supply of Pitches			
Additional supply from empty pitches	-	0	
Additional supply new sites	-	0	
Movement to bricks and mortar	-	7	
Total Supply		7	
Current Need			
Current unauthorised developments or encampments and seeking to stay in the area	7	-	
Concealed households	0	-	
Movement from bricks and mortar	2	-	
Waiting list for public sites	14	-	
Total Current Need	23		
Future Needs			
Currently on sites with temporary planning permission	7	-	
Net migration	0	-	
Net new household formation	53	-	
Total Future Needs	60		
Total	83	7	76

Overall Needs for Each Planning Authority

Adur

50. The main drivers behind a total 15 year requirement of **4 additional pitches** in Adur are the waiting list and population growth associated with the Withy Patch site. This is a reduction from 7 pitches in the original assessment due to the updated assessment of the waiting list data.

Figure 9
Extra Pitches which are required in Adur from 2012-2027

Reason for Requirement/Vacancy	Gross Requirement	Supply	Net Requirement
Supply of Pitches			
Additional supply from empty pitches	-	0	
Additional supply new sites	-	0	
Movement to bricks and mortar	-	2	
Total Supply		2	
Current Need			
Current unauthorised developments or encampments and seeking to stay in the area	0	-	
Concealed households	0	-	
Movement from bricks and mortar	0	-	
Waiting list for public sites	2	-	
Total Current Need	2	-	
Future Needs			
Currently on sites with temporary planning permission	0	-	
Net migration	0	-	
Net new household formation	4	-	
Total Future Needs	4	-	
Total	6	2	4

Arun

51. The waiting list for the Ryebank public site, population growth from existing sites and the expiry of a temporary planning permission provide the basis for a requirement of **14 additional pitches** in Arun. This is a fall of 4 pitches when compared with the 2013 assessment due to the change in the way waiting list data has been treated, and subsequent new household formation.

Figure 10
Extra Pitches which are required in Arun from 2012-2027

Reason for Requirement/Vacancy	Gross Requirement	Supply	Net Requirement
Supply of Pitches			
Additional supply from empty pitches	-	0	
Additional supply new sites	-	0	
Movement to bricks and mortar	-	1	
Total Supply	-	1	
Current Need			
Current unauthorised developments or encampments and seeking to stay in the area	0	-	
Concealed households	0	-	
Movement from bricks and mortar	0	-	
Waiting list for public sites	5	-	
Total Current Need	5		
Future Needs			
Currently on sites with temporary planning permission	0	-	
Net migration	0	-	
Net new household formation	10	-	
Total Future Needs	10		
Total	15	1	14

Chichester

52. The existing Gypsy and Traveller population of Chichester is higher than the other authorities in Coastal West Sussex. This inevitably sees household growth through new formations being higher. When combined with the waiting list for public sites, a loss of a site with temporary permission and addressing the needs of households on an unauthorised site sees the total requirement being **52 additional pitches**. This is a fall of 7 pitches when compared with the 2013 assessment due to the reallocation of a site from Chichester to the SDNPA area and the updated treatment of the waiting list data and subsequent new household formation.

Figure 11
Extra Pitches which are required in Chichester from 2012-2027

Reason for Requirement/Vacancy	Gross Requirement	Supply	Net Requirement
Supply of Pitches			
Additional supply from empty pitches		0	
Additional supply new sites		0	
Movement to bricks and mortar		2	
Total Supply		2	
Current Need			
Current unauthorised developments or encampments and seeking to stay in the area	5	-	
Concealed households	0	-	
Movement from bricks and mortar	2	-	
Waiting list for public sites	7	-	
Total Current Need	14		
Future Needs			
Currently on sites with temporary planning permission	5	-	
Net migration	0	-	
Net new household formation	35	-	
Total Future Needs	40		
Total	54	2	52

South Downs National Park Authority

53. The total requirement for the SDNPA within Coastal West Sussex is **6 additional pitches** which are due to expiry of two sites with temporary planning permission and the growth in household numbers due to formation. This represent a rise in the needs of 3 pitches when compared to the original assessment due to the initial misallocation of a site with temporary planning permission to Chichester planning authority and also the impact this reallocation to SDNPA has on future household formations.

Figure 12

Extra Pitches which are required in South Downs National Park Authority from 2012-2027

Reason for Requirement/Vacancy	Gross Requirement	Supply	Net Requirement
Supply of Pitches			
Additional supply from empty pitches	-	0	
Additional supply new sites	-	0	
Movement to bricks and mortar	-	2	
Total Supply	-	2	
Current Need			
Current unauthorised developments or encampments and seeking to stay in the area	2	-	
Concealed households	0	-	
Movement from bricks and mortar	0	-	
Waiting list for public sites	0	-	
Total Current Need	2		
Future Needs			
Currently on sites with temporary planning permission	2	-	
Net migration	0	-	
Net new household formation	4	-	
Total Future Needs	6		
Total	8	2	6

Worthing

54. The lack of any existing authorised or unauthorised pitches in Worthing outside of the South Downs National Park Authority implies that there is no identified need in the area. This is unchanged from the 2013 assessment.

Figure 13
Extra Pitches which are required in Worthing from 2012-2027

Reason for Requirement/Vacancy	Gross Requirement	Supply	Net Requirement
Supply of Pitches			
Additional supply from empty pitches		0	
Additional supply new sites		0	
Movement to bricks and mortar		0	
Total Supply	-	0	
Current Need			
Current unauthorised developments or encampments and seeking to stay in the area	0	-	
Concealed households	0	-	
Movement from bricks and mortar	0	-	
Waiting list for public sites	0	-	
Total Current Need	0	-	
Future Needs			
Currently on sites with temporary planning permission	0	-	
Net migration	0	-	
Net new household formation	0	-	
Total Future Needs	0	-	
Total	0	0	0

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and the National Planning Policy Framework

55. ORS have consulted with CLG over issues such as whether paragraphs 47 and 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework apply to Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople site provision and have been informed that they do not. ORS submitted a written question and received a verbal response to this query. However, a planning inspector at a hearing in Wokingham also confirmed that paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy does not apply because it is not included in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.
56. On this basis, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites is best considered largely in isolation from the wider requirements set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. We have set out below our estimates for public and private site provision based upon the original assessment, but this should not be considered to be binding on local authorities

Split by Public/Private Sites by Planning Authority to 2027

57. In terms of providing the split between public and private sites, we have treated those on the waiting list as requiring public sites, those currently on unauthorised developments or sites with temporary planning permission as requiring private sites and for household growth to follow the pattern of existing sites. In summary, Figure 14 sets out the net requirement for new pitch provision by local planning authority by public and private sites until 2027.

Figure 14
Extra Pitch Provision in Sussex Coastal by Planning Authority by Public and Private Sites (Source: ORS Housing Market Model)

Planning Authority	2012-2017		2018-2022		2023-2027	
	Public	Private/New Traveller	Public	Private/New Traveller	Public	Private/New Traveller
Adur	1	0	1	0	2	0
Arun	5	1	2	2	2	2
Chichester	12	15	6	6	6	7
South Downs National Park Authority	0	2	0	2	0	2
Worthing	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18	18	9	10	10	11

Transit/Emergency Stopping Site Provision

58. 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 on the way to somewhere else. A typical transit site 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. They do not have a function in meeting local need which must be addressed on permanent sites.
59. 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 someone can stay on it, but has much more limited facilities with typically only a source of water and chemical toilets provided.
60. There is currently one transit site in the study area with three pitches on a privately owned site at West Ashling in Chichester and no emergency stopping place. However, we would note that local authorities and the police are not able to use transit provision on private sites as part of their enforcement action policies and therefore whilst it does provide an option for visiting households it is at the discretion of the site owner as to who is allowed on to the site. The presence of a public transit site or emergency stopping place in an area can speed up enforcement on unauthorised encampments, with households facing committing an offence if they do not move on to the site, or leave the County.
61. While some of those on unauthorised encampments who were interviewed as part of the survey were seeking permanent pitches rather than transit site accommodation, there were 11 households on unauthorised sites in the study area who did not consider their location to be their permanent base. These households were split between eight in Adur and three in Chichester.

62. The key issue in determining if there is a requirement for further transit site or emergency stopping place provision is whether there is evidence of sufficient travelling through the area. The tables below show that evidence held by West Sussex County Council indicates that in the period 2008-2011, 53 unauthorised encampments occurred in Coastal West Sussex on highways land. Meanwhile local authority records indicate that at least 76 encampments occurred on local authority land in Coastal West Sussex between 2008 and 2012. These figures are likely to be an under-estimate of all encampments in the study because some will have also occurred on private land and hence would not be the responsibility of West Sussex County Council or the local authorities. We would note that any encampments within the SDNPA area are counted within the totals for the local authority where they occurred.

Figure 15

Number of Encampments on Highways Land in Coastal West Sussex by Local Authority 2008-2011 (Source: West Sussex County Council)

Local Authority	2008	2009	2010	2011
Adur	7	2	1	1
Arun	5	11	0	7
Chichester	4	5	1	3
Worthing	1	3	1	1
Total	17	21	3	12

Figure 16

Number of Encampments on Local Authority Land in Coastal West Sussex by Local Authority 2008-2012 (Source: Local Authority Records. Note: * indicates data not recorded)

Local Authority	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Adur	4	6	4	1	2
Arun	4	14	7	12	0
Chichester	*	5	3	5	4
Worthing	1	2	1	0	1
Total	9	27	15	18	7

63. This would appear to highlight a need for at least one transit site or emergency stopping place in the area to help to manage unauthorised encampments. Unauthorised encampments during the study occurred predominantly in Arun, but in recent years a number of encampments have also occurred in Adur, Chichester and Worthing. There is no clear case why a site should be situated in any one local authority and we would note that transit sites and emergency stopping places are an area where cross boundary working could prove to be particularly effective and that the needs of Gypsy and Travellers visiting West Sussex are an issue which should be considered at a strategic level. Given the total scale of encampments across the four areas, a 10 pitch transit site or emergency stopping place in the study area would be the most economically viable to help to manage unauthorised encampments. If a transit site is provided, the location must be chosen carefully to ensure its use by visiting households or it will simply become a mechanism for speeding up enforcement action against unauthorised encampments.

Appendix A: Gypsy and Traveller Sites in Coastal West Sussex

Gypsy and Traveller Sites in Adur Planning Authority

Site	Number of Pitches
Local Authority Sites	
Withy Patch Caravan Site Old Shoreham Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 0RT	12
TOTAL PITCHES ON LOCAL AUTHORITY SITES	12
Private Sites with Permanent Permission	
TOTAL PITCHES ON PRIVATE SITES WITH PERMANENT PERMISSION	0
Private Sites with Temporary Permission	
TOTAL PITCHES ON PRIVATE SITES WITH TEMPORARY PERMISSION	0
Tolerated Sites – Long-term without planning permission	
-	-
TOTAL PITCHES ON LONG-TERM TOLERATED PRIVATE SITES	0
Unauthorised Developments	
-	-
TOTAL PITCHES ON UNAUTHORISED DEVELOPMENTS	-
TOTAL PITCHES	12

Gypsy and Traveller Sites in Arun Planning Authority

Site	Number of Pitches
Local Authority Sites	
Ryebank Caravan Site Bilsham Road Yapton Arundel BN18 0JZ	12
TOTAL PITCHES ON LOCAL AUTHORITY SITES	12
Private Sites with Permanent Permission	
The Paddocks, Northfields Lane, Aldingbourne, PO20 3UH	4
2 Wyndham Acres, Northfields Lane, Aldingbourne	1
Dragonfly, Eastergate Lane, Walberton	1
Land at Limmer Pond Stables, Church Road, Aldingbourne	1
Fieldview, Pagham Road, Pagham PO21 3PY	2
The Old Stables, Penfold Lane Rustington	2
The Cottage Piggeries, Church Lane, Barnham, PO22 0DB	1
TOTAL PITCHES ON PRIVATE SITES WITH PERMANENT PERMISSION	12
Private Sites with Temporary Permission	
TOTAL PITCHES ON PRIVATE SITES WITH TEMPORARY PERMISSION	0
Tolerated Sites – Long-term without planning permission	
-	-
TOTAL PITCHES ON LONG-TERM TOLERATED PRIVATE SITES	0
Unauthorised Developments	
-	-
TOTAL PITCHES ON UNAUTHORISED DEVELOPMENTS	0
TOTAL PITCHES	24

Gypsy and Traveller Sites in Chichester Planning Authority

Site	Number of Pitches
Local Authority Sites	
Easthampnett Caravan Park Marsh Lane Easthampnett Chichester West Sussex PO18 0JN	23
Westbourne Caravan Site Cemetery Lane Westbourne Emsworth Hants PO10 8RZ	17
TOTAL PITCHES ON LOCAL AUTHORITY SITES	40
Private Sites with Permanent Permission	
Little Acre, Keynor Lane, Sidlesham	1
Longacre, Bracklesham Lane	5
Clearwater, Ratham Lane, West Ashling	4
Clearwater, Ratham Lane, West Ashling	3 (transit)
The Hawthorns, Clayton Lane, Bracklesham	1
The Willows, Plot 2 Clayton Lane, Bracklesham Bay:	1
Merston Pheasantries, Bognor Road, Chichester	8
Southbourne Farm Shop, Southbourne	1
Melita Nursery, Chalk Lane, Sidlesham	4
Tower View Nursery, West Ashling Road/Scant Road East, Hambrook	10
Bridgefoot Meadow, Kirdford	2
The Stables, Bracklesham Lane, Bracklesham	1
Maytrees Adj Priors Leaze Bungalow, Priors Leaze Lane, Hambrook	1
Plot A, Pond Farm, Newells Lane	1
TOTAL PITCHES ON PRIVATE SITES WITH PERMANENT PERMISSION	40
Private Sites with Temporary Permission	
Plot B, Pond Farm, Newells Lane	1
Lakeside Barn, Hunston Road, Nr Chichester:	3
Five Oaks, West Ashling Road, Hambrook	1
TOTAL PITCHES ON PRIVATE SITES WITH TEMPORARY PERMISSION	5
Tolerated Sites – Long-term without planning permission	
Merston Pheasantries, Bognor Road, Chichester	3
Priors Leaze Lane, Hambrook	1
The Orchard, Scant Road East, Hambrook	1
TOTAL PITCHES ON LONG-TERM TOLERATED PRIVATE SITES	5
Unauthorised Developments	
Pond Farm, Newells Lane, West Ashling -	5
TOTAL PITCHES ON UNAUTHORISED DEVELOPMENTS	5
TOTAL PITCHES	95

Gypsy and Traveller Sites in South Downs National Park Authority

Site	Number of Pitches
Local Authority Sites	
TOTAL PITCHES ON LOCAL AUTHORITY SITES	
	0
Private Sites with Permanent Permission	
Old Timbers Shellbridge Road, Slindon Common Slindon	1
Coventry Plantation, Horsham Road Findon	7
TOTAL PITCHES ON PRIVATE SITES WITH PERMANENT PERMISSION	
	8
Private Sites with Temporary Permission	
Wychway Farm, Selden Lane, Patching BN13 3UL	1
Oak Tree Farm, Kirdford	1
TOTAL PITCHES ON PRIVATE SITES WITH TEMPORARY PERMISSION	
	2
Tolerated Sites – Long-term without planning permission	
Titnore Lane, Worthing	2
TOTAL PITCHES ON LONG-TERM TOLERATED PRIVATE SITES	
	2
Unauthorised Developments	
The Wood Yard, Patching	1
Three Cornered Piece, Bohemia Hollow, East Harting	1
TOTAL PITCHES ON UNAUTHORISED DEVELOPMENTS	
	2
TOTAL PITCHES	
	14

Gypsy and Traveller Sites in Worthing Planning Authority

Site	Number of Pitches
Local Authority Sites	
TOTAL PITCHES ON LOCAL AUTHORITY SITES	0
Private Sites with Permanent Permission	
TOTAL PITCHES ON PRIVATE SITES WITH PERMANENT PERMISSION	0
Private Sites with Temporary Permission	
TOTAL PITCHES ON PRIVATE SITES WITH TEMPORARY PERMISSION	0
Tolerated Sites – Long-term without planning permission	
TOTAL PITCHES ON LONG-TERM TOLERATED PRIVATE SITES	0
Unauthorised Developments	
TOTAL PITCHES ON UNAUTHORISED DEVELOPMENTS	0
TOTAL PITCHES	0

Appendix B: ORS Technical Note on New Household Formation March 2015



Opinion Research Services

Technical Note

Gypsy and Traveller Household Formation and Growth Rates

March 31st 2015

Opinion Research Services
Spin-out company of Swansea University



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

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

© Copyright March 2015

Contents

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

Household Growth Rates

Abstract and conclusions

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

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

Compound growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Caravan counts

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

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

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

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

19. The annual 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.
20. 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

21. 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

22. 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

23. 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.
24. The age profile is important, as the table below (derived from census data) shows. Even assuming zero deaths in the population, achieving an annual population growth of 3% (that is, doubling in size every 23.5 years) would require half of the "year one" population to be aged under 23.5 years. When deaths are accounted for (at a rate of 0.5% per annum), to achieve the same rate of growth, a population of Gypsies and Travellers would need about half its members to be aged under 16 years. In fact, though, the 2011 census shows that the midway age point for the national Gypsy and Traveller population is 26 years – so the population could not possibly double in 23.5 years.

Table 4

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

Age Group	Number of People	Cumulative Percentage
Age 0 to 4	5,725	10.4
Age 5 to 7	3,219	16.3
Age 8 to 9	2,006	19.9
Age 10 to 14	5,431	29.8
Age 15	1,089	31.8
Age 16 to 17	2,145	35.7
Age 18 to 19	1,750	38.9
Age 20 to 24	4,464	47.1
Age 25 to 29	4,189	54.7
Age 30 to 34	3,833	61.7
Age 35 to 39	3,779	68.5

Age 40 to 44	3,828	75.5
Age 45 to 49	3,547	82.0
Age 50 to 54	2,811	87.1
Age 55 to 59	2,074	90.9
Age 60 to 64	1,758	94.1
Age 65 to 69	1,215	96.3
Age 70 to 74	905	97.9
Age 75 to 79	594	99.0
Age 80 to 84	303	99.6
Age 85 and over	230	100.0

Birth and fertility rates

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)

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

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)

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

38. 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).
39. 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.
40. 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

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

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

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

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

Summary conclusions

43. 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.
44. 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.

45. 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.
46. 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.