

Cumbria Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment

Final report

Philip Brown, Lisa Hunt and Jenna Condie

Salford Housing and Urban Studies Unit
University of Salford

May 2008



About the Authors

Philip Brown and Lisa Hunt are Research Fellows and in the Salford Housing and Urban Studies Unit (SHUSU) at the University of Salford. Jenna Condie is a Research Assistant in the Salford Housing and Urban Studies Unit (SHUSU) at the University of Salford.

The Salford Housing and Urban Studies Unit is a dedicated multi-disciplinary research and consultancy unit providing a range of services relating to housing and urban management to public and private sector clients. The Unit brings together researchers drawn from a range of disciplines including: social policy, housing management, urban geography, environmental management, psychology, social care and social work.

Study Team

Core team members:

Dr Philip Brown

Dr Lisa Hunt

Jenna Condie

Community Interviewers:

John Coffey

Valerie Moody

Louise Wannop

Steering Group

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Paula Allen | Lake District National Park Authority |
| Patricia Bell | Cumbria Constabulary |
| Kerry Courts | Carlisle City Council |
| Colin Garnett | Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council |
| Trevor Gear | Allerdale Borough Council |
| Graham Hale | Cumbria County Council |
| Angela Harrison | Cumbria County Council |
| Jeremy Hewitson | Carlisle City Council |
| Jane-Ann Hurn | Northern Network of Travelling People |
| Julie Jackson | South Lakeland District Council |
| Toni Megean | Copeland Borough Council |
| Kirk Mulhearn | Lancashire Section of the Showmen's Guild |
| Lee Walker | Eden District Council |

Acknowledgements

This study was greatly dependent upon the time, expertise and contributions of a number of individuals and organisations, without whom the study could not have been completed. Members of the project Steering Group provided guidance and assistance throughout the project and thanks must go to all of them for their support to the study team.

Special thanks are also due to all those who took the time to participate in the study, helped organise the fieldwork and provided invaluable information and support in the production of this report. We are particularly indebted to Anne Taylor and the other team members at the Pre-School Learning Alliance for their assistance during the course of the study.

Particular thanks must, of course, go to the many Gypsies and Travellers who found the time to talk to us and answer our questions in a full, honest and patient manner. It is hoped that this report is able to accurately reflect their experiences and needs.

This report is based on research undertaken by the study team and the analysis and comment thereafter does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the research commissioning authorities, or any participating stakeholders and agencies. The authors take responsibility for any inaccuracies or omissions in the report.

Executive Summary

The Study

1. Recent legislation and guidance from the government has indicated a commitment to taking steps to resolve some of the long standing accommodation issues for members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities. This legislation has an overarching aim of ensuring that members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities have equal access to decent and appropriate accommodation options akin to each and every other member of society. As a result, a number of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAAAs) are now being undertaken across the UK, as local authorities respond to these new obligations and requirements.
2. The research and report were commissioned by the authorities within Cumbria (Eden District Council; Copeland Borough Council; Allerdale Borough Council; Carlisle City Council; Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council; South Lakeland District Council; and, Lake District National Park Authority¹) in May 2007. The study was conducted by a team of researchers from the Salford Housing and Urban Studies Unit at the University of Salford. The study was greatly aided by research support and expertise from members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities. The study was managed by a Steering Group composed of officers representing the commissioning authorities.
3. The assessment was undertaken by conducting:
 - A review of available literature, data and secondary sources;
 - A detailed questionnaire completed by housing and planning officers;
 - Consultations with key stakeholders; and
 - A total of 130 interviews with Gypsies and Travellers from a range of tenures and community groups.

Background

4. Following the Housing Act 2004, local authorities have been preparing to develop and implement strategies to respond to the accommodation needs of the Gypsy and Traveller communities living in their areas as part of their wider housing strategies and the Regional Housing Strategy (RHS). Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAAAs) are designed to provide the evidence needed to inform these strategies. However, as well as presenting evidence and information on accommodation needs at an immediate local level the evidence

¹ For ease, in some instances, these are referred to only by the Borough, District or City name in this document.

collected and analysis produced has a wider regional role. The assessment of accommodation need and pitch requirements are also to be fed into the Regional Planning Body (RPB), in this case the North West Regional Assembly (NWRA), for inclusion into the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). The RSS then specifies pitch numbers required (but not their location) for each local planning authority (LPA) in light of the GTAA's conducted and a strategic view of need, supply and demand across the region is taken. The local planning authority's Development Planning Document (DPD) then identifies specific sites to match pitch numbers from the RSS.

Main Findings

Local Gypsies and Travellers and accommodation provision

5. There is no one source of information about the size of the Gypsy and Traveller population in the Study Area. Our best estimate is that there are at least 771 local Gypsies and Travellers
6. Gypsies and Travellers are accommodated in various forms in the Study Area; in housing, on private sites and on unauthorised sites. There are no socially rented sites in the Study Area. There were five residential yards for Travelling Showpeople in the Study Area.
7. There are 2 private sites in the Study Area (with the boundaries of Carlisle City Council and Eden District Council) together providing an estimated 74 pitches. These are split between approximately 54 residential pitches and 20 transit pitches. These sites accommodate approximately 178 individuals. Residents on these sites have good access to a range of basic amenities including: a water supply, electricity, rubbish collection, and eating space. There is some reduced access to WC, amenity blocks, showers, and children's play areas. The residents of these sites were broadly positive about their accommodation and sites although neutral to poor responses were generated about the management of the sites.

Unauthorised encampments

8. The Caravan Count in July 2007 recorded 107 caravans on unauthorised encampments (on land not owned by Gypsies and Travellers). Records kept by the local authorities show that the Study Area experienced around 57 encampments over the previous full calendar year (2006). Most authorities saw this as broadly reflective of previous years. According to the authorities the average encampment size was just over 3 caravans. Most encampments stayed for a relatively short period of time with the average duration being just under 1 week. Allerdale Borough Council and Carlisle City Council experienced more encampments than any of the other local authorities. The remaining authorities experienced between 2-4 encampments over a 12 month period.

9. All the local authorities are party to joint agreements and protocols in order to manage unauthorised encampments.
10. There were 17 household interviews conducted with households on unauthorised encampments over the fieldwork period (June 2007 - January 2008). The average number of caravans owned by households on unauthorised encampments was 1.5 with around 2.9 people living in each caravan. Most households felt that they had enough living space for their needs.
11. Access to facilities was largely restricted for households on unauthorised encampments; two-thirds of households had access to an electricity supply, a quarter had access to a WC, only one in ten had access to water. No one reported being able to access waste disposal.
12. Just two respondents on unauthorised encampments had a base elsewhere.

Gypsies and Travellers in bricks and mortar housing

13. The inclusion of Gypsies and Travellers in local authority housing and homelessness strategies is the exception rather than the rule at present. No local authority was able to reliably quantify the number of Gypsies and Travellers in social or private bricks and mortar housing. It is estimated by the Study Team that there are at least 120 Gypsy and Traveller households in bricks and mortar housing although it is also believed that this may be a significant under-estimate.
14. A total of 58 households living in bricks and mortar housing across the Study Area were interviewed. Almost two-thirds of respondents were owner-occupiers, a quarter were council tenants, with the remainder either RSL or private tenants. Just over half of households still retained a trailer. The vast majority of respondents viewed their home either positively or ambivalently. Almost a third of respondents had lived in their accommodation for 5 years or more, and half had lived there for between 1 and 5 years. The vast majority either wanted to remain in their house indefinitely or could not say how long they wanted to stay.
15. A fifth of all respondents had lived in a house at some point in the past.

Characteristics of local Gypsies and Travellers

16. The survey of Gypsies and Travellers identified some of the important characteristics of the local population.
 - Household size is significantly larger than in the settled/non-Traveller population at 3.5 persons across the whole sample
 - A significant number of the sample (25%) were households over 60 years of age.
 - Young families are the predominant household type in the Study Area as a whole. There are more couples in bricks and

mortar housing than on site based accommodation - these couples tend to be older at 60+ years.

- Two-thirds of respondents felt they were 'local' to the area they were residing in. 'Family connections' was the main reason given when respondents were asked why they were living where they were.
- The local population consists mainly of Romany Gypsies (English) (51%) with the next largest population consisting of Travelling Showpeople (almost a fifth of the population). There were very few other groups of Travellers - just one in ten were Irish Travellers - which may reflect problems that certain other groups have of accessing the sites in the Study Area.
- The vast majority of children of school age reportedly regularly attend school or receive home education.
- The Gypsy and Traveller population was largely sedentary. However, around two-fifths of households on sites travelled during the year - mostly seasonally - around half of bricks and mortar households travel at some point every year.
- Respondents tended to travel to numerous locations across the UK. Appleby Fair was an obvious draw, but a number of households travelled extensively throughout Northern England, as well as some travelling to the Midlands, the South West and South East.
- Self-employment was a major source of income for respondents, with the type of work people were undertaking including: gardening/tree work, carpet related trades, uPVC and guttering and scrap.

Gypsies and Travellers and housing-related support

17. There were no Supporting People funded services provided in the Study Area which were directed at Gypsies and Travellers in particular.
18. The kind of housing-related services Gypsies and Travellers expressed an interest in receiving assistance with included: services around harassment, accessing health care, accessing legal services, support with planning, and accessing legal services.

Accommodation preferences and aspirations

19. All households were asked whether there was anyone living with them who were likely to want their own accommodation over the next 5 years. Overall, this equated to 13 individual households who will require their own accommodation by 2012.
20. There was support for the creation of additional long-stay residential sites within the Study Area, with a quarter of respondents interested in

moving to a new residential site - this included two-thirds of the households who were currently accommodated on the private sites within the Study Area. Respondents voiced a preference for residential sites with a pitch capacity of between 15-20 pitches.

21. Just over a quarter of respondents wanted to see the development of more transit/short-stay sites in the Study Area. Interest was mainly shown from households from bricks and mortar accommodation which suggested that the creation of more authorised short-stay accommodation would enable an increase in family visits and help to maintain the tradition of travelling. It was said by around a third of respondents that such sites should be around 1-5 pitches in size with a number of people expecting to use the site for between 1-4 weeks - although over half of respondents did not know how long they would use such sites/pitches for.
22. Respondents were asked to comment on a range of differing accommodation types in order to ascertain their preferences. The clear preference was for a small private site which they/their family owned, followed by a family owned house. Living on a site owned by a private landlord or another Gypsy/Traveller was amongst the least favoured options - this highlights the importance of good management of sites. The least favoured option overall was a house owned by a local authority or RSL.

Accommodation need and supply

23. Nationally, there are no signs that the growth in the Gypsy and Traveller population will slow significantly. The supply of additional authorised accommodation has slowed since 1994, but the size of the population of Gypsies and Travellers does not appear to have been affected to a great extent. Instead, the way in which Gypsies and Travellers live has changed, with increases in unauthorised accommodation, innovative house dwelling arrangements (living in trailers in the grounds of houses), overcrowding on sites and overcrowding within accommodation units (trailers, houses, chalets, etc.). In order to respond effectively and appropriately to the lack of suitable accommodation, to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers, the regional planning body (North West Regional Assembly) has the role of ensuring that all local authorities contribute to resolving the current shortage of authorised site accommodation in a strategic manner, which helps redress current imbalances in the pattern of provision, and enhances the sustainability of the Gypsy and Traveller site network.
24. The 'models' for assessing the numerical requirement for additional residential pitches, have developed significantly over the past few years. The calculation used here is an adaptation of the example

provided by the CLG.² The calculation for years 1-5 (2007-2012) takes account of need arising from the following indicators: expiry of temporary planning permissions, household growth, need from unauthorised developments, movement between sites and housing, need from closing sites, and need from households on unauthorised encampments. On the supply side the calculation takes account of: pitch vacancies on socially rented sites, unused pitches, and known/planned developments of sites/pitches. These calculations are estimates based on information drawn from: local authority information, knowledge of key stakeholders, survey findings and assumptions based on the professional experience of the study team.

25. Additional requirements beyond 2012 are based on estimated household growth. This follows commonly accepted assumptions as to the growth of the population.³
26. Transit requirements (2007-2012) are calculated by the average number of households on unauthorised encampments seeking a transit/short-stay pitch in the area; an allowance for vacancies is included in order to manage their operation effectively. No further transit provision is estimated to be required beyond 2012 on the assumption that the level of travelling will not increase in the foreseeable future and other surrounding local authorities will also have developed appropriate transit options.
27. Requirements for the additional residential provision for Travelling Showpeople are estimated on the basis of survey findings and local authority information.
28. Because of the historical inequalities in pitch provision, Gypsies and Travellers have constrained choices as to where and how they would choose to live if they had real choice. So while choices for the non-Travelling community are generally much wider, as there is social housing available in every authority in the country, there are no local authority sites in 138 of the 353 local authorities in England, and only in 71 authorities is there more than one site. Some authorities have no authorised private sites. Over time, this has inevitably meant that Gypsies and Travellers have generally moved to areas they see as offering the best life chances; for example, an authority which provides a site; an authority which is perceived as having more private authorised sites than others; or, an authority that is attractive in some

² CLG (2007) *Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments – Guidance*. London: HMSO.

³ Household growth rates of 2% and 3% a year were suggested as appropriate in Niner, P. (2003) *Local Authority Gypsy/Traveller Sites in England*, London: ODPM. A 3% growth rate was also used in the recent report from Communities and Local Government (2007) *Preparing Regional Spatial Strategy reviews on Gypsies and Travellers by regional planning bodies*. HMSO.

other way (slower enforcement, transport links, friends and family resident, etc.). Therefore, there is a tendency, when the need for additional accommodation is assessed, for the needs assessment to further compound these inequalities in site provision. For example, authorities which already provide Gypsy and Traveller accommodation (publicly or privately) are assessed as having greater need for additional pitch provision than authorities with little or no pitch provision. This is compounded further the longer-term the assessment is made (ie to 2016).

29. As requested in the research brief, Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs have been identified at a sub-regional and a local level. This has been done on a 'need where it is seen to arise' basis. However, the results of this apportionment should not necessarily be assumed to imply that those needs should be actually met in that specific locality. This distribution reflects the current uneven distribution of pitch provision and the Gypsy and Traveller population across the Study Area. Decisions about where need should be met should be strategic, taken in partnership with local authorities, the County Council and the North West Regional Assembly - involving consultation with Gypsies and Travellers and other interested parties - which will take into account wider social and economic planning considerations such as equity, choice and sustainability. Table i below presents the 'needs where they arise' requirements; due to the lack of accurate information and data about the entire Gypsy and Traveller population it is likely that these requirements represent the minimum additional accommodation provision required.

Table i: Residential accommodation need arising from existing district level Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople populations

| | Study Area Total | Allerdale | Barrow-in- Furness | Carlisle | Copeland | Eden | Lake District NP | S Lakeland |
|---|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|----------|----------|------|---------------------|------------|
| Current authorised residential provision ⁴ (pitches) | 112 | 24 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 5 |
| Additional residential need 2007-2012 (pitches and plots) | 71 | 19 | 5 | 32 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 6 |

⁴ These are approximations of the provision based on information obtained from the authorities during the course of the assessment. This includes Travelling Showpeople yards.

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|----|---|----|---|----|---|---|
| Additional residential need 2012-2016 (pitches and plots) | 18 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 |
| Additional suggested transit need 2007-2016 (pitches and plots) ⁵ | 35 | | | | | | | |
| Estimated total additional residential pitch/plot need 2007-2016 | 89 | 23 | 6 | 39 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 8 |

Note: For pragmatic reasons these figures have been rounded up to the nearest whole pitch

Recommendations

30. The overarching recommendation resulting from this assessment is that the authorities across the Study Area engage pro-actively to meet the accommodation needs that have been identified as a result of this assessment and that a strategic joined-up approach is taken. More specifically, a number of recommendations have been made for the Partner Authorities, which can be found in the main report.

⁵ This is an illustration of the equitable split of the identified need. Transit requirements are particularly difficult to quantify with any accuracy. Consideration will need to be given to the appropriate number, size and distribution of transit pitches in each authority. The main report outlines a series of options based upon different assumptions of how this need might be apportioned.

Contents:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| About the Authors..... | 2 |
| Study Team..... | 2 |
| Acknowledgements | 3 |
| Executive Summary | 4 |
| The Study | 4 |
| Background..... | 4 |
| Main Findings | 5 |
| Recommendations..... | 11 |
| List of Tables | 16 |
| List of Figures..... | 18 |
| Glossary..... | 18 |
| List of Acronyms..... | 21 |
| 1. Overview | 22 |
| Background and study brief | 22 |
| Aims of the assessment..... | 24 |
| A note on terminology | 24 |
| Outline of the report | 26 |
| 2. The Assessment Methodology..... | 28 |
| Stage one: Collation and review of existing secondary information | 28 |
| Stage two: Consultation with service providers and other stakeholders | 29 |
| Stage three: Survey with Gypsies and Travellers | 29 |
| 3. National, Regional and Local Policy Context..... | 36 |
| National policy | 36 |
| Regional policy | 37 |
| Local Policies, Plans and Strategies | 38 |
| 4. Gypsies and Travellers in the Study Area: The Current Picture | 40 |
| Caravan numbers and trends from the caravan count..... | 40 |
| 5. Size and Characteristics of the Local Gypsy and Traveller Population..... | 47 |
| Demographic and household characteristics | 47 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| The size of the local Gypsy and Traveller community..... | 53 |
| 6. Authorised Site Provision - Findings..... | 56 |
| Socially rented provision | 56 |
| Private Gypsy and Traveller sites | 56 |
| 7. Planning and the unauthorised Development of Sites - Findings... | 62 |
| Planning applications..... | 62 |
| Unauthorised development of Gypsy and Traveller caravan sites | 62 |
| Planning issues..... | 64 |
| 8. Unauthorised Encampments - Findings..... | 66 |
| 9. Gypsies and Travellers in Social and Private Bricks and Mortar Accommodation - Findings | 71 |
| 10. Housing-Related Support Service: General Services - Findings... | 77 |
| Housing-related support | 77 |
| Access to local services and amenities | 79 |
| 11. Employment, Education and Health - Findings..... | 83 |
| Gypsies and Travellers and work, employment and training | 83 |
| Gypsies and Travellers and education..... | 84 |
| Gypsies and Travellers and health | 86 |
| 12. Accommodation Histories, Intentions and Travelling - Findings .. | 88 |
| Accommodation histories..... | 88 |
| Travelling patterns and experiences | 90 |
| 13. Household Formation, Accommodation Preferences Aspirations | 94 |
| Household formation..... | 94 |
| Accommodation preferences and aspirations | 94 |
| 14. Travelling Showpeople | 101 |
| Views from Travelling Showpeople | 102 |
| 15. An Assessment of Need for Residential Pitches..... | 106 |
| Calculating accommodation supply and need | 106 |
| 16. An Assessment of Need for Transit Pitches..... | 119 |
| 17. An Assessment of Need for Travelling Showpeople Pitches..... | 126 |
| 18. Recommendations | 130 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Strategy, systems and policy framework | 131 |
| Accommodating transient Gypsies and Travellers | 133 |
| Communication and engagement | 134 |
| Developing accommodation..... | 135 |
| Health and housing-related support Issues | 136 |
| Travelling Showpeople accommodation | 138 |
| Appendix 1: Local Plan Policies on Gypsy Site Provision | 139 |
| Appendix 2: CLG Caravan Count results for Study Area: local authority.. | 143 |
| Appendix 3: Consultation event..... | 145 |

List of Tables

- Table 1: Achieved household interviews by target
- Table 2: Sample in relation to local Gypsy and Traveller population
- Table 3: Number of achieved interviews by area
- Table 4: Summary of Residential Pitch Requirements: North West Region and Sub-regions: 2006 to 2011 Area Estimated requirement
- Table 5: Caravans by Type of Site July 2007
- Table 6: Summary of Caravan Numbers 1994 and 2007
- Table 7: Summary of Caravan Numbers on Unauthorised Sites 1998 and 2007
- Table 8: Caravans by Type of Site by Local Authority January 1994
- Table 9: Caravans by Type of Site by Local Authority January 2007
- Table 10: Age of interviewees
- Table 11: Household size distribution
- Table 12: Average household size by accommodation type
- Table 13: Household type by type of accommodation
- Table 14: Marital status of the interview sample
- Table 15: Local to the area?
- Table 16: Reasons for residing in the Study Area (figures in % of sample)
- Table 17: Interviewees by Gypsy and Traveller group
- Table 18: Estimated Study Area Gypsy and Traveller population
- Table 19: Private sites with the Study Area
- Table 20: Views on the site (in %)
- Table 21: Access to facilities on private sites
- Table 22: Access to basic facilities on unauthorised encampments
- Table 23: Views on the house (in %)
- Table 24: Likelihood of using housing-related support services (in %)
- Table 25: Access to services and importance of service
- Table 26: % households with family members with specific health problems
- Table 27: Duration of residence on current site
- Table 28: Prior accommodation of households on authorised sites

Table 29: Frequency of travelling by current accommodation type

Table 30: Anticipated areas to travel to over the next 12 months

Table 31: Popularity of preferred accommodation

Table 32: Views on the type of accommodation preferred

Table 33: Residential yards for Travelling Showpeople from information provided by local authorities and the Showmen's Guild

Table 34: Summary of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople requirements by local authority area (2007-2016)

Table 35: Apportionment of transit pitches by local authority based on three options

Table 36: Summary of estimated need for residential plots for Travelling Showpeople at a Study Area level 2007-2012

List of Figures

Figure 1: Caravans on Socially Rented Sites: January 1994 to July 2007

Figure 2: Caravans on Private Authorised Sites: January 1994 to July 2007

Figure 3: Caravans on Unauthorised Sites: January 1994 to July 2007

Figure 4: Caravans by Type of Site: January 1994 to 2007

Glossary

The following terms are used in this report and may need some clarification. In the case of those terms which are related to Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation and culture, it is noted that a number of these terms are often contested and debated. It is not the intention of the authors to present these terms as absolute definitions rather; the explanations provided are those the authors used in this assessment as their frames of reference.

| Term | Explanation |
|--|---|
| Amenity block/shed | On most residential Gypsy/Travellers sites these are buildings where basic plumbing amenities (bath/shower, WC and sink) are provided at the rate of one building per pitch. |
| Authorised local authority site/Registered Social Landlord site | An authorised site owned by either the local authority or a Registered Social Landlord. |
| Authorised Private site | An authorised site owned by a private individual (who may or may not be a Gypsy or a Traveller). These sites can be owner-occupied, rented or a mixture of owner-occupied and rented pitches. |
| Bricks and mortar | Permanent mainstream housing |
| Caravan | Mobile living vehicle used by Gypsies and Travellers. Also referred to as trailers. |
| Chalet | In the absence of a specific definition the term 'chalet' is used here to refer to single storey residential units which resemble mobile homes. |
| Country People/Buffers | Term used by Irish Travellers to refer to settled people/non-Travellers. |
| Development Plan | Documents which outline the key development |

| | |
|--|--|
| Documents (DPDs) | goals of the Local Development Framework |
| Doubling-up | To share a pitch on an authorised site |
| Gaujo/Gorger | Literal translation indicates someone who is not of the Romany Gypsy race. Romany word used mainly, but not exclusively, by Romany Gypsies to refer to members of the settled community/non-Gypsy/Travellers |
| Green Belt | A policy or land use designation used to retain areas of largely undeveloped, wild, or agricultural land surrounding or neighbouring urban areas. |
| Gypsy | Members of Gypsy or Traveller communities. Usually used to describe Romany (English) Gypsies originating from India. This term is not acceptable to all Travellers |
| Gypsies and Travellers (as used in this assessment) | Consistent with the Housing Act 2004, inclusive of: all Gypsies, Irish Travellers, New Travellers, Show People, Circus People and Gypsies and Travellers in bricks and mortar accommodation. Can also include Roma and boat dwellers if there is evidence of a need, suppressed or otherwise, for pitch accommodation. |
| Local Plan/Local Development Framework (LDF) | A set of documents which a Local Planning Authority creates to describe their strategy for development and use of land in their area of authority. |
| Mobile home | Legally classified as a caravan but not usually moveable without dismantling/or lorry |
| Pitch/plot | Area of land on a site/development generally home to one licensee household. Can be varying sizes and have varying caravan occupancy levels. Often also referred to as a plot, particularly in relation to Travelling Showpeople. There is no agreed definition as to the size of a pitch. |
| Pulling-up | To park a trailer/caravan |
| Settled community/people | Reference to non-Travellers (those that live in houses) |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Site | An authorised area of land on which Gypsies and Travellers are accommodated in trailers/chalets/vehicles. Can contain one or multiple pitches. |
| Stopping place | Locations frequented by Gypsies and Travellers, usually for short periods of time. |
| Supporting People | A funding programme which provides grants in order to assist in the provision of housing related support to develop and sustain an individuals' capacity to live independently in their accommodation. |
| Suppressed/concealed household | Households, living within other households, who are unable to set up separate family units and who are unable to access a place on an authorised site, or obtain or afford land to develop one. |
| Trailer | Term commonly used by Gypsies and Travellers to refer to a moveable caravan |
| Transit site | Site intended for short stays. Such sites are usually permanent, but there is a limit on the length of time residents can stay. |
| Travelling Showpeople | Commonly referred to as Showmen, these are a group of occupational Travellers who work on travelling shows and fairs across the UK and abroad. |
| Unauthorised Development | This refers to a caravan/trailer or group of caravans/trailers on land owned (possibly developed) by Gypsies and Travellers without planning permission. |
| Unauthorised Encampment | Stopping on private/public land without permission (eg at the side of the road). |
| Yard | Term used by Travelling Showpeople to refer to a site. |

List of Acronyms

| | |
|--------------|--|
| CLG | Communities and Local Government |
| CJPOA | Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 |
| CRE | Commission for Racial Equality |
| DPD | Development Plan Document |
| GTAA | Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment |
| LDF | Local Development Framework |
| LGA | Local Government Association |
| LPA | Local Planning Authority |
| NWRA | North West Regional Assembly |
| ODPM | Office of the Deputy Prime Minister |
| RHB | Regional Housing Board |
| RHS | Regional Housing Strategy |
| RPB | Regional Planning Body |
| RSL | Registered Social Landlord |
| RSS | Regional Spatial Strategy |
| SHUSU | Salford Housing and Urban Studies Unit |

Note: Over the last few years the main Governmental department largely responsible for Gypsy and Traveller related issues (in particular regarding housing and planning) has been subject to certain degree of reform. This can cause confusion. The main changes are summarised below.

Until 2001 the **Department for Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR)** was the responsible department for these issues. In 2001 responsibility was passed to the **Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions (DTLR)**. In 2002 the **Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM)** took control of these issues (within which the Gypsy and Traveller Unit was founded) with this being replaced by the **Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG)** in 2006.

1. Overview

- 1.1 This report presents the findings of an assessment of the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers across the county of Cumbria. The research and report were commissioned by the authorities within Cumbria (Eden District Council; Copeland Borough Council; Allerdale Borough Council; Carlisle City Council; Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council; South Lakeland District Council; and, Lake District National Park Authority⁶) in May 2007. The study was conducted by a team of researchers from the Salford Housing and Urban Studies Unit at the University of Salford. The study was greatly aided by research support and expertise from members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities. The study was managed by a Steering Group composed of officers representing the commissioning authorities.

Background and study brief

- 1.2 Enshrined within the Caravan Sites Act 1968 was a duty upon local authorities to provide sites to Gypsies and Travellers residing in and resorting to their boroughs. As a result of the measures contained within the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994, this duty was removed. Over the subsequent years, coupled with continued migration, travelling patterns and household formation, this has meant that the numbers of Gypsies and Travellers requiring authorised places to live/stop far exceed the number of authorised pitches available. In addition to the lack of available authorised pitches, Gypsies and Travellers have also found gaining planning permission a major obstacle to providing sites for themselves and their families. Those Gypsies and Travellers who can afford to buy land are frequently in breach of planning laws when they attempt to develop that land for residential use. Subsequently, they find themselves subject to enforcement action and often evicted, frequently resorting to the use of further unauthorised land/accommodation.
- 1.3 Under Section 8 of the Housing Act 1985, local authorities are required to consider the various accommodation needs of the local population and to carry out periodic reviews in order to provide relevant and appropriate provision to meet these needs. Recent legislation (Housing Act 2004 and Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) and guidance (Circular 01/2006) from the government indicate a commitment to taking steps to resolve some of these long standing issues for members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities. This legislation has an overarching aim of ensuring that members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities have equal access to decent and appropriate accommodation options akin to each and every other member of society.

⁶ For ease, these are referred to only by the borough, district or city name throughout this document.

- 1.4 Following the Housing Act 2004, local authorities have been preparing to develop and implement strategies to respond to the accommodation needs of the Gypsy and Traveller communities living in their areas as part of their wider housing strategies and the Regional Housing Strategy (RHS). Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAAAs) are designed to provide the evidence needed to inform these strategies. However, as well as presenting evidence and information on accommodation needs at an immediate local level the evidence collected and analysis produced have a wider regional role. The assessment of accommodation need and pitch requirements are also to be fed into the Regional Planning Body (RPB), in this case the North West Regional Assembly (NWRA), for inclusion into the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). The RSS then specifies pitch numbers required (but not their location) for each local planning authority (LPA) in light of the GTAAAs produced and a strategic view of need, supply and demand across the region. The local planning authority's Development Planning Document (DPD) then identifies specific sites to match pitch numbers from the RSS.
- 1.5 Each DPD is subject to examination in public, and one of the tests of soundness will be whether it is founded on robust and credible evidence: data received from GTAAAs are fundamental in providing such an evidence base for the RHSs and RSSs.
- 1.6 The regional dimension is intended to ensure that all local authorities contribute to resolving the current shortage of authorised site accommodation in a strategic manner, which helps redress current imbalances in the pattern of provision, and enhances the sustainability of the Gypsy and Traveller site network. Such a strategic approach will contribute to meeting the Government's objective⁷ that 'Gypsies and Travellers and the settled community should live together peacefully', and to the greater social inclusion of Gypsies and Travellers who are amongst the most deprived groups in the population.
- 1.7 The vast majority of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAAAs) across England are either completed or in progress. Guidance from Communities and Local Government (CLG) requires that all GTAAAs are completed by the end of 2007.
- 1.8 In order to comply with the CLGs increasing emphasis on taking regional strategic approaches, and also recognising the diverse characteristics of the Gypsy and Traveller populations, it is considered good practice for several authorities to commission such work jointly. Thus, for the Cumbria authorities this study aims to generate a robust sub-regional understanding of the current provision, gaps and accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers across the Study Area.

⁷ ODPM (2006) *Local authorities and Gypsies and Travellers: Guide to responsibilities and powers*, ODPM, p. 5,
http://www.communities.gov.uk/pub/400/LocalAuthoritiesandGypsiesandTravellersGuidetoresponsibilitiesandpowersPDF223KB_id1163400.pdf

Aims of the assessment

- 1.9 The main aim of the assessment was to produce an accommodation needs assessment capable of desegregation to district level with a comprehensive assessment of existing and future accommodation and wider service needs within each area. Within this broad aim there were several objectives:
- To produce detailed information about local Gypsies and Travellers in relation to their demographic profile, household formation, current accommodation needs, accommodation related service and support needs and barriers to accessing services.
 - To assess the current and potential future accommodation needs within the Cumbria Study Area.
 - To generate reliable estimates of future accommodation need.
- 1.10 In addition to this main assessment of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs, a separate assessment was also commissioned to look at issues related to Appleby Horse Fair. The Appleby Horse Fair assessment looks in-depth at the organisation of the Fair and the experiences and general needs of the Gypsies and Travellers who attend this important annual cultural event. It was not requirement of the brief to quantify the need for accommodation provision for the Fair in either the main Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment or the separate Appleby Horse Fair study.⁸

A note on terminology

Gypsies and Travellers

- 1.11 Defining Gypsies and Travellers is not straightforward. Different definitions are used for a variety of purposes. At a very broad level the term 'Gypsies and Travellers' is used by non-Gypsies and Travellers to encompass a variety of groups and individuals who have a tradition or practice of nomadism in common. More narrowly both Gypsies and Irish Travellers are recognised minority ethnic groupings.
- 1.12 At the same time Gypsies and Travellers have been defined for accommodation and planning purposes. The statutory definition of Gypsies and Travellers for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment required by the Housing Act 2004 is:

⁸ The aim of the Appleby Fair assessment was to provide an evidence base to assist the creation of a strategic response to Appleby Fair, as well as offering pragmatic ways forward to any issues arising from the Fair. For more details about the Appleby Fair assessment please see Hunt, L., Brown, P. and Condie, J. (2008) *Appleby Fair Assessment*, SHUSU: The University of Salford.

- (a) *persons with a cultural tradition of nomadism or of living in a caravan; and*
 - (b) *all other persons of a nomadic habit of life, whatever their race or origin, including:*
 - (i) *such persons who, on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependant's educational or health needs or old age, have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently; and*
 - (ii) *members of an organised group of travelling showpeople or circus people (whether or not travelling together as such).*
- 1.13 There is a separate definition for planning purposes as specified in ODPM Circular 01/2006 which offers a narrower definition and excludes Travelling Showpeople.
- 1.14 This assessment has adopted the Housing Act 2004 definition and has sought to be inclusive in the Gypsy and Traveller groupings. More specifically we sought to include all Gypsies and Travellers (including New Travellers) living in caravan based accommodation or bricks and mortar housing. As the Housing Act 2004 definition indicates, we have also sought to include Travelling Showpeople living on their permanent base within the Study Area.

Housing/accommodation need

- 1.15 Crucially, for Gypsies and Travellers, the definition of housing need is varied slightly to acknowledge the different contexts in which members of these communities live. The general definition of housing need is "households who are unable to access suitable housing without some financial assistance", with housing demand defined as "the quantity of housing that households are willing and able to buy or rent."⁹
- 1.16 In recognising that in many cases these definitions are inappropriate for Gypsies and Travellers, the guidance on Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments refers to distinctive requirements that necessitate moving beyond the limitations of the definition for both caravan dwellers and those in bricks and mortar housing. For caravan dwelling households, need may take the form of those:¹⁰ who have no authorised site on which to reside;
- whose existing site accommodation is overcrowded or unsuitable, but who are unable to obtain larger or more suitable accommodation; and,

⁹ODPM (2006) Definition of the term 'Gypsies and Travellers' for the purposes of the Housing Act 2004. Consultation Paper, February, London: HMSO.

¹⁰ CLG (2007) *Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments – Guidance*. London: HMSO.

- who contain suppressed households who are unable to set up separate family units and are unable to access a place on an authorised site, or obtain or afford land to develop one.
- 1.17 In the context of bricks and mortar dwelling households, need may take the form of:
- those whose existing accommodation is overcrowded or unsuitable (including unsuitability by virtue of psychological aversion to bricks and mortar accommodation).
- 1.18 This assessment has used a definition of accommodation need which encompasses all the circumstances detailed above.

Outline of the report

- 1.19 Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments are a relatively new tool to assist local authorities and stakeholders to understand and gain knowledge on the needs, experiences and context of a collection of individuals who have usually not featured, or only on the margins, of other similar assessments. The information available pertaining to Gypsies and Travellers is often spread across a wide range of issues and held by a diverse group of departments and agencies. Thus, the collection and collation of this information entails a systematic process and this is reflected in the structure of this report.

Chapter 1 sets the background to the needs assessment, the aims of the assessment and a comment on the terms 'Gypsy and Traveller' and 'Housing/accommodation need'.

Chapter 2 presents details of the methodological process and research methods involved in the assessment as well as a commentary on the sampling strategy and sampling issues.

Chapter 3 sets the legislative and policy context for the assessment at a national, regional and local level.

Chapters 4 and 5 provide some detailed analysis of the local Gypsy and Traveller population by looking at the bi-annual Caravan Count for the area and the characteristics of the sample involved in the assessment.

Chapter 6 looks at the findings relating to authorised social and private Gypsy and Traveller sites in relation to management information, geographical location and resident views.

Chapter 7 examines the findings relating to planning and the unauthorised development of Gypsy and Travellers sites.

Chapter 8 provides an analysis of unauthorised encampments including a detailed exploration of the views of households on unauthorised encampments.

Chapter 9 looks at Gypsies and Travellers in private and social bricks and mortar housing, with particular attention to local

authority policies relating to Gypsies and Travellers in housing, numbers in housing and views from the housed Gypsy and Traveller population about their accommodation.

Chapter 10 brings together a range of findings to explore housing/related services and how they are provided for, experienced and viewed by Gypsies and Travellers; Chapter 11 explores education, employment and health issues.

Chapters 12 and 13 examine the accommodation histories and aspirations of the Gypsy and Traveller population.

Chapter 14 looks at the specific findings in relation to Travelling Showpeople.

Chapters 15 - 17 bring together data on the supply of, and need for, Gypsy and Traveller residential and transit pitches, and pitches for Travelling Showpeople. These chapters comment on the type, level and broad location of the accommodation needed.

Finally, Chapter 18 sets out some recommendations based on the assessment for future work on site provision, housing policy and other policy and practice areas.

2. The Assessment Methodology

2.1 Draft practice guidance for local authorities undertaking Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments was released by the ODPM (now CLG) in February 2006 with final guidance released in October 2007. Specialised guidance on assessments was felt to be required as many local authority housing needs assessments were failing to assess or identify the needs of Gypsies and Travellers. The Guidance explains why assessments are needed, how authorities might go about conducting an assessment, and issues to consider. The Guidance is non-prescriptive in terms of methods, but suggests that Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments incorporate a number of components. Such components include existing data sources; the experiences and knowledge of key stakeholders; and, the living conditions and views of Gypsies and Travellers.

2.2 This assessment was undertaken in three distinct stages:

- Stage one - collation and review of existing secondary information
- Stage two - consultation with service providers and other stakeholders
- Stage three - survey with Gypsies and Travellers across the Cumbria Study Area.

2.3 Each of these stages is described in more detail below.

Stage one: Collation and review of existing secondary information

2.4 This first stage comprised a review of the available literature and secondary sources obtained from government (central and local), regional, community and academic bodies. This provided an historical, social and political overview of the situation of Gypsies and Travellers in Cumbria. More specifically this included the collection, review and synthesis of:

- The bi-annual Count of Gypsy and Traveller caravans.
- Local plans, Regional and Core Strategy documents and other literature relevant to Local Development Frameworks. Housing Strategies, Homelessness Strategies and Supporting People Strategies were analysed, as were local authority allocation and monitoring procedures.
- Various records and data maintained and provided by the local authorities. Information was obtained on: resident demographics; waiting lists; unauthorised sites (developments and encampments); housing; and, planning applications.

- 2.5 Much of this information was collected via an extensive self-completion questionnaire sent to each authority, and joint-working between housing, planning, health and education was required in order to provide a completed questionnaire. This questionnaire can be found in the separate document entitled Survey Instruments.

Stage two: Consultation with service providers and other stakeholders

- 2.6 The second stage involved gathering the views of various service providers and other stakeholders and drew on their experience and perceptions of the main issues for Gypsies and Travellers in Cumbria. This stage was a vital way in which initial findings could be checked and set in context by the qualitative experience of stakeholders.
- 2.7 A number of one-to-one consultations were held with a variety of stakeholders. This included people who were recommended to the research team the Steering Group, as well as people the research team identified during the course of the assessment.
- 2.8 These discussions were largely structured around three broad issues:
- The particular experiences that certain professionals have in relation to the accommodation and related needs of Gypsies and Travellers across Cumbria;
 - The current working practices of different professionals in relation to Gypsies and Travellers across Cumbria; and,
 - Stakeholder perspectives on what the priority needs are for Gypsies and Travellers across Cumbria.
- 2.9 Where required, these discussions were more focused upon clarifying information provided during Stage one.

Stage three: Survey with Gypsies and Travellers

- 2.10 One of the most important aspects of the assessment was consulting with local Gypsies and Travellers. The survey took place between June 2007 and January 2008.
- 2.11 In all cases consultations took the form of face-to-face interviews in order to gather information about their characteristics, experiences, accommodation and related needs and aspirations. The survey with Gypsies and Travellers is discussed below under three sections: sampling strategy and response rates; questionnaire design; and, fieldwork and interviewers.

Sampling and response rates

- 2.12 Sampling Gypsy and Traveller households for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments is always problematic given the absence of accurate information concerning the size and location of the

communities. As such, the sampling technique for the assessment was purposive rather than strictly random and differed depending upon the particular accommodation type currently inhabited by Gypsies and Travellers across Cumbria.

- For households on authorised sites and unauthorised developments, we compiled a sample frame from information provided by the local authorities about all known sites within Cumbria. A quota was set for interviews of at least 50% of the occupied pitches. Repeat visits were made to locations in order to achieve interviews if households were away from the site, it was not convenient for the household in question, or the fieldworkers ran out of time. Members of the research team had particular issues around accessing residents on authorised sites where the site owner/manager plays a gatekeeper role. However, this is common problem across many authorised private sites nationally and not something which is solely found in Cumbria.
- For households on unauthorised encampments, local authority officers from all authorities were encouraged to inform the fieldwork team when and where encampments occurred during the fieldwork period. We also encouraged our Community Interviewers to use their networks in order to link with households on unauthorised encampments in the area.
- Information from the local authority indicated that there were no socially rented sites in the Study Area therefore no data gathering on these sites was possible.
- As the population of Gypsies and Travellers in bricks and mortar housing is relatively hidden from official records there was no sample frame from which to identify people. Therefore, in order to engage with housed Gypsies and Travellers, the fieldwork team relied on one main method: contacts of the Gypsy and Traveller Community Interviewers who were a part of the fieldwork team. The fieldwork team employed professional judgement in order to achieve a sample from bricks and mortar housing which broadly reflected the known population concentrations of housed Gypsies and Travellers across the Study Area.

2.13 A total of 130 Gypsy and Traveller households were involved in the assessment within the boundaries of the authorities comprising the Cumbria Study Area.

2.14 Table 1 below shows the target and achieved household interviews for each accommodation type. As can be seen most targets were achieved and exceeded. In general, the exceeding or otherwise of targets tends to be a reflection of the difficulty in setting initial quotas for interviews in the current climate of information paucity on Gypsies and Travellers

and access problems - particularly in the case of housed families and households on private sites. In terms of the interviews conducted on unauthorised developments, these are separated into two distinct types: households on 'regular' unauthorised developments (living on land which is privately owned but without permission), and households on temporary unauthorised developments, which consisted of families who were 'wintering' in the garden of family in housed accommodation (ie staying with family over the Christmas period). There was no initial quota set for this form of accommodation but such households were in the area during the assessment period and agreed to participate.

Table 1: Achieved household interviews by target

| Type of accommodation | Target (No.) | Achieved (No.) | % |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|
| Socially rented sites | 0 | 0 | N/A |
| Private authorised sites | 27 | 22 | 81 |
| Unauthorised developments | 3 | 4 | 133 |
| Unauthorised encampments | 8 ¹¹ | 17 | 213 |
| Housed | 60 | 58 | 97 |
| Travelling Showpeople | 26 | 23 | 88 |
| Temporary unauthorised development | N/A | 6 | N/A |
| Total | 124 | 130 | 105 |

2.15 Table 2 below illustrates how the assessment sample relates to the known number of pitches and estimated population by accommodation type. As can be seen, nearly half of the pitches on the private sites are represented which reflects a general difficulty in accessing households on these sites as well as having a lack of understanding as to the size of the total private site based population at the beginning of the study. Also, as discussed above, the exceeding or otherwise of other targets is generally a reflection of the difficulty in setting initial quotas for interviews in the current climate of information paucity on Gypsies and

¹¹ This target was set based on information about the number from the caravan count as of July 2007 which showed 14 caravans (approx 8 households) within the Study Area.

Travellers. We were particularly fortunate to have such a good representation of Travelling Showpeople households which was aided extensively by the work of a Community Interviewer from the Travelling Showpeople community.

Table 2: Sample in relation to local Gypsy and Traveller population

| Type of accommodation | No. of sites | | | No. of pitches/households | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------|-----|---------------------------|--------|-----|
| | Total | Sample | % | Total | Sample | % |
| Socially rented sites | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Private authorised sites | 2 | 2 | 100 | 54 | 22 | 41 |
| Unauthorised developments | 4 | 4 | 100 | 5 | 4 | 80 |
| Unauthorised encampments | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8 | 17 | 213 |
| Housed | N/A | N/A | N/A | 120 ¹² | 58 | 48 |
| Travelling Showpeople | 4 | 4 | 80 | 38 | 23 | 61 |
| Temporary unauthorised developments | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 6 | N/A |

2.16 Table 3 below shows this response rate by local authority area. Most of the interviews were carried out in Carlisle, Allerdale and Eden. Stakeholder consultation suggests that these are the areas with the greatest concentration of Gypsies and Travellers. No interviews were carried out within Copeland or the Lake District National Park Authority - this is not to suggest that no Gypsies and Travellers live there or pull-up temporarily in these areas.

¹² Based on information supplied by the authorities and the operational experiences of the study team it seems reasonable to assume that the total bricks and mortar population equates to at least 120 households. This divides to an estimated 50 households in Carlisle; 20 in South Lakeland, Allerdale and Eden and 10 households in Barrow. There is no practical rationale for assuming Gypsies and Travellers live within Copeland as the fieldwork team were not made aware of such households. We therefore assume, for the purposes of the GTAA, that the housed population in Copeland is zero – similar to all areas, this is likely to be an understatement.

Table 3: Number of achieved interviews by area

| Type of accommodation | Local authority area | | | | | | | Total |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|
| | Allerdale Borough Council | Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council | Carlisle City Council | Copeland Borough Council | Eden District Council | Lake District National Park Authority | South Lakeland District Council | |
| Socially rented sites | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Private authorised sites | 1 | 0 | 12 | - | 9 | - | 0 | 22 |
| Unauthorised developments | 0 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | - | 0 | 4 |
| Unauthorised encampments | 11 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | - | 0 | 17 |
| Housed | 16 | 3 | 14 | 0 | | - | 11 | 58 |
| Temporary unauthorised development ¹³ | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 6 |
| Travelling Showpeople | 14 | 0 | 9 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 23 |
| Total | 42 | 5 | 46 | 0 | 26 | - | 11 | 130 |

¹³ This describes households who were 'wintering' within the grounds of family/friends who lived in bricks and mortar housing.

- 2.17 In terms of the gender split between interviewees, we spoke to 93 men (72%) and 37 women (28%). The greater presence of men in the sample may be reflective of the presence of a male Community Interviewer. This contrasts with a number of other Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments where women have been the main point of contact.
- 2.18 Overall, we believe that the findings for the assessment are based on reliable and reflective response rates from accommodation types, geographical areas and gender within the Cumbria Study Area.

Questionnaire design

- 2.19 All interviews with Gypsy and Traveller households utilised a structured questionnaire with a mixture of tick-box answers and open-ended questions. This mixed approach enabled us to gather quantifiable information, but also allowed for contextualisation and qualification by the more narrative responses. There were three questionnaires: one for site accommodation; one for bricks and mortar accommodation; and a separate questionnaire for Travelling Showpeople. Each survey contained the following sections:
- Current accommodation/site/encampment;
 - Experience of travelling;
 - Housing and site experiences;
 - Household details;
 - Services; and,
 - Future accommodation preferences/aspirations.
- 2.20 Following consultation with Gypsies and Travellers and experience of previous GTAAs, questions around income and benefits were excluded as these were seen to potentially jeopardise the ability to achieve interviews in the Study Area due to the alienation that such questions can cause with the communities.
- 2.21 The questionnaires used in the assessment are available in a separate document entitled 'Survey Instruments'.

Fieldwork and interviewers

- 2.22 In addition to SHUSU fieldwork staff, and of crucial importance to engaging as effectively as possible with the Gypsy and Traveller population, was the involvement of Gypsy and Traveller Community Interviewers. In total, three members of the Gypsy and Traveller community were involved in the assessment as Community Interviewers. One interviewer was recruited from within the Study Area, while two lived outside Cumbria. However, both had excellent links with the Gypsy and Traveller community across the Study Area and one, as mentioned previously, was a member of the Travelling Showpeople

community. The two interviewers from outside Cumbria had also worked with the study team on previous assessments so were experienced interviewers, familiar with the interviewing process.

- 2.23 In order to standardise our fieldwork approach, each interviewer has undergone an intensive training course on interviewer skills, and is provided with support from the core study team members during their interviewing activity. Each questionnaire that was returned to us was subject to quality control and appropriate feedback was given to the interviewers.
- 2.24 As well as the Community Interviewers, members of the Study Team also engaged with Gypsies and Travellers. By taking this dual approach we found we were able to access a range of people that would otherwise have not been included in the assessment, such as 'hidden' members of the community (older people or people living in bricks and mortar housing), those people who were uncomfortable talking to non-Travellers as well as those people who wanted to speak to people from outside their own community.

3. National, Regional and Local Policy Context

- 3.1 For the most part Gypsies and Travellers are affected by legislation in much the same way as members of the non-Travelling communities. However, it is the policy areas of housing and planning that have particular implications for Gypsies and Travellers. In recognising that there is a significant lack of accommodation options for the various Gypsy and Traveller groups, a plethora of documents have been published over the last 18 months, which directly affect specific policies towards Gypsies and Travellers. This section looks at the relevant national, regional and local planning policies affecting Gypsies and Travellers at the time of the assessment.

National policy

- 3.2 The main document detailing the broad aims of the currently policy towards the accommodation and planning objectives for Gypsies and Travellers is Circular 01/06. In particular, this specifies that the aims of the legislation and policy developments are to:
- ensure that Gypsies and Travellers have fair access to suitable accommodation, education, health and welfare provision;
 - reduce the number of unauthorised encampments;
 - increase the number of sites and address under-provision over the next 3-5 years;
 - protect the traditional travelling way of life of Gypsies and Travellers;
 - underline the importance of assessing accommodation need at different geographical scales;
 - promote private site provision; and,
 - avoid Gypsies and Travellers becoming homeless, where eviction from unauthorised sites occurs and where there is no alternative accommodation.
- 3.3 An overview of the process and system for ensuring adequate provision is implemented for Gypsies and Travellers was detailed in Chapter 1 of this report.
- 3.4 In September 2007, revised planning guidance in relation to the specific planning requirements of Travelling Showpeople was released in Circular 04/07. This replaces Circular 22/91 and aims to ensure that the system for pitch assessment, identification and allocation as introduced for Gypsies and Travellers is also applied to Travelling Showpeople.
- 3.5 The Gypsy and Traveller Sites Grant provides capital funding for improving and increasing Gypsy and Traveller site/pitch provision by local authorities and Registered Social Landlords. From 2006-08 a

national total of £56m has been made available, managed by the Regional Housing Boards or equivalents. In the North West, a total of £2.8m has been agreed over the 2006-08 period. In addition, a total of £97m has been made available for the 2008-11 period with the North West proposed allocated being £6m. Since 2006, Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) have been able to set up and manage Gypsy and Traveller sites. Both local authorities and RSLs are eligible for funding under the Gypsy and Traveller Sites Grant.

- 3.6 Since the introduction of the Housing Act 2004, it has been made clear that Gypsy and Traveller accommodation need and requirements should feature in local authority Housing and Homelessness¹⁴ Strategies. Authorities have been informed that, in line with their obligations under the Human Rights Act 1998, the needs and way of life of Gypsies and Travellers must be considered when considering accommodation applications.
- 3.7 The Government is also planning two Bills for the next session of Parliament which could impact upon Gypsies and Travellers - the Housing and Regeneration Bill and the Planning Reform Bill. Both these Bills could offer significant amendments to how accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers is provided.¹⁵

Regional policy

- 3.8 In terms of regional planning policy, Regional Planning Guidance for the North West (RPG13) (March 2003) did not mention Gypsies and Travellers. The North West Plan (the draft regional spatial strategy) which was submitted for consultation in 2006, noted within section 9 'Living in the North West - Ensuring a Strong, Healthy and Just Society' that:

'There is also the requirement to assess the housing needs of gypsies and travellers in the Region. In this respect, the Assembly, in partnership with the Regional Housing Board, is proposing to undertake research on the future requirements of gypsies and travellers, in order to inform a future review of both RSS and the Regional Housing Strategy'.

- 3.9 The Regional Spatial Strategy is currently being revised and a Partial Review is intended to commence in late 2007. The Partial Review will look at a number of issues including the apportionment of pitch requirements amongst local authorities. The Review will be informed by

¹⁴ See Homelessness & Housing Support Directorate (2006) Homelessness Code of Guidance for Local Authorities, CLG.

¹⁵ See the Traveller Law Reform Project for more specific issues and concerns <http://www.travellerslaw.org.uk/pdfs/housingregeneration.pdf>

the results of each Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment completed across the North West.¹⁶

- 3.10 In recognising that each sub-region was working under different time scales to produce GTAAs the North West Regional Assembly commissioned a regionally focused GTAA.¹⁷ Table 4 below shows the estimated sub-regional pitch requirements from this GTAA.

Table 4: Summary of Residential Pitch Requirements: North West Region and Sub-regions: 2006 to 2011 Area Estimated requirement

| Area | Estimated pitch requirement |
|--------------------------|--|
| Cheshire Partnership | 79-112 + 17 pitches for Travelling Showpeople (TS) |
| Cumbria | 12 + 16 pitches for TS |
| Greater Manchester | 87 + 149 pitches for TS |
| Lancashire | 126-147 + 7 pitches for TS |
| Merseyside | 28 |
| North West Region | 332-386 + 189 pitches for TS |

- 3.11 In line with ODPM Circular 01/2006, the Interim Statement urges local authorities in areas with proven need to act to make provision in advance of the full regional planning process, and to use the various available powers to ensure sites are developed.

Local Policies, Plans and Strategies

- 3.12 All current development plans except Lake District National Park Authority and South Lakeland District Council include a policy towards Gypsy and Traveller sites. The relevant extracts of these plans are shown in detail in Appendix 1. None of these local plans are pro-active and most leave considerable discretion in their implementation.
- 3.13 All authorities except Allerdale Borough Council indicated that there will be relevant policies in the emerging Development Plan Documents under the new planning system.

¹⁶ In the absence of completed GTAAs for Greater Manchester, Cumbria and Merseyside the North West Regional Assembly are being informed by the findings of the regional GTAA.

¹⁷ Brown, P *et al* (2007) North West Regional Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation and Related Services Assessment, SHUSU, The University of Salford.

- 3.14 All authorities indicated that there were no sites/locations considered as suitable for Gypsy and Traveller development. In terms of the sorts of areas that would be deemed suitable for Gypsy and Traveller site provision and the criteria that would satisfy a successful planning application authorities tended to refer to their particular Local Plan or refer to general development control criteria. Lake District National Park Authority stated that evidence of need for such development would be a key factor.

4. Gypsies and Travellers in the Study Area: The Current Picture

- 4.1 This chapter looks at the Count of Gypsy and Traveller Caravans in order to present what is known about Gypsies and Travellers within the Study Area. In particular, this section presents information on the size and spatial distribution of the Gypsy and Traveller population.

Caravan numbers and trends from the caravan count

- 4.2 The Caravan Count is far from perfect, but at present it remains the only official source of information on the size and distribution of a population that remains relatively unknown. Although a number of local authorities are able to provide very accurate information for the Count, generally speaking the Count needs to be treated with caution. Nationally speaking, a number of authorities occasionally report problems of access to the recording system, technical issues around submitting the information, or failures in reporting caravan numbers in time. As a result, the information provided by the Caravan Count may not always accurately reflect the actual numbers of caravans and sites in the area at that time; however, when tempered by locally held knowledge it can be extremely useful as a broad guide. Furthermore, it provides a vital starting point in the attempts of local authorities to ascertain levels of need given the general absence of increased provision since 1994.
- 4.3 According to the most recent Caravan Count there were a reported total of 107 caravans across the Study Area. The returns for the last five Caravan Counts across the Study Area are presented in the table in Appendix 2. What stands out from these figures is that the vast majority of Gypsy and Traveller caravans are accommodated on authorised privately owned provision (82% of all caravans). According to the Caravan Count all authorities had caravans present in some form, with the exception of Allerdale Borough Council, which had none, and Copeland Borough Council as the relevant information was not received from that authority. Carlisle City Council (44) and Eden District Council (32) had the highest numbers of caravans which was largely due to the private site provision in those areas. Unauthorised encampments feature in a number of authorities, with South Lakeland District Council accommodating the largest numbers of caravans on unauthorised encampments, with 14 caravans at the last count (July 2007). Interestingly no unauthorised developments were recorded in the Study Area.
- 4.4 Table 5 shows the distribution of caravans in the Study Area by type of site at July 2007. The proportions are compared with the North West Region and England. The Study Area has a very distinctive distribution. The majority of caravans are on private sites (82%) with the remainder on unauthorised sites on land that is not Gypsy-owned (18%). Both proportions are significantly lower than the regional and national averages.

Table 5: Caravans by Type of Site July 2007

| Type of site | Study Area | | North West | England |
|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|----------|
| | Number | % | % | % |
| Social rented | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Private | 88 | 82 | 13 | 1 |
| Unauthorised Developments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unauthorised Encampments | 19 | 18 | 10 | 1 |
| Total | 107 | 100 | 23 | 2 |

4.5 Table 6 summarises caravan numbers for the Study Area by type of site for January 1994 and 2007, and July in 1994 and 2007. The types of unauthorised sites were not distinguished in 1994 and 'unauthorised site' includes both Gypsy-owned and other land.

Table 6: Summary of Caravan Numbers 1994 and 2007

| Type of site | January | | | July | | |
|---------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | 1994 | 2007 | % change | 1994 | 2007 | % change |
| Social rented | 8 | 0 | -100% | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Private | 100 | 160 | +60% | 93 | 88 | -5% |
| Unauthorised | 34 | 6 | -82% | 20 | 19 | -5% |
| Total | 142 | 166 | +17% | 113 | 107 | -5% |

4.6 In terms of the Caravan Count comparison over time, there is an indication that:

- Overall caravan numbers have slightly increased by 17% (January to January) and decreased slightly by 5% (July to July). This illustrates the problems in comparing point-in-time figures to check trends.
- An increase in caravans on authorised private sites is shown in January/January (+60%). This increase more than offsets the significant decreases in caravans on both socially rented (-


100%) and unauthorised sites (-82%) when measured January to January.

- The number of caravans on social rented sites has decreased to no provision from January/January (-100%).
- The number of caravans on unauthorised sites has remained relatively similar from July 1994 to 2007, but has decreased significantly from January 1994 to 2007.

4.7 The charts on the following pages illustrate Study Area changes in caravan numbers by type of site over time, which amplifies the apparent trends revealed in the table above.


4.8 Figure 1 shows that the number of caravans on socially rented sites has fluctuated at times over the period.

Figure 1: Caravans on Socially Rented Sites: January 1994 to July 2007




4.9 Figure 2 shows that numbers of caravans on authorised private sites have varied over the period albeit with some marked seasonal fluctuations at times.

Figure 2: Caravans on Private Authorised Sites: January 1994 to July 2007




4.10 Figure 3 for caravans on unauthorised sites shows a fluctuating pattern over time - remaining within similar parameters - with a peak during 2001.

Figure 3: Caravans on Unauthorised Sites: January 1994 to July 2007



4.11 Figure 4 brings these caravans figures together and adds a total line.

Figure 4: Caravans by Type of Site: January 1994 to 2007



Unauthorised sites

- 4.12 Because unauthorised sites include both unauthorised developments and unauthorised encampments, overall trends can hide significant shifts between the two forms of unauthorised site. Table 7 presents the breakdown of caravan numbers on different types of unauthorised sites in 1998 (when the figures were first available) and 2007. Because some numbers are small, the change calculations often seem dramatic. Caravans on Gypsy/Traveller-owned land usually equate with unauthorised development of sites; caravans on other land with unauthorised encampments.

Table 7: Summary of Caravan Numbers on Unauthorised Sites 1998 and 2007

| Type of site | January | | | July | | |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| | 1998 | 2007 | % change | 1998 | 2007 | % change |
| Gypsy land: tolerated | 2 | 0 | Infinite decrease | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gypsy land: not tolerated | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gypsy land: total | 2 | 0 | Infinite decrease | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other land: tolerated | 1 | 0 | Infinite decrease | 0 | 5 | +500 |
| Other land: not tolerated | 4 | 6 | +50 | 17 | 14 | -18 |
| Other land: total | 5 | 6 | +20 | 17 | 19 | +12 |
| Total | 7 | 6 | -14 | 17 | 19 | +12 |

Geographical patterns

4.13 Table 8 shows the distribution of caravans between local authorities by type of site at January 1994.

Table 8: Caravans by Type of Site by Local Authority January 1994

| Type of site | Study Area | Allerdale | Barrow-in-Furness | Carlisle | Copeland | Eden | South Lakeland |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------------|
| Social rented sites | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Private sites | 100 | 0 | 20 | 52 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| Unauthorised sites (all) | 34 | 3 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Total | 142 | 3 | 32 | 71 | 0 | 28 | 8 |

4.14 Table 9 shows the distribution of caravans between local authorities by type of site at January 2007. Carlisle City Council and Eden District Council have the highest caravan numbers, followed by Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council.

Table 9: Caravans by Type of Site by Local Authority January 2007

| Type of site | Study Area | Allerdale | Barrow-in-Furness | Carlisle | Copeland | Eden | South Lakeland |
|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------|------------|----------|-----------|----------------|
| Social rented sites | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Private sites | 160 | 0 | 16 | 108 | 0 | 38 | 0 |
| Unauthorised - Gypsy-owned land | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Unauthorised - other land | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 166 | 0 | 16 | 114 | 0 | 38 | 0 |

- 4.15 Comparing 1994 and 2007, shows that caravan numbers have increased in Carlisle and Eden and have decreased in Barrow-in-Furness, South Lakeland and Allerdale. Copeland had no caravans in the area in 1994 and 2007. The growth in caravans has been mainly in private authorised sites.

5. Size and Characteristics of the Local Gypsy and Traveller Population

- 5.1 This chapter aims to provide some information on the demographics of the sample involved in this accommodation assessment, and uses this to make some indication of the overall size and composition of the Gypsy and Traveller population across the Cumbria Study Area.

Demographic and household characteristics

- 5.2 Characteristics of Gypsy and Traveller communities are often hidden or not widely known. Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments present an ideal opportunity to get to know more about the community at large, particularly in terms of living circumstances, age, Gypsy and Traveller groups and household composition. The following aims to provide some information about the composition of Gypsy and Traveller households in the sample.

Age of interviewees

- 5.3 The age profile of the sample can be seen from Table 10. The 25-39 age group were the most consulted during the assessment, forming 39% of the total sample. This was followed by the 40-49 age group (18%) and the 60-74 age group (17%). In total, nearly a quarter of the sample was over 60 years of age. This age profile bears some similarity to the age profile of other GTAAs in the North West.

Table 10: Age of interviewees

| Age Group | No. | % |
|----------------|-----|----|
| 16-24 | 7 | 5 |
| 25-39 | 51 | 39 |
| 40-49 | 23 | 18 |
| 50-59 | 14 | 11 |
| 60-74 | 22 | 17 |
| 75-84 | 6 | 5 |
| 85+ | 2 | 2 |
| No information | 2 | 2 |

| | |
|--------------|------------|
| Total | 130 |
|--------------|------------|

Household size

5.4 In total, the survey sample accounts for 455 members of the Gypsy and Traveller community in the Cumbria Study Area. The average household size for the whole sample is 3.5 persons - significantly larger than the household size of the non-Traveller population. However, this hides a range in household sizes as indicated in Table 11 below.

Table 11: Household size distribution

| Household Size | No. | % |
|-----------------------|------------|----------|
| 1 Person | 16 | 12 |
| 2 Persons | 35 | 27 |
| 3 Persons | 14 | 11 |
| 4 Persons | 31 | 24 |
| 5 Persons | 15 | 12 |
| 6 Persons | 12 | 9 |
| 7 Persons | 4 | 3 |
| 8 Persons | 1 | 1 |
| 9 Persons | 0 | 0 |
| 10 Persons | 2 | 1 |
| Total | 130 | |

5.5 There were significant differences in the size of households in relation to their current accommodation type as well. As can be seen from Table 12, respondents from unauthorised encampments tended to have the largest households followed by those living in bricks and mortar housing (3.9). Households classed as temporary unauthorised developments had the smallest household size. Travelling Showpeople also had a smaller average household size compared to other Gypsy and Traveller groups.

Table 12: Average household size by accommodation type

| Accommodation type | Average household size |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Unauthorised encampments | 4.4 |
| Bricks and Mortar | 3.9 |
| Private sites | 3.3 |
| Unauthorised development | 3.0 |
| Travelling Showpeople | 2.6 |
| Temp unauthorised development | 2.2 |

Household type

5.6 Table 13 shows the household type by type of accommodation. Families have been classified as follows:

| Family type | Definition |
|---------------|---|
| Single person | - 1 adult |
| Couple | - 2 adults, no children or young adults |
| Young family | - 1 or 2 adults, 1 or more children aged up to 16 years; no young adults |
| Older family | - All adult family with 1 or more children classified as 'young adults' (over 16 years but living within another household) |
| Mixed family | - Family with children under and over 16 years |
| Other | - 3 or more adults, none classified as young adults |

Table 13: Household type by type of accommodation

| Household type | Private sites | Bricks and mortar | Unauthorised encampments | Travelling Showpeople | Unauthorised development | temp Unauthorised development | Total |
|------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|
| Number in sample | 22 | 58 | 17 | 23 | 4 | 6 | 130 |
| | % | % | % | % | % | % | % |
| Single | 14 | 5 | 18 | 22 | 25 | 33 | 13 |
| Couple | 14 | 31 | 12 | 30 | 0 | 33 | 25 |
| Young family | 64 | 41 | 59 | 35 | 50 | 33 | 46 |
| Older family | 5 | 17 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Mixed family | 0 | 5 | 12 | 4 | 25 | 0 | 5 |
| Other | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

5.7 Table 13 shows that:

- Young families are currently the predominant household type in the Study Area.
- Both older and mixed families live in the area which may suggest some demand for separate accommodation from concealed households.

Marital status

5.8 In total, 84% of the interviewees were married. The remainder described their marital status as either widowed (8%), single (6%) or divorced (3%).

Table 14: Marital status of the interview sample

| Marital status | No. | % |
|----------------|-----|----|
| Married | 109 | 84 |

| | | |
|--------------|------------|---|
| Widowed | 10 | 8 |
| Single | 8 | 6 |
| Divorced | 3 | 2 |
| Total | 130 | |

Local connections to the Study Area

5.9 When asked if they felt 'local' to the area where they were currently accommodated, two-thirds of the total sample thought they were (66%). See Table 13 for a breakdown by current accommodation type.

Table 15: Local to the area?

| Accommodation type | No. households local | % of sample |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------------|
| Unauthorised encampments | 6 | 35 |
| Bricks and Mortar | 38 | 66 |
| Private sites | 22 | 55 |
| Unauthorised development | 2 | 50 |
| Travelling Showpeople | 22 | 96 |
| Temp unauthorised development | 6 | 100 |

5.10 As Table 15 shows, a third of households on unauthorised encampments considered themselves local to the area. Just over half of households on the private sites thought they were local, two-thirds of households in bricks and mortar housing reported feeling local. Nearly all Travelling Showpeople respondents felt local to the area. Interestingly, while only visiting the area over the Christmas period, all households on temporary unauthorised developments considered themselves as 'locals'.

Table 16: Reasons for residing in the Study Area (figures in % of sample)

| Household type | Private sites | Bricks and mortar | Unauthorised encampments | Travelling Showpeople | Unauthorised development | temp Unauthorised development | Total |
|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Family lives here | 64 | 88 | 38 | 91 | 75 | 67 | 76 |
| Place of birth | 23 | 35 | 19 | 30 | 50 | 33 | 30 |
| Work | 32 | 7 | 38 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Schooling | 55 | 7 | 0 | 57 | 25 | 0 | 23 |
| Only place I could find | 32 | 0 | 19 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Other | 23 | 0 | 13 | 35 | 25 | 0 | 12 |
| Family/community event | 0 | 7 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Holiday | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

5.11 The presence of family in the Study Area was the major reason why households were residing where they were. This was particularly the case for Travelling Showpeople and Gypsies and Travellers in bricks and mortar accommodation. This is broadly consistent with findings from other GTAAs. Family connection and place of birth were clearly the main reasons for households 'wintering' on temporary unauthorised encampments for staying in the area. Just over a quarter reported that work opportunities were also a particular reason they were in the area - this was particularly the case for Travelling Showpeople. Very few people cited family/community events and holidays as being the reason why they were accommodated where they were.

5.12 Thus, from these findings the majority of Gypsies and Travellers on sites and in housing can be seen to 'belong', in some way, to the Study Area.

Gypsy and Traveller groups

5.13 Table 17 below shows the number of interviews carried out with different Gypsy and Traveller groups.

Table 17: Interviewees by Gypsy and Traveller group

| Gypsy and Traveller groups | No. of households | % |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Romany/Gypsy (English) | 66 | 51 |
| Travelling Showperson | 24 | 18 |
| Traveller (not specified) | 16 | 12 |
| Irish Traveller | 11 | 9 |
| Scottish Gypsy/Traveller | 9 | 7 |
| Welsh Gypsy/Traveller | 2 | 2 |
| Other | 2 | 2 |
| Total | 130 | |

5.14 As can be seen, the largest group in the sample were Romany/Gypsy (English) forming over half of the sample (51%). This was followed by Travelling Showpeople (18%). A total of sixteen of respondents described themselves as the more generic 'Traveller' (12% of the sample). Irish Travellers formed only 1 in 10 people in the sample (9%). With regards to those who identified themselves as 'other', one person provided no further details, while the other described them self as 'nomadic'.

The size of the local Gypsy and Traveller community

5.15 For most minority ethnic communities, presenting data about the size of the community in question is usually relatively straightforward (with the exception of communities who have large numbers of irregular migrants and migrant workers, etc. amongst them). However, for Gypsies and Travellers, one of the most difficult issues is providing accurate information on this population (see Chapter 4). As a result, we have used information provided by the local authorities and others, together with our survey findings, in order to provide a best estimate as to the size of the Cumbria Gypsy and Traveller population at the time of the assessment (see Table 18). Due to their mobility levels, this estimate does not include households on unauthorised encampments or households on the temporary unauthorised developments.

Table 18: Estimated Study Area Gypsy and Traveller population

| Type of accommodation | Families/Households (based on 1 pitch = 1 household) | Individuals | Derivation |
|---------------------------|---|-------------|---|
| Private sites | 54 | 178 | Estimated number of pitches multiplied by average household size from the survey (3.3) |
| Housing | 120 ¹⁸ | 468 | Number of families estimated to be in the area multiplied by average household size from the survey (3.9) |
| Unauthorised developments | 5 | 15 | Estimated number of families in the area multiplied by the average household size from the survey (3.0) |
| Travelling Showpeople | 38 | 110 | Estimated number of families in the area multiplied by the average household size from the survey (2.9) |
| Total | 217 | 771 | |

¹⁸ This is based on the operational experiences of the fieldwork team and Community Interviewers. Due to a lack of information, this is likely to be an underestimate of the total population in bricks and mortar accommodation across the Study Area.

- 5.16 We estimate that there are at least 771 Gypsies and Travellers in the Study Area, although the estimate for housed Gypsies and Travellers is likely to be an under-estimate.

6. Authorised Site Provision - Findings

- 6.1 A certain degree of caution needs to be taken when extrapolating the characteristics, trends and needs of the Gypsy and Traveller population from the Caravan Counts and other such data alone. In order to provide more specific information on the local Gypsy and Traveller population, this chapter draws upon the survey completed by local authorities on site provision, stakeholder views and knowledge, and the views of Gypsies and Travellers who occupy these sites.

Socially rented provision

- 6.2 There is currently no socially rented (local authority) provision available in the Study Area.
- 6.3 Carlisle City Council indicated that two local authority sites has closed since 1994; one residential site accommodating 12 pitches - this site was sold, and one transit site of 40 pitches - this site was closed.

Plans for socially rented provision

- 6.4 All authorities indicated that there were no plans to provide a socially rented Gypsy and Traveller site over the next five years; although a number of authorities qualified this statement as being dependent upon the findings of the GTAA. However, there was some indication from Carlisle City Council that this was something they were looking to pursue.

Private Gypsy and Traveller sites

- 6.5 In light of the lack of socially rented provision, authorised private accommodation is the sole form of authorised provision in the Study Area. This section looks at private sites across the Study Area.
- 6.6 From the information provided by the local authorities there were 2 private sites identified (see Table 19 below). It proved difficult to accurately establish the pitch capacity of all private sites. The pitch capacity, stated in Table 19, is drawn from information held by local authority officers where planning permissions are often based on maximum caravan occupancy rather than clearly defined pitches. Where pitch numbers are not defined by the authority or the number provided to the research team did not appear accurate upon observation of the site, we have used a 1.7 caravan to pitch ratio to ascertain the approximate number of pitches.¹⁹ However, it must be noted that such ratios can and do change over time and this is merely indicative.

¹⁹ Where this is the case the site concerned is indicated by *

Table 19: Private sites with the Study Area

| Local authority | Site | Est Total Pitches ²⁰ | Est Pitches available to use |
|-----------------------|----------------|---|---|
| Carlisle City Council | Hadrian's Park | 54 (30 residential; 24 transit) ²¹ | 30 ²² (mixture of residential and transit) |
| Eden District Council | Lakeland View | 44 (unknown mixed use)* | 44 |

- 6.7 It proved difficult to accurately establish, not only the pitch capacity of the sites, but also the split between their use (ie residential and transit), as well as the number of pitches that were available for use. It is thought that at **Hadrian's Park**, a total 24 pitches are currently closed/unavailable - it is thought that this is due to a desire for refurbishment of the site, although there were reports by stakeholders and ex/residents that their closure was a result of some discrimination towards those who had previously used the site. Out of the pitches available these are a combination of pitches (residential and transit) we assume that 20 are for residential purposes and 10 for transit. The **Lakeland View** site was stated to have a capacity of 75 caravans (a potential capacity of 44 pitches using a 1.7 caravan to pitch ratio). This was a mixed use site (both residential and transit), although it is unclear as to the proportion of each - it was thought that all pitches were available. We assume that 34 pitches are for residential use and the remaining 10 are used on a transit basis. It is therefore estimated that these two sites provide approximately 74 pitches.
- 6.8 Each local authority was asked how the number of private sites/pitches had changed since 2001. The majority of authorities reported that their provision had remained static, only Carlisle City Council reported that there had been the reduction of 1 site (12 pitches) over this period. Similarly, only Carlisle City Council thought that the number of private sites/pitches would increase over the next five years.
- 6.9 In comparison to socially rented sites (where they exist), where there is often good access to management information via local authority records, it is difficult to gain an accurate idea about occupancy levels

²⁰ For use exclusively by Gypsies and Travellers

²¹ The local authority reported that the site has permission for 70 pitches but due to space and overlapping it is not possible to implement all 70. A total of 16 pitches can be used by anyone with only 54 restricted for use by Gypsies and Travellers.

²² The remaining pitches are thought to be considered closed by the site owner

and vacancies on private sites. As a result we have assumed that these sites were at capacity at the time of the assessment. Therefore the base supply figure used in the assessment for private sites is 54 residential pitches and 20 transit pitches.

Residents' views:

- 6.10 All respondents on the private sites provided details about how many living units (caravans/trailers) they had. Fifteen respondents (68%) had 1 trailer and five respondents had 2 trailers (23%). The average number of living units per household was 1.3 trailers.
- 6.11 Over half of households (65%) thought they had enough space for their needs. Those households who felt that they did not have enough space all attributed this to being constrained by the size of their pitch. All of the households reporting small pitch sizes were renting their pitch rather than being an owner-occupier.
- 6.12 Site residents of private sites were asked, on a five-point scale from very good to very poor, what they thought about a number of aspects of their site including: size of pitch; design of site; neighbours on site; location; facilities on site; and, management. The vast majority of respondents on the sites viewed these issues positively (see Table 20). Issues of management and facilities were the two main areas which generated the most diverse responses. A significant number of respondents were not happy about these issues; however, it was the site in Carlisle which generated the most negative views from respondents around site management.

Table 20: Views on the site (in %)

| Issue | Very good | Good | Neutral | Poor | Very Poor |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|
| Size of pitch | 32 | 46 | 9 | 9 | 5 |
| Design of site | 32 | 41 | 5 | 18 | 5 |
| Neighbours on site | 46 | 46 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Location of site | 82 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Facilities on site | 14 | 9 | 9 | 27 | 41 |
| Management | 23 | 18 | 14 | 23 | 23 |

- 6.13 Prior to the fieldwork commencing we received various reports from stakeholders that part of the Hadrian's Park (Carlisle) site had closed or

families had been evicted. It remains unclear the precise details of what occurred on the site, but what was evident is that part of the site was closed at the time of the assessment and the owner had given notice to leave (due to ill health of the owner) to a number of residents in the form of a letter. A number of these households became unauthorised encampments and unauthorised developments (see Chapter 7), while some households left the Study Area entirely. The Study Team managed to interview a number of these households to get their views on what had occurred.

- 6.14 The views of ex-residents of the Carlisle site indicated that it was because of the owner's ill-health that they were required to leave; however, no one the Study Team consulted thought this was the 'real' reason. One respondent thought that this was just a blanket excuse to remove certain families, as the owner was allegedly moving different families onto the site in their place. These ex-residents made a number of allegations about how the site was run covering issues such as: rent levels, charging for electricity and services, and harassment (verbal and physical). Consultation with the site owner indicated that there had been some issues with families on the transit part of the site, but also that they wanted to refurbish it, subject to funding. As mentioned above, the precise details of what happened are unclear; however, it was apparent that there was a degree of exclusion on this site, which is similar to other GTAA areas where there are large privately owned/run sites and where this is the sole form of provision.
- 6.15 Experiences around access to basic facilities were sought from those we spoke to on all private sites (see Table 21 below). As can be seen, most households had access to the services we enquired about. There were a small number of people who reported a lack of access a postal service, but it was unclear why this was the case. Less than half of respondents reported having a lack of access to somewhere safe for children to play, while just 24% of amenity blocks were heated.

Table 21: Access to facilities on private sites

| | % of sample have access |
|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Rubbish collection | 100 |
| Water | 100 |
| Electricity supply | 100 |
| Eating/sitting space | 100 |
| WC | 91 |
| Postal service | 91 |
| Kitchen facilities | 91 |
| Shed (%heated) | 77 (24%) |
| Shower | 64 |
| Laundry | 59 |
| Fire precautions | 50 |
| Children's play area | 41 |
| Bath | 23 |

- 6.16 Twelve households on private sites (55%) mentioned concerns they had around health and safety on their sites. When asked to expand upon their concerns, the majority of comments referred to hygiene and WC facilities:

"The toilets are bad, they are dirty and only two of them are working"

"The toilet block just isn't clean - they smell"

"The toilets are very bad, there needs to be more of them"

- 6.17 The remaining comments tended to highlight the lack of facilities for children on the site:

“There’s no where for the kids to play so they end up playing in the old block of toilets.”

“The kids have nowhere to play, the site manager doesn’t like the kids and the kids are frightened of him”

“There’s no where for the kids to play, there’s no play area”

- 6.18 Just 4 households on private sites in the Study Area (18%) said that they had an additional base elsewhere. Three of these respondents said the base was another private site. The locations given were Leeds (2 respondents) and Stockport. The remaining respondent was having a house built and was staying on the site while the building work was being completed. They indicated that this house was in the Carlisle area.

7. Planning and the unauthorised Development of Sites - Findings

- 7.1 This chapter looks at a range of issues around Gypsies and Travellers providing pitches/sites for themselves within the Study Area. In particular, this looks at private authorised provision, planning applications, planning issues and the unauthorised development of Gypsy and Traveller caravan sites. Data from the local authorities and Gypsies and Travellers are explored.

Planning applications

- 7.2 Only Carlisle City Council indicated that there had been any planning applications received, granted, refused and granted on appeal since 2001. They expected the number of private Gypsy and Traveller sites to increase over the next five years “due to anticipated need for emergency accommodation”. The other authorities indicated that they had received no applications and most indicated that this would not increase over the next five years, with the exception of Lake District National Park Authority who stated that it was difficult to say and Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council who did not provide an answer.

Unauthorised development of Gypsy and Traveller caravan sites

- 7.3 At the time of the assessment there were four unauthorised developments of Gypsy and Traveller sites across the Cumbria Study Area. Two of these were identified by the local authority with both located within the boundary of Carlisle City Council. The remaining two unauthorised developments were located by the research team and were found within the boundaries of Eden District Council and Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council. The Barrow-in-Furness development consisted of a household living, on a residential basis as opposed to short-term, in trailer accommodation in the grounds of a bricks and mortar dwelling which belonged to a family member. This breaks down as follows:

- Carlisle - 2 sites/5 caravans (approx 3 pitches)
- Eden - 1 site/approx 1 pitch
- Barrow-in-Furness - 1 site/approx 1 pitch

- 7.4 The estimated total pitches involved in unauthorised developments equated to approximately 5 pitches.
- 7.5 Carlisle City Council and Allerdale Borough Council expected the unauthorised development of Gypsy and Traveller sites to increase over the next five years; Eden District Council, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council and Lake District National Park Authority said that they did not expect an increase; and South Lakeland District Council said they did not know whether or not there would be an increase.

Views of residents on 'regular' unauthorised developments

- 7.6 During our fieldwork we managed to consult with households on all four of the 'regular' unauthorised developments. This consists of one interview per development (4 separate households). Given the small sample size, the views of residents are discussed as real cases rather than as indicative percentages. In addition, we also managed to consult with six 'temporary' unauthorised developments, which consisted of households who were 'wintering' or visiting family who lived in bricks and mortar accommodation in the Study Area over the Christmas period. These households had pulled on to their families' property over the period and were living within their trailer. Some of the views of these households are discussed at the end of this section.
- 7.7 All households on the unauthorised developments provided details about how many living units they had: 1 household had 1 unit; and 3 households had 2 units. The average number of living units per household was 1.8.
- 7.8 Only 1 respondent thought that this did not give them enough space, with this respondent requiring a larger plot of land than they currently had.
- 7.9 Residents of the developments were asked, on a five-point scale from very good to very poor, what they thought about a number of aspects of their site including: size of pitch; design of site; neighbours on site; location; facilities on site; and, management. Most of these respondents on the sites viewed these issues positively; however, in a few cases people commented quite negatively on the size of the site and its location. From conversations held with these residents there was a particular view that they had felt pushed to move onto this land as a result of being evicted/forced off one of the private sites in the Study Area. This reportedly meant they were not as able to make an informed decision about where to live as might otherwise have been possible.
- 7.10 Experiences around access to basic facilities were sought from those on the developments. Access to facilities varied. Two respondents were able to access most facilities (water, WC, electricity, rubbish collection, etc.). The remaining two households reported a lack of access to all facilities that we enquired about. When asked how they coped with a lack of access to water, both responded by saying they used a family members water supply from near by.
- 7.11 All four respondents had concerns about health and safety, but they did not expand on what these concerns were.
- 7.12 With regards to the six households who were 'wintering' in the grounds of families' houses, four were intending to stay there for around 3 months. Two households indicated that they intended staying for longer - up to around 12 months. Two respondents commented that they were aware they had to be 'careful' not to get their family into trouble with the

authority for being there. Interestingly, when asked, all 6 households were looking for site-based accommodation in the local area (Carlisle).

Planning issues

- 7.13 Local authority officers were asked if they could volunteer an example of good practice in relation to the planning approach. Only two authorities offered an example. One authority offered more general comments rather than being planning specific:

"We've not had to engage in the past. Changes to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act has meant that local authorities have had to address and reassess how they engage. The LDNPA now attends the 'Joint Agency Strategic Planning Group: Gypsy and Traveller Issues'" (Lake District National Park Authority).

- 7.14 While the other authority referred to joint agency working:

"Cross country working, joint agency with Gypsy and Traveller representatives, Police, Social Services, Planning, Environmental Health, Housing. Regular meetings to discuss issue, needs and protocols" (Eden District Council)

The Joint Agency Strategic Planning Group

The Joint Agency Strategic Planning Group, for which Cumbria Constabulary is the secretariat, was regarded by a large number of stakeholders as a significant form of good practice in the area. Although this group does not meet to discuss physical/development planning issues, it is widely attended and provides a link between all the different agencies that operate in the area, as well as providing an advisory and information sharing role for those agencies who attend. The formation of the group was built around information sharing and possible service development around managing unauthorised encampments, which resulted in the production of the Joint Protocol for Managing Unauthorised Encampments. Members of the group however, often discuss other issues associated with Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and wider service needs.

The experience of Gypsies and Travellers in relation to planning

- 7.15 We were keen to explore, with Gypsies and Travellers, their experience of buying land and/or going through the planning process.
- 7.16 We asked all respondents if they had ever purchased their own land. Just 16 respondents, including 3 Travelling Showpeople, had, at some time in the past, bought their own land. Twelve of these respondents applied for planning permission - it is unclear from the findings where in the UK this land was purchased. Seven of the 16 respondents were now accommodated either in bricks and mortar housing or on unauthorised encampments - with the remainder living on private sites or unauthorised developments.

- 7.17 We asked respondents to elaborate on their experiences of the planning system in order to gain some insight into the process from their perspective. Interestingly, in many of these cases the application made was for a self-build bricks and mortar dwelling rather than a pitch/site for trailers. Apart from the households on the unauthorised developments, whose application for planning permission was ongoing, all but one of the respondents reported that their application had been refused.

8. Unauthorised Encampments - Findings

- 8.1 The presence and incidence of unauthorised encampments is a significant issue impacting upon local authorities, landowners, Gypsies and Travellers, the settled population and the public purse. Just as unauthorised developments are often cited as a major source tension - unauthorised encampments are often the type of accommodation which has become synonymous with Gypsies and Travellers and is often a further source of tension with the wider community.
- 8.2 Due to the nature of unauthorised encampments (ie unpredictability, seasonal fluctuations, etc.), it is very difficult to grasp a comprehensive picture of need for residential and/or transit accommodation without considering a range of interconnected issues. This section, however, seeks to look at the 'known' prevalence of unauthorised encampments and views of households on such encampments in order to draw some tentative indication as to level and nature of need for authorised provision.

Policies on managing unauthorised encampments

- 8.3 Three of the authorities have formal written policies for managing unauthorised encampments: Allerdale Borough Council; Carlisle City Council; and, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council. The remaining authorities indicated that they did not have a written policy, with the exception of Eden District Council who had a policy specifically for Appleby Fair, which dealt with issues of sanitation, water, litter, etc.
- 8.4 All authorities are party to joint agreements or protocols with the Police, other local authorities and other agencies for managing unauthorised encampments.
- 8.5 In most cases, first contact with Gypsies and Travellers on unauthorised encampments is usually made by a council officer. Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council, Allerdale Borough Council and Eden District Council indicated that a Police officer can also be the first contact. In addition, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council stated that the County Council may also make first contact. Lake District National Park Authority indicated that they were not sure at this stage who was the first to make contact with Gypsies and Travellers on unauthorised encampments.

Good practice on managing unauthorised encampments

- 8.6 Four authorities referred to the Joint Protocol as an area of good practice (Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council, South Lakeland District Council, Eden District Council and Allerdale Borough Council). Again these were more general comments rather than being specific to managing unauthorised encampments:

"Joint Protocol seems to be working well so far. A new Protocol is being developed on a County-wide basis with representatives from the Gypsy/Traveller community. Informal contact and building trust works well" (South Lakeland District Council).

"[We] have a County-wide Gypsy and Traveller group that has established a Joint Protocol. Police, Gypsy and Traveller representatives, local authority, etc. all attend meetings and have developed this Protocol. [It] also provides a forum for discussing forthcoming events/issues, e.g. Gypsy and Traveller housing needs assessment, Appleby Horse Fair, etc." (Eden District Council).

Geographical patterns and incidence of unauthorised encampments

- 8.7 When asked whether or not they keep records of encampments, the following information was provided: Carlisle City Council, Allerdale Borough Council and Eden District Council log all known encampments; Copeland Borough Council log some encampments; Lake District National Park Authority and Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council did not log encampments; and, South Lakeland District Council indicated that they did not keep records at present.
- 8.8 The number of separate encampments experienced during 2006 is shown below.
- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| • South Lakeland | 3 ²³ (normally 2 in area) |
| • Lake District | No information (normally none in area) |
| • Barrow-in-Furness | 3 (normally none in area) |
| • Carlisle | 31 although 4 of these are thought to be related to Appleby - 27 'normal' encampments (normally 1 in area) |
| • Allerdale | 18 (normally 1 in area) |
| • Eden | 4 (normally 1 in area) |
| • Copeland | 2 (normally none in the area) |
- 8.9 This gives a total of 57 known unauthorised encampments across the Cumbria Study Area, which is potentially an underestimate. It is clear from this information that the Caravan Count does not provide a reliable indication as to the presence of households on unauthorised encampments in the Study Area.
- 8.10 Details of location, number of caravans, and action taken were provided for these encampments, with the exception of Carlisle City Council who only provided these details for 4 out of 31 encampments. From the information provided, the average encampment size was just over 3 caravans (range 1 to 11).

²³ South Lakeland indicated that they did not know how many encampments had occurred in 2006; however, they provided information for three encampments and this figure has been used.

8.11 In terms of action taken:

- **Carlisle City Council:** 3 'notice to quit', 1 'negotiated'
- **Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council:** 3 'leave by negotiation'
- **Allerdale Borough Council:** 18 'moved from site'
- **Eden District Council:** no information provided
- **South Lakeland District Council:** no information provided
- **Copeland Borough Council:** all 'requested to move'

Trends in unauthorised encampments

8.12 Authorities were asked whether there was any seasonal variation in the number of encampments that they experienced. With the exception of the Lake District National Park Authority and Copeland Borough Council who have very few or no encampments, all authorities indicated that there were usually more unauthorised encampments during the summer.

8.13 Authorities were also asked how the number of unauthorised encampments has changed over the past 5 years. Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council, Carlisle City Council, Eden District Council and Allerdale Borough Council stated that the number of encampments had remained the same. Lake District National Park Authority and South Lakeland District Council did not provide any information on this.

8.14 In terms of size of group, Copeland Borough Council, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council, Eden District Council and Allerdale Borough Council said that encampments had remained broadly the same size over the past 5 years, while Carlisle City Council said the size had decreased. Again, Lake District National Park Authority and South Lakeland District Council did not provide any information on this. Only Carlisle City Council offered any comments on observable changes to unauthorised encampments over the past 5 year, stating that there was increased use of industrial estates and business parks.

8.15 Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council, Carlisle City Council, Eden District Council, Allerdale Borough Council and South Lakeland District Council indicated that most unauthorised encampments were people who were 'in transit', with South Lakeland District Council also stating that people were 'local' as well. They also made reference to Gypsies and Travellers coming from neighbouring areas such as Carnforth and Morecambe.

8.16 When asked how they expected the number of encampments to change over the next 5 years, Copeland Borough Council, Eden District Council, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council, Allerdale Borough Council and Carlisle City Council all expected the number of caravans on unauthorised encampments to remain broadly the same, while

South Lakeland District Council expected the number to increase. Lake District National Park Authority did not provide any information on this.

Living on unauthorised encampments - views from Gypsies and Travellers

- 8.17 As mentioned previously, a total of 17 households were interviewed on unauthorised encampments. The majority of respondents were Romany Gypsies (11 respondents/65%). Three respondents described themselves as Scottish Gypsy or Traveller; two respondents were Irish Travellers; and, one described themselves as 'Traveller'. Interestingly, the number of Irish Travellers included in the sample was at a low level compared with other GTAA areas, where Irish Travellers tend to feature in much greater numbers on unauthorised encampments.
- 8.18 All households interviewed on unauthorised encampments provided details about how many living units they had: twelve households had 1 trailer; three households had 2 trailers; and, two households had 4 trailers. The average number of living units was 1.5 trailers per household.
- 8.19 When the average household size for encampments (4.4) is divided by the average number of trailers households possess, this provides us with an average of 2.9 people per trailer on unauthorised encampments.
- 8.20 In terms of space their accommodation provided them with, all but one respondent felt that their trailers provided them with enough space. A lack of space in this one instance was attributed to needing more or larger living units.
- 8.21 The majority of those interviewed had been on the encampment for a short period of time. Thirteen (76%) had been there for less than 1 week and just two respondents had been there for between 2 weeks and one month. Two households could not provide an answer to the question.
- 8.22 With regards to how long they anticipated staying on the encampment, 7 respondents (41%) intended staying for up to 1 week, the remaining respondents (59%) did not know. Respondents were asked to elaborate on why they would be leaving the encampment. Five respondents indicated that they would be leaving due to eviction, rather than leaving of their own volition. Of the remaining two respondents, one talked about how the piece of land was 'dangerous' due to its proximity to the road, and the other spoke about how they had 'run out of grazing land for the horses'.
- 8.23 When asked if they would like to stay in this area (ie local authority area where interview took place), 8 respondents did not know (47%); 6 respondents (35%) indicated that they would like to stay in the area; while 3 households (18%) wanted to leave the area. Two households reported having a base elsewhere; both of these were pitches on a private site in Scotland. The six people who wanted to stay in the area were interviewed in Carlisle (2 respondents), Eden (1 respondent) and

Allerdale (3 respondents). With regards to what type of accommodation they were looking for, a number of responses were given. Three people wanted their own piece of land (with or without planning permission). One person indicated that they were looking for a council site. Interestingly, two respondents reported that they were happy to find other unauthorised encampments to pull onto.

- 8.24 For those households currently living on unauthorised encampments, access to most of the very basic facilities was a major issue (see Table 22 below). Most of the respondents talked about relying on garages, service stations and supermarkets to meet their needs. The following comments are representative of views from households on unauthorised encampments with regards to accessing basic services:

"We go to Asda when it's open and get water from the local garage. We've got a generator for power"

"I'll go to the garage if I need the toilet or I sometimes go to the nearest hedge. Got a generator for electricity so we're ok there"

"I tend to just knock on doors for water"

Table 22: Access to basic facilities on unauthorised encampments

| Type of facility | Have access? (%) |
|---------------------------|------------------|
| Electricity supply | 65 |
| WC/Toilet | 24 |
| Water | 12 |
| Showers | 0 |
| Waste disposal/collection | 0 |

- 8.25 As can be seen from Table 22 above, no households reported being able to use waste disposal facilities. From consultations undertaken as part of this study, as well as correspondence we received from various Parish Councils, this was repeatedly reported as one of the main areas of tension between the settled community, as Gypsies and Travellers in many villages, towns and local areas become synonymous with fly-tipping. However, as many Gypsies and Travellers use vans as their means of transport, their access to local authority recycling centres is restricted by the exclusion of 'business' disposals, unless a charge is paid. Although some Gypsies and Travellers do discard such waste on land which they have used/encamped upon, it has also been known for non-Gypsies and Travellers to use such sites as fly-tipping areas in order to deflect blame from themselves to transient Gypsies and Travellers.

9. Gypsies and Travellers in Social and Private Bricks and Mortar Accommodation - Findings

- 9.1 The number of Gypsies and Travellers currently accommodated within bricks and mortar accommodation is unknown, but potentially large. Movement to and from housing is a major concern if the strategic approach, policies and working practices of local authorities are to remain effective. One of the main issues of the consultation revolved around the role that housing services do, should and could play in the accommodation of Gypsies and Travellers within the Study Area.
- 9.2 This chapter looks at the information held by the authorities around Gypsies and Travellers and housing, and looks at the approaches these authorities take. It then continues with analysing the responses of housed Gypsies and Travellers who took part in the assessment.

Housing policies

- 9.3 Authorities were asked whether specific reference is made to Gypsies and Travellers in various housing strategies:

Current housing strategy Yes for Allerdale Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council, Eden District Council and South Lakeland District Council;

No for Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council and Carlisle City Council;

No for Lake District National Park Authority, but this is being addressed in LDF.

Current homelessness strategy Yes for Allerdale Borough Council;

No for Carlisle City Council, Copeland Borough Council, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council, South Lakeland District Council and Eden District Council;

Not applicable for Lake District National Park Authority.

Current BME housing strategy Yes for South Lakeland District Council;

No for Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council;

No BME strategy for Allerdale Borough Council, Carlisle City Council, Copeland Borough Council, Eden District Council and Lake District National Park Authority.

- 9.4 Obviously specific inclusion of Gypsies and Travellers is the exception rather than the rule at present, which will require changes when results of the needs assessment are available. Furthermore, no authority within the Study Area currently identifies Gypsies and Travellers in their

ethnic records and monitoring of social housing applications and allocations.

- 9.5 Authorities were asked to provide details of how Gypsies and Travellers who are homeless are supported through the homelessness process. The comments made included:

“All clients presenting as homeless or threatened with homelessness are offered appropriate advice and assistance depending upon their circumstances. If it is a matter of alternative site facilities and a local caravan site is not currently available, then contact would be made with alternative sites nearby. Should none be available, arrangements would be made to accommodate the household within our stock of temporary accommodation. If there was a request for permanent housing, the application would proceed with regards to the DCLG guidelines and Homelessness Legislation” (Carlisle City Council)

“No applications have been received for a number of years and therefore there are no specific services in place to assist this group; however, the advice service is adaptable to meet particular needs of individuals and families. Support and assistance can be accessed, if required, through specialist providers and the Housing Advice Team have experience of providing advice and services to Gypsies and Travellers in other areas” (South Lakeland District Council)

“No bespoke service. [Gypsies and Travellers] would be provided with services on same basis as any other applicant” (Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council)

- 9.6 Allerdale Borough Council indicated that Gypsies and Travellers would be supported and assisted according to their needs.
- 9.7 From our consultations with Gypsies and Travellers it emerged that a small number of them had presented as homeless to the local authority when evicted from/forced to leave one of the private sites. The respondents indicated that they were offered bricks and mortar accommodation as an alternative. One of the respondents we talked to added:

“It shouldn’t be a problem for me, I’ve got a home, it’s just that no one will let me put it anywhere”

- 9.8 There were three pro-active answers to a question about steps taken to provide Gypsies and Travellers with housing advice and assistance or to help them access social housing:

“Housing advice is offered to Gypsies and Travellers either here at the Civic centre or on/off the local sites, depending on the circumstances. Staff take a good deal of time with clients and always take regards to the needs of all minority groups when referring for social housing. Fortnightly nomination meetings with

the local housing provider ensures that allocations are as appropriate as possible” (Carlisle City Council)

“Consultation with the Supported People team in 2006 regarding the needs of this client group concluded that there was a need for additional research into the needs on a Cumbria-wide basis. Further consideration to needs will be introduced in the Cumbria Homelessness Strategy 2008-2013” (South Lakeland District Council)

“Close liaison with housing providers to ensure suitability of accommodation” (Allerdale Borough Council)

Gypsies and Travellers in social housing

- 9.9 Authorities were asked to estimate the number of Gypsies and Travellers currently registered for social housing and the number housed over the last 12 months. Eden District Council, Allerdale Borough Council, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council and South Lakeland District Council did not know, with South Lakeland District Council adding they estimated none. Lake District National Park Authority did not provide any information, while Carlisle City Council stated that they do not have a housing register. No authority was able to comment on trends in the number of Gypsies and Travellers moving into social rented housing over the past 5 years, and none could comment on the expected number of Gypsies and Travellers moving into social housing over the next 5 years.
- 9.10 With regards to how many Gypsies and Travellers had presented as homeless over the past 12 months, all authorities, with the exception of Carlisle City Council, stated that they did not know or that there were none. Carlisle City Council indicated that 2 Gypsies and Travellers had presented as homeless and the reason given was “Notice to quit from caravan site”.
- 9.11 When asked what authorities’ thought were the main reasons why Gypsies and Travellers move into housing, from a list of possible reasons, Allerdale Borough Council and Eden District Council indicated the following reasons:
- Unable to find stopping places when travelling
 - Unable to get a place on a site
 - Harassment or other problems on a site
- 9.12 Carlisle City Council indicated the following main reasons:
- Health reasons
 - Want a permanent house or flat
 - Unable to get a place on a site
 - Harassment or other problems on a site

- 9.13 Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council, Copeland Borough Council, South Lakeland District Council and Lake District National Park Authority were unable to comment.
- 9.14 Only South Lakeland District Council and Carlisle City Council were able to give an estimate of the number of Gypsies and Travellers living in social rented housing in their area. South Lakeland District Council estimated there were less than 10 families, while Carlisle City Council estimated in the range of 10 - 50 families. Only Carlisle City Council could comment on the distribution of Gypsies and Travellers on particular estates or areas and that was to say that they were fairly even. They could not comment on where these were.

Gypsies and Travellers in private housing

- 9.15 Answers to questions about Gypsies and Travellers in other forms of housing were largely uninformative:
- No authority could not provide any information about the numbers of Gypsies and Travellers in private housing.
 - Only Carlisle City Council was aware of any issues arising in relation to Gypsies and Travellers living in their area and this related to complaints from neighbouring properties.
 - Eden District Council and Allerdale Borough Council indicated that Gypsies and Travellers in their area do live on caravan or mobile home parks not specifically designed for them. Carlisle City Council said they did not, while the remaining authorities had no information.

Living in bricks and mortar housing - views from Gypsies and Travellers

- 9.16 Among the 58 respondents consulted who lived in bricks and mortar accommodation, 49 (85%) lived in a house; 8 (14%) lived in a bungalow; and, 1 respondent lived in a flat.
- 9.17 In total, 62% of bricks and mortar dwellers were owner-occupiers; 26% were council tenants; 10% were private tenants; and, 2% (1 respondent) was a tenant of an RSL.
- 9.18 In terms of the size of the dwelling, 3% had 1 bedroom; 55% had 2 bedrooms; and, 41% had 3 bedrooms. All respondents thought that their property gave them enough space.
- 9.19 In total, over half of households (54%) in bricks and mortar accommodation still owned trailers. Of these, the vast majority (94%) owned just 1 trailer.
- 9.20 Residents in bricks and mortar accommodation were asked, on a five-point scale from very good to very poor, what they thought about a number of aspects of their accommodation including: size of house; design of house; neighbours; location; facilities; and, condition/state of repair. The vast majority of respondents in bricks and mortar accommodation viewed these issues either positively or, in a few

cases, ambivalently. Respondents were particularly happy about the facilities of the house. Views on their neighbours generated the most ambivalence from respondents; however, only 3 households viewed their neighbours in a negative light.

Table 23: Views on the house (in %)

| Issue | Very good | Good | Neutral | Poor | Very Poor |
|---------------------------|-----------|------|---------|------|-----------|
| Size of house | 54 | 43 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Design of house | 52 | 41 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| Neighbours | 26 | 45 | 24 | 3 | 2 |
| Location | 41 | 45 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| Facilities | 57 | 41 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Condition/state of repair | 53 | 40 | 5 | 2 | 0 |

9.21 All respondents had access to the basic facilities we enquired about, with the exception of 15 respondents (26%) who did not have a shower; 4 respondents who did not have access to somewhere safe for their children to play; and, 1 respondent who did not have a bath.

9.22 Most households had lived in their accommodation for a long time: 28% for 5 years or more; 50% had been there for between 1 and 5 years; with the remainder (22%) there for less than a year. No respondent had been in bricks and mortar accommodation for less than 3 months.

9.23 Generally speaking, when asked how long they were likely to remain in their houses, 50% of respondents said they did not know; 45% thought they would remain indefinitely; and, 3 respondents (5%) were planning to leave within the next 12 months. When asked their reasons for leaving, one respondent said it was to move to a bigger property; one respondent said they were going to travel; another reported that the house was too small; and, the remaining household stated: 'to get away from all the racism'.

9.24 We asked all of the interview sample about their previous experience of living in bricks and mortar accommodation. A total of 21 households (20% of the overall sample) had prior experience of bricks and mortar housing. If we remove the households who are now in bricks and mortar housing from this figure, this indicates that 13% of households had been in bricks and mortar accommodation at some time in the past, but had since left. What the data shows is that respondents from all the different accommodation types had previous experience of living in bricks and mortar housing. The percentage from the different accommodation types is shown below:

- 18% of households currently on unauthorised encampments
 - 33% of households on private sites
 - 75% of households on the unauthorised developments
- 9.25 With regards to what type of house they had previously lived in, 38% had lived in a privately owned house; 33% had lived in a council owned property; 24% had been private tenants; and, one household (5%) had been a tenant of an RSL. The vast majority of these respondents had moved into the property with their family when they were younger, or were born in a house. Two respondents reported that they had moved into a house due to a lack of sites. Four people cited 'other' reasons for moving into the house, which included: "just to see what it was like" and "no real reason".
- 9.26 As a number of people had left bricks and mortar accommodation, we were keen to ascertain people's views and experiences of living in houses, flats, etc. and why they had left. We asked people on a five point scale, very good to very poor, to rate their experience. A third of respondents (29%) thought that living in bricks and mortar accommodation was either a very good or good experience; 21% had indifferent views; and, 50% thought it was a poor or very poor experience.
- 9.27 Of particular interest was the reasons given for leaving this accommodation. There were a whole range of different responses, perhaps reflecting some of the difficulties faced by Gypsies and Travellers in adjusting to a different way of living. We received a number of comments which referred to a general aversion to living in bricks and mortar, cultural reasons or moving because of marriage or children:
- "It wasn't for us. The house was in a bad place and the kids were getting bullied"*
- "I would have been in the nut house if I hadn't have left"*
- "It was too closed in, had to put a caravan in the garden and live there"*
- "I got married and made a start on my own in a trailer"*
- "I just got fed up with the people on the estate"*
- 9.28 Of the households who had previously lived in bricks and mortar accommodation, just 4% would consider doing so again; 64% said now; and, 32% of respondents said they did not know. We asked respondents what the main reasons would be for considering living in bricks and mortar accommodation. The reasons respondents gave would be for the benefit of their children's education and to give them a degree of stability.
- 9.29 No respondent reported being on a waiting list for a house.

10. Housing-Related Support Service and General Services - Findings

- 10.1 The questionnaire to local authority officers also sought to ascertain and collate the recognition of Gypsies and Travellers in relation to housing-related support services - many of which come under the umbrella of the Supporting People programme.

Housing-related support

- 10.2 When asked about the housing-related support services available for Gypsies and Travellers, no authority could refer to any specific housing related support services for Gypsies and Travellers.
- 10.3 When asked which services Gypsies and Travellers most frequently approach the Council about (with a list of general housing-related support categories provided) it was largely unknown. South Lakeland District Council indicated that Gypsies and Travellers do not commonly approach the Council.

Views from Gypsies and Travellers on housing-related support services

- 10.4 It proved extremely difficult to find a suitable method to gain some idea as to the level of experience/need within the Gypsy and Traveller community for housing-related services. The very concept of an outside agency providing services such as support for settling into new accommodation or childcare was often seen as nonsensical because of the reliance upon strong family networks and the support that the extended family have historically provided within Gypsy and Traveller communities. However, we were keen to attempt to gain some idea about the levels of need for a number of services. We consulted with key stakeholders and reviewed key documents²⁴ from elsewhere to produce a list of the kind of services to gain views on.
- 10.5 We asked all Gypsy and Traveller respondents to comment on the likelihood of using a number of services on a scale which covered: 'would never use'; 'might use'; 'would definitely use'; and, 'don't know' (see Table 24).

²⁴ See Supporting People Eastern Regional Cross Authority Group - Gypsy and Traveller Conference, 27th April 2005 <http://www.spkweb.org.uk/NR/rdonlyres/6DA547AB-FCBB-4B4F-AE12-A5DD282B4C34/7895/FinalReportofGypsyandtravellerWorkshopApril2006.doc> and The Housing Support Needs of Gypsies and Travellers in West Yorkshire, North Yorkshire and York, December 2006, <http://www.calderdale.gov.uk/council/consultations/engage/downloadaddoc.jsp?id=941>

Table 24: Likelihood of using housing-related support services (in %)

| Support need | Would never use | Might use | Would definitely use | Don't know |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------------|------------|
| Finding accommodation | 21 | 36 | 39 | 5 |
| Settling into new accommodation | 47 | 32 | 15 | 8 |
| Budgeting | 69 | 20 | 4 | 8 |
| Meeting people | 69 | 20 | 4 | 7 |
| Accessing a GP | 9 | 14 | 77 | 0 |
| Accessing legal services | 14 | 27 | 54 | 5 |
| Harassment | 28 | 19 | 49 | 4 |
| Claiming benefits | 30 | 30 | 32 | 9 |
| Finding a job | 63 | 22 | 7 | 8 |
| Accessing training (for adults) | 54 | 24 | 4 | 8 |
| Pregnancy | 44 | 15 | 39 | 3 |
| Parenting | 89 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Filling in forms | 24 | 39 | 37 | 0 |
| Support with planning | 9 | 17 | 70 | 3 |

- 10.6 As can be seen, many of the respondents were not interested in receiving support with the majority of the services highlighted in Table 24. This might be explained by a general perception from respondents that these services are not applicable to Gypsies and Travellers, therefore these findings cannot be seen to provide an illustration as to the definitive need for such services. However, the results do seem to indicate where the current main concerns about service areas are. The services which elicited the most interest were (in order of interest): accessing a GP, support with planning, accessing legal services and harassment. As can be seen, the majority of people require quite practical assistance, particularly around planning and gaining secure accommodation.

Access to local services and amenities

- 10.7 In order to gain some idea as to the interaction that the Gypsies and Travellers have with various local services, we asked people if they felt that they or their family had sufficient access to certain services and how important these services were to them (see Table 25). As can be seen, for the most part the services that are most important to people seem to be the ones to which Gypsies and Travellers currently had access to.

Table 25: Access to services and importance of service

| Services | Have access (%) | Very important (%) | Quite important (%) | Not so important (%) | Not important at all (%) | Don't know (%) |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Public Transport | 86 | 19 | 7 | 21 | 53 | 0 |
| GP/Health Centre | 88 | 85 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Health Visitor | 33 | 26 | 12 | 22 | 37 | 4 |
| Social Worker | 23 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 83 | 6 |
| Maternity Care | 43 | 24 | 15 | 9 | 51 | 1 |
| A&E | 92 | 73 | 22 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Dentist | 55 | 79 | 12 | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| Sports and Leisure Centres | 51 | 15 | 17 | 29 | 35 | 5 |
| Local Shops | 100 | 73 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| Banks | 89 | 39 | 17 | 26 | 16 | 1 |
| Post Office | 95 | 58 | 26 | 14 | 2 | 1 |
| Nursery School and Children's Service | 38 | 27 | 12 | 12 | 45 | 4 |
| Services for Older People | 29 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 71 | 16 |
| Youth Clubs | 26 | 15 | 4 | 4 | 65 | 10 |

- 10.8 Around 18% of those we asked about accessing the above services felt that there were barriers to access. The majority of the comments referred to lack of dental services in the area. However, for households who did not have an authorised pitch to stay on, it was the lack of a fixed address which was seen as the major problem:

"Sometimes if you haven't got an address they won't let you access things."

"We are never in one place long enough to find out where everything is."

- 10.9 In addition, there were a number of older people who made comments regarding accessing services:

"We don't leave the camp that much so we don't know what we can and can't get."

"We could do with home help."

"Everything is uphill."

- 10.10 We asked whether people who worked in the local authority, health service, education and other services should be more aware of issues affecting Gypsies and Travellers. Over half of the people interviewed (53%) felt that more awareness was required; 35% did not know if more awareness is needed; and a smaller number of people (12%) felt that awareness was not needed. When asked to expand on their views the majority of people spoke about the need to treat Gypsies and Travellers equally and be more understanding of their way of life:

"The councils need to build better places for us in better places and not besides tips or industrial estates, they need to know we are humans too."

"The schools need to understand more about our ways."

"They need to listen to us more and stop trying to change us. Just treat us with respect."

"The council should be a bit more understanding when it comes to planning issues."

- 10.11 We also asked respondents if they felt that they had ever experienced harassment or discrimination because they were a Gypsy or a Traveller. A total of 36% of respondents thought that they had. We asked people to expand on the nature of the discrimination/harassment and we received a variety of responses including:

"I couldn't get in to a shop in the town and someone wouldn't let us into a night club in Carlisle because we were travellers."

"The pubs can be trouble sometimes. The people shout at us and won't let us in for some reason"

"All the time, people call us dirty Gypsies."

"People accuse you of things and treat you all the same. I've been accused of taking someone's dog."

"Occasionally people shout out of windows but it's usually OK. They behave better towards people in horse drawn wagons but it's different if you are in a van."

"The people in the village are prejudiced against us. They've complained about us being here because we are travellers."

- 10.12 A number of respondents we spoke to also talked about how a site owner in the area is seemingly prejudiced towards Gypsies and Travellers:

"[The owner] is racist, he is the site owner, he doesn't like Gypsies."

11. Employment, Education and Health - Findings

11.1 This section presents findings relating to Gypsies and Travellers in the three main service areas of employment, education and health.

Gypsies and Travellers and work, employment and training

11.2 For this section, the survey started with a general question about the kind of work undertaken by respondents and their families²⁵. Answers were extremely varied with the most popular broad areas being landscaping/tree work, roofing, uPVC and guttering, tarmac and scrap. It was clear that many of these trades were practical and manual and it was not uncommon to find families engaged in multiple trades.

11.3 We also asked how many people were self-employed and employed in the households. Out of the sample of 65 respondents who volunteered information, 55 had self-employed family members and just 9 households had people who were employed by someone else. Clearly self-employment is a major mode of employment for Gypsies and Travellers.

11.4 A total of 17% of households who currently travelled felt that travelling had an impact on their work. Some respondents expanded on why this was the case with comments such as:

“Because if we are in an area where we are getting plenty of work and get moved on, it’s bad.”

“It’s part of the way of life is finding work.”

11.5 A higher number of respondents (27%) who currently travelled felt that work impacted on their travelling way of life:

“Don’t get much time off to travel about.”

“Can’t take time off work to travel about. Need wages to pay the mortgage.”

11.6 The survey also asked whether or not households had any particular ‘site needs’ in relation to their work (ie the storage of equipment, etc.); 29% said they did. These respondents all wanted either more room to park vehicles or more room to store tools:

“Need storage but they [site owners] can’t get permission to put a shed up.”

“More room on the site to park the wagon up safely.”

²⁵ This section does not include the responses from Travelling Showpeople. The work-related issues of Travelling Showpeople are covered in Chapter 14.

“Need a garage or large shed to keep my tools in.”

- 11.7 In terms of training for work, only 10% of the sample (11 respondents) had been on some form of training, either formal through the colleges or work (7 people) or informal through friends, family and social networks (6 people). An additional 5 respondents wanted to take part in training at some point in the future. These respondents commented further by saying:

“Anything that will help me do my job better.”

“Have done a horse riding instructor course, would like training to do horse riding for children. Would like to work for Citizen’s Advice Bureau, I have the form to fill in to work for them.”

Gypsies and Travellers and education

- 11.8 There are two specific services, which target the learning needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the Study Area. Firstly, Cumbria County Council Specialist Advisory Teaching Service offers support for Gypsy/Traveller/Showpeople families in a number of different ways including: in-service training for school staff on Gypsy and Traveller issues, the creation of distance learning packs, which are used significantly by the children of Travelling Showpeople households. Secondly, the Pre-school Learning Alliance runs a Travellers Project, which includes a ‘playbus’ that visits the two authorised private sites in the Study Area. This project has been in operation for 15 years. It was originally set up for pre-school provision; however, the role has grown to include family support work, ‘after school club’, as well as coordinating with other agencies in the Study Area to assist with other support needs (ie accommodation, health, etc.). The Travellers Project also employs Gypsy/Traveller workers. It is considered as an example of good practice by a number of stakeholders in the Study Area, as well as being an important resource for a number of Gypsies and Travellers who took part in the survey, as the following comments illustrate:

“A phone call is all that’s needed and they are so helpful. Thank god we have them.”

“The worker is very helpful on the education bus, help with everything.”

“That’s a good service. They come once a week.”

- 11.9 A total of 55 households had school age children (between 5yrs and 16yrs). A total of 37 households said their children regularly attend school (61% of households with school-age children) with an additional 11 households (23% of households with school-age children) reporting that their children receive home education. Twenty-three respondents said their children did not attend school regularly, and 2 respondents said they did not know if their children went to school regularly.

11.10 In terms of differences in attendance levels, Travelling Showpeople families had the highest level of attendance (all Travelling Showpeople children went to school with the exception of one child who was home tutored). In addition, children were most likely to attend school regularly if they were living in bricks and mortar accommodation (78%) or on owner-occupied private sites (67%). This was followed by households living on unauthorised developments, where 50% of children regularly attended school. Not surprisingly, respondents on unauthorised encampments reported the lowest levels of regular attendance in comparison to other accommodation types, with no one reporting regular attendance at school.

11.11 We asked those respondents with school-age children in regular attendance to rate their children's schools. Many viewed the school as either very good or good (56%). Some people expanded on their positive rating:

"The children enjoy it and are learning well."

"The children seem to enjoy it, the bullying seems under control."

"They understand our travelling lifestyle and are very good to our children."

"The schools are good around here. Most of the Traveller kids go there."

11.12 Three respondents (5%) felt the schools were neither good nor poor, while a quarter of respondents viewed the schools in a negative light. We asked respondents to expand on why they had given this negative rating:

"The Traveller kids don't fit in. The other kids don't like the Traveller kids very much."

"Because my children are always in trouble and I think it's just because they are Travellers."

"The teacher is rude. They don't like the Traveller kids. They don't teach them like that teach the other kids in school."

"They don't help the Travellers very much. They have a lower level of learning at the school."

11.13 We also asked people how easy or difficult they thought accessing children's education/schools was in the local area. Most of the respondents said they did not know (47%); 30% felt that access was either easy or very easy; and, 12% felt that access was difficult or very difficult. All of the Travelling Showpeople households reported that it was either very easy or easy to access schools/education in the local area.

11.14 Stakeholder consultation indicated that, after accommodation, education was an important issue for a number of Gypsies and

Travellers in the Study Area. There were some concerns with regards to the attendance levels and retention rates, particularly with regards to secondary education. It was felt that there was a need to develop a more 'flexible' approach to secondary education, perhaps exploring the option of attending 'sessions', which could take place in schools or colleges. It was also highlighted that there was a need to ensure that home schooling was being monitored and was fully supported.

- 11.15 We also asked each respondent to comment on the level/standard of education that they themselves had obtained. A large number of people (53% of the sample) simply stated that they had "no schooling" or "none". For those respondents that did comment, generally speaking there were very low levels of educational attainment, with only 5 respondents reporting having sat some form of examination. Many respondents reported problems with reading and writing. It was common to find women reporting poorer levels of literacy than men or their husbands and also common to find that people had left formal education at around 11 years of age. Some further comments about level/standard of education were made, these include:

"I went to 50 million different schools, its hard being the new kid especially when you live in a caravan, but I did my 'O' levels."

"Went until 11 and then stopped and my husband went to school until he was 16."

"None, but I've never had any trouble making money."

"I can read and write, went to school until I was 11."

Gypsies and Travellers and health

- 11.16 Identifying households where members have particular health needs for special or adapted accommodation is an important component of housing needs surveys. A growing number of studies show that Gypsies and Travellers experience higher levels of health problems than members of the non-travelling population.
- 11.17 We asked whether respondents had members of their households who experienced some specific conditions (mobility problems, visual impairment, hearing impairments, mental health problems, learning disabilities or communication problems). See Table 26 below.

Table 26: % households with family members with specific health problems

| Type of condition | No. one in household | One person in household | Two people in household | Three people in household |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Mobility problems | 85 | 12 | 3 | - |
| Visual impairment | 94 | 6 | - | - |
| Hearing impairment | 90 | 10 | - | - |
| Mental health problems | 99 | 1 | - | - |
| Learning disability | 99 | 1 | - | - |
| Communication problems | 100 | - | - | - |

11.18 As can be seen from Table 26, the vast majority of households do not have members with any of these specific conditions. However, a small but significant number of households do have members with these health problems, in particularly mobility issues and visual impairments. In addition, a further 99 households (76% of the sample) had someone in their family who experienced some other kind of health problem. Conditions reported included (in most prevalent order) asthma, arthritis, heart problems, chest problems, diabetes, and back problems. Four people also reported experiencing anxiety attacks, depression and stress.

12. Accommodation Histories, Intentions and Travelling - Findings

12.1 This section looks specifically at some of the ways the Gypsies and Travellers we spoke to during the course of the study have lived in the past and how they would like to live in the future.

Accommodation histories

12.2 In order to gain some idea as to the movement between different types of accommodation, this section of the survey looked at a range of different issues including: the sort of accommodation they had immediately prior to their current accommodation; the general location of prior accommodation; reasons for leaving this accommodation; and, the reasons for living in their current accommodation.

12.3 The majority of Gypsies and Travellers living on authorised sites in the Study Area had been on their current site for longer periods (Table 27). A total of 59% of those occupying a privately rented pitch (at least 1 in every 2 households) have been living on the site for 5 or more years, closely followed by 23% living on the site between 3 and 5 years. However, 13% of those on private rented sites had been on the site for less than one year - this could be explained by the fact that these sites are also serving as a form of transit provision for the area.

Table 27: Duration of residence on current site

| Duration of residence | % of respondents |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Less than 6 months | 9 |
| 6 - 12 months | 5 |
| 12 months - 3 years | 0 |
| 3 years - 5 years | 23 |
| Over 5 years | 59 |
| Don't know | 5 |

12.4 The previous accommodation of those on authorised sites, in order of significance is shown in Table 28. As can be seen, the main form of accommodation that households on authorised sites had prior to their current site was a privately rented pitch followed by private transit site. One respondent indicated that the site they were currently living on was the only place they had lived.

Table 28: Prior accommodation of households on authorised sites

| Private rented pitch | 50 |
|---------------------------|----|
| Private transit site | 23 |
| Other | 14 |
| Bricks and mortar housing | 9 |
| Socially rented site | 5 |

- 12.5 Households currently on unauthorised sites came mostly from unauthorised encampments (70% of the sample). However, the other previous accommodation types included: caravan park (3 respondents); private rented site (3 respondents); council site (1 respondent); and, bricks and mortar (1 respondent).
- 12.6 We asked people to tell us what precipitated their move from their previous accommodation (respondents could choose from a list of different reasons). The three most common responses were: to get married/live with partner; eviction; and, site closure. Households on unauthorised encampments cited eviction as being the main reason they had left their previous accommodation.

Travelling patterns and experiences

- 12.7 In order to shed some light on the travelling patterns and experiences of Gypsies and Travellers throughout the Study Area, respondents were asked about a range of issues associated with travelling.
- 12.8 One of the most important issues to gain some information on was the frequency that households travelled. The vast majority of people reported that they never travelled or travelled seasonally, which generally means for short periods during the summer months. Table 29 breaks this down by accommodation type.

Table 29: Frequency of travelling by current accommodation type

| How often travelled? | Current Accommodation Type | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| | Unauthorised encampment (%) | Unauthorised development (%) | Private sites (%) | Bricks and Mortar (%) |
| Every week | 71 | 10 | - | - |
| Every month | 12 | - | 5 | 2 |
| Every couple of months | 6 | - | 18 | 18 |
| Seasonally | 12 | 40 | 55 | 25 |
| Once per year | - | 10 | 5 | 9 |
| Never | - | 40 | 18 | 46 |

- 12.9 As would be expected, unauthorised encampments are the most mobile. Those households living in bricks and mortar were the least mobile, indicating that they travel less frequently or not at all.
- 12.10 With regards to why people did not travel, again, we received diverse replies. Some common themes were around being less physically mobile or disabled, being too old or general health reasons. Others talked about how they were

‘settled’ or how they liked the place they were now living. A number of people also referred to the difficulty travelling nowadays, with no where to legally stop:

“There’s no sites to stop on now.”

“Because we are sick of getting moved on.”

- 12.11 The majority of respondents (62%) felt that the frequency that they travel was typical, with the remainder commenting that this had changed over the past few years. When asked in what ways it had changed, we received a variety of responses, including:

“I did travel more when I was younger. I could pull on to more places when younger”

“I can’t travel now my old back has gone.”

“Had children. They’re in school so we don’t like to take them out.”

“Just bought this house, nowhere at present to put one [trailer]. Looking into storage in the area.”

- 12.12 For those who did travel, however, we asked them where they liked to go. This was an open question designed to allow respondents to mention three of the places they visited most frequently. The most common answers were areas within the Study Area, particularly Carlisle, Cumbria (all over) and Appleby (for Appleby Fair). The second most common destinations appear to be areas of Scotland. There was also a tendency for people to mention preferences to travel to areas in Northern England such as Blackpool, Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool and areas of Cheshire and the North East of England. However, some people did mention travelling to southern areas such as: Birmingham, London, Wrexham, Rugby, Norfolk, and Bristol.
- 12.13 In total, approximately two-thirds of the sample had travelled to some extent over the past 12 months. It was clear from the responses that work opportunities were the main reason Gypsies and Travellers chose to travel. However, during this 12 month period households travelled for a number of other reasons. In order of popularity, after travelling for work, people tended to travel for fairs (in particular Appleby Fair); to see and visit relatives; and, for a holiday.
- 12.14 For those people who still travelled, there was a wide variation in how many caravans/trailers they travelled with from 1 to 10; however, most people travelled with between 1 and 4 caravans.
- 12.15 With regard to what type of accommodation people had used while travelling during the last 12 months, the most common was staying with family or relatives on private sites (50%), this was followed by pulling up at the ‘roadside’ (39%), which as a general rule would indicate unauthorised encampments. Interestingly families used the both ‘roadside’ in the countryside and the ‘roadside’ in residential town/city environments at relatively similar levels. A number of people also used caravan parks (37%).
- 12.16 Of the people who had travelled in the last 12 month period, 43% indicated that they had been forced to leave where they were staying, which was largely attributed to eviction (90% of those who had been forced to leave).

12.17 In order to further understand people's travelling patterns, we asked everyone where they thought they might travel in the next 12 month period (summer 2007 - summer 2008). Interestingly, there was a significant amount of travelling anticipated in areas local to where they were based now. This was particularly the case for households on unauthorised encampments, where 88% of households intend to return to the same local area and the areas surrounding it (Table 30).

Table 30: Anticipated areas to travel to over the next 12 months

| Travel in the next 12 months? | % of travelling respondents |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Within same local area | 37 |
| Within the Study Area ²⁶ | 55 |
| Other parts of the UK | 74 |
| Abroad | 15 |

12.18 In terms of preference for accommodation when travelling, people were asked about the sort of accommodation they would like to use in future (Table 31).

Table 31: Popularity of preferred accommodation

| Type preferred accommodation | % of respondents |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| With family on private sites | 53 |
| With family on socially rented sites | 52 |
| Caravan park | 47 |
| Roadside | 41 |
| Public/private transit sites | 29 |
| Farmers fields | 15 |
| Other | 9 |
| Hotels | 7 |

²⁶ The particular geographical areas concerned was explained to respondents as fully as was possible

- 12.19 As Table 31 shows, when travelling, people would rather stay with family on private sites, followed closely by staying with family on socially rented sites. Interestingly, more people wanted to stay on mainstream caravan parks than had actually used them in the last 12 month period. Staying on the roadside was more preferable than staying on public/private transit sites. Anecdotal evidence from fieldwork in other local authority areas indicates that there is a general negative view of transit site provision amongst Gypsies and Travellers. However, this may reflect the perceived current standard, management and availability of such sites, which is generally seen as quite poor, rather than a comment on the nature of transit accommodation itself.
- 12.20 With regards to future travelling aspirations, the majority of respondents (47%) thought that their travelling patterns were likely to remain similar to their current pattern; 23% who did not know; 18% reported that they were likely to travel more in the future; while, 12% indicated that they would travel less than they did currently.

13. Household Formation and Accommodation Preferences and Aspirations

Household formation

- 13.1 A total of 3 households (3% of the sample), reported concealed households (ie that there were separate households currently living with them in need of accommodation). These included children who required their own accommodation; in one case they were described as being a nephew. In total it equates to 4 separate households in need of accommodation. All but one of these new households was expected to want to settle in the area where they currently live, and would want trailer based accommodation.
- 13.2 Respondents were also asked whether there were people living with them who were likely to want their own separate accommodation in the next five years (2007-2012). A total of 5 households said that there were people living with them who would require separate accommodation within the next five year period (3 from site-based accommodation and two from bricks and mortar accommodation). This equated to 9 separate households, who were all children of the respondents. The majority (7 separate households) were thought to want trailer based accommodation (including one household currently in bricks and mortar housing). The remaining two were expected to want to live in bricks and mortar accommodation (they were currently living in bricks and mortar accommodation). With regards to where these households were expected to want to live, 5 were thought to want to live near where they currently live (including the 2 people wanting bricks and mortar accommodation). It was unknown where the remaining would want to live.
- 13.3 We are confident there was no double counting between the current need and that identified for the next five year period.

Accommodation preferences and aspirations

- 13.4 The final section of the survey with Gypsies and Travellers²⁷ focused on some of the ways in which they would like to see accommodation options change and their preferences with regards to accommodation.

Long stay residential sites

- 13.5 A total of 31 respondents (30% of the sample) said that they would like to move to either a long-stay residential site or a different residential site. Six out of the 17 households living on unauthorised encampments were interested in this option (35% of the sample from unauthorised encampments in the Study Area). Five households on the unauthorised developments were interested in moving to another long-stay residential site (50% of the sample from unauthorised developments in the Study Area), which perhaps illustrates their desire for stability for themselves and their family. A total of 14 households from private sites would consider moving to another site (64% of the sample from private

²⁷ This section does not include the preferences and aspirations for future accommodation of Travelling Showpeople. Please see Chapter 14.

sites). Six households from bricks and mortar accommodation reported a desire to move to site based accommodation (two in Allerdale, one in Barrow-in-Furness, one in Eden, one in South Lakeland, and one in Carlisle).

- 13.6 It was crucial to ascertain some notion as to where people wanted this site based accommodation to be. Respondents were presented with options for areas where they could live: within the same local area (i.e. the local authority they were interviewed in); within Cumbria; and, other parts of the UK. The majority of respondents wanted the site within their local area (67%); some also indicated within Cumbria as well (57%). A smaller number indicated that they would like a site anywhere in the UK (27%).
- 13.7 We asked all respondents, who expressed an interest in long-stay sites, how long they would expect to stay on such a site. Most of the respondents could not indicate a time and simply answered 'don't know' (45%); 29% thought they would stay on a site for 5 years and over; 20% thought they would stay on a site for more than 3 years but less than 5 years; and, the remainder of the sample stated 3 years or less.
- 13.8 We also want to ascertain views with regards to what they thought the maximum size a residential site should be. The majority of respondents said that a site should not be any larger than 40 pitches, which may be a reflection of the large sites already in the Study Area. However, a significant number of respondents indicated a preference for sites of between 15-20 pitches.

Transit/short-stay sites

- 13.9 A total of 30 respondents said that they would be interested in stopping at a short-stay or transit site (28% of the sample). This comprised: 6 households on unauthorised encampments; 3 households on unauthorised developments; 9 households from private sites (all from private rented pitches); and, 12 households from bricks and mortar accommodation.
- 13.10 We asked all respondents who expressed an interest in short-stay sites how long they would expect to stay on such a site. A large number of people could not indicate a time and simply answered 'don't know' (58%); 24% felt they would stay for a very short time (1-4 weeks); 6% thought they would stay between 3 months and 6 months; and, 6% thought they would stay between 6 months and 12 months.
- 13.11 Again, we also want to ascertain views with regards to what they thought the maximum size a transit site should be. The majority of respondents thought a site should be around 1 - 5 pitches in size, with a smaller number of respondents indicating that 20-25 pitches was the maximum number of pitches for short-stay accommodation.

Incorporated long-stay and short-stay sites

- 13.12 We also asked people what their thoughts were about sites that incorporated both long-stay pitches and short-stay pitches. Most respondents said they did not know (52%); 43% thought it was a good idea; while, 5% viewed it as a bad idea. We asked people to provide further comments on this type of accommodation. Comments in favour of such a site included:

“It gets you off the roads and saves hassle. It gives Travellers somewhere to go with facilities.”

“It does work because we have good friends who pull on at winter time. They need a place for the winter.”

“It gives you peace of mind to know that you are settled and not going to be moved on.”

13.13 More tentative comments included:

“As long as the right person runs it and they know who is coming on.”

13.14 Views against such a site included:

“It would bring trouble to the people on long stay if the wrong ones pulled on the short stay.”

“You would never know who is coming on. It wouldn’t work. People would come on and smash it up.”

13.15 Many of the people we spoke to thought that a long stay site with short stay facilities is a good idea. However, it was apparent that people did not want to open up their residential site up to strangers and that a short-stay area should be restricted to the families of residential site residents. This indicates that, where short-stay pitches are made available on residential sites, some control over transit users may be necessary in order to ensure and maintain feelings of safety and cohesion for the more permanent residents.

Accommodation preferences

13.16 We asked all respondents to comment on their accommodation preferences from the following list of options:

- A private site owned and lived on by them or their family
- A site owned by another Gypsy or Traveller
- A site owned by the local council
- A family owned house
- A local authority or housing association owned house
- Travelling around and staying on authorised transit sites
- A ‘group housing’ type site (mixture of transit/residential/chalet/ trailer accommodation)

13.17 The answers were ranked on a scale from 1 to 10, with 1 being the worst option for them and 10 being the best option. The mean (average) answer for each accommodation type is presented in preference order in Table 32 below. As can be seen, by far the most preferred form of accommodation is a private site owned either by themselves or their family. This is followed by living in a privately owned

house, and living in 'group housing'.²⁸ Living on a site owned by the local authority, and travelling around often staying on authorised sites were both viewed relatively ambivalently. Living on sites owned by another Gypsy/Traveller or private landlord were both viewed relatively unfavourably. Living in a local authority or housing association house was regarded as the least favoured option.

Table 32: Views on the type of accommodation preferred

| Type of site | Mean answer |
|---|-------------|
| A private site owned by them or their family | 9.2 |
| A family owned house | 7.7 |
| 'Group housing' | 6.6 |
| A site owned by the local council | 5.6 |
| Travelling around on authorised transit sites | 5.2 |
| A site owned by another Gypsy or Traveller | 4.6 |
| A site owned by a private landlord (not a Gypsy or Traveller) | 4.4 |
| A local authority or housing association owned house | 3.1 |

13.18 This final section looks at some of the qualitative information we obtained when respondents were asked about both the best and worst place they had ever lived. In terms of the worst place people lived, we received a variety of responses. Many people talked about how living on the roadside was the worst place for them:

"Behind an old factory in Preston. We had no toilet, when we had to go to the toilet there was rats at your feet. It was a dirty unhygienic place."

"I was in a field with no lights, no toilets. Basically nothing, I hated it."

"Beside a railway line in Manchester, I was terrified of the children going on the lines and we had nowhere to go to the toilet."

13.19 Others made reference to the reaction of the non-Traveller community:

"I was stopping on a layby in Carlisle on my own and one night a group of local lads came around and were rocking my trailer and when I came out one

²⁸ On the questionnaire this was phrased as 'A site incorporating long stay/permanent plots/housing with short stay/transit facilities'.

of them hit me with a stick so I had to move off at two in the morning to get away."

"South Lakes. It's too busy and the people are unfriendly. People don't like getting stuck behind a horse drawn wagon."

- 13.20 A number of people commented that their time living in a bricks and mortar accommodation was a particularly unpleasant time:

"This house because I don't get to see any of the girls anymore. I miss being out in the trailer, it can get very lonely here."

"This house. I don't like being cut off from my travelling life and that's how I feel here, like I'm trapped."

"In the house. It's not fair, we haven't got a choice. We had nowhere to go. We don't fit in around here. We want our own home back on a camp site where we belong. It's not asking for much, just a place to call home. We don't want to live like this anymore, it's not right."

"The first house I lived in, it was on a big estate in Manchester full of drug addicts and thieves, I couldn't wait to leave it."

- 13.21 Others were more specific about their experiences on particular places:

"Basildon, Essex. We pulled onto a holiday site then they found out we were Travellers and asked us to leave. We told them that we had paid for two weeks and we were staying. Then they called the police and they made us leave. That was the most racist place I've ever been."

"A site in Lancashire but I won't say which one. It stunk, the bins were always over full, the kids were wild."

"A site the council ran it stank and was full of rats."

"Bolton site, what a bad site. I was on it for two weeks and the police is down every night and the children are very cheeky."

"[Name of site owner] was nice at first but now it's one of the worst places. [Name of site owner] has shot people's dogs and poisoned other people's dogs."

- 13.22 Similarly, in terms of the best places people had lived, we received a variety of comments. Some respondents were quite general about the things they required:

"All the same. We just want peace and quiet."

"Anywhere I have lived in and around this area. I have loved it, so good because it has all the familiar surroundings and it's home."

"We've been on lots of sites. They're always nice."

"I enjoyed everywhere we travelled as a child and still enjoy everywhere we go."

- 13.23 Others provided more specific examples:

“Doncaster. Nice and big site. The people were nice and it was near the town and shops.”

“Houghton. It was nice and clean, handy for the town. The people were nice.”

“Ireland is home. Love to go back but my family won’t go back. They’re used to this country.”

“On the site [Hadrian’s park], liked being on a site. Good sense of community with the children.”

“The little site in Chorley we stop on. It’s a holiday site but very quiet and secluded. We stop there most of the year because we are very friendly with the owner but we have to leave in the winter.”

- 13.24 A number of people reminisced about their childhood and sites that they used to live on:

“As a child I was brought up on the roads until I was 10. It was a lovely way of life, my parents used to say ‘go to sleep’ and when you wake up your somewhere else.”

“On a site we lived on before we came here. We had been on it for years and was settled. We had everything we wanted and needed. All the people were really friendly until one bad family came and put us off.”

“The site where I was brought up. I loved it, all our friends were there. It was a nice place to live until it changed owners and went downhill.”

- 13.25 It was also apparent that the presence and proximity to family and friends was a major reason why certain areas and experiences were viewed as positive:

“Swansea. We stopped there with all the family on a site and it was a good site, very clean and we were all related.”

“Carlisle. It’s where I am from and where I like to be because of family and pals.”

“When I was born in Ireland. It was good as I was brought up with all my cousins all of similar ages. It was good because we used to go working together, drinking together, and all our wives we married were sisters and cousins. We are all still very close.”

“Kent when I was younger, we used to go stay with my mother’s family and I always enjoyed it.”

“Doncaster stopping with all my family.”

- 13.26 Some of the respondents talked about the site they currently lived on being the best place they have lived:

“Here. I’m bringing up my children in a lovely area. I have a lovely home, family nearby, it’s a real friendly place, and we’re accepted.”

“Here where we are. We know we have Appleby Fair every year. It’s ideal as we have horses and there’s always Travellers nearby or passing.”

“The Penrith site I’ve lived here for 20 years. I know all the Travellers on the site.”

“Houghton is very nice but we need more toilets, its handy for town, handy for the local school. I like the people.”

“Here where I am I feel safe. I am close to my family and don’t get hassle.”

13.27 Similarly, some people living in bricks and mortar accommodation viewed their current house as the best place they have lived:

“Here in this house. Its peaceful and quiet and we can keep ourselves to ourselves.”

“I am quite enjoying living in this area and living in the house, its peaceful, I haven’t got any trouble off other Travellers.”

14. Travelling Showpeople

- 14.1 Travelling Showpeople occupy an unusual position in planning terms and a separate planning Circular, detailing the particular planning needs of Travelling Showpeople, has recently been produced; Circular 04/07. As well as outlining the requirements for pitch identification and allocation for Travelling Showpeople, Circular 04/07 also requires that the accommodation needs of Travelling Showpeople are included within GTAA's.
- 14.2 According to information received by the local authorities and Showmen's Guild there are 5 residential yards for Travelling Showpeople in the Study Area; 2 in Carlisle; 2 in Allerdale and, 1 in South Lakeland. There is another yard in Lake District National Park Authority; however, it is believed that this is used for storage purposes only. Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council did not provide any information and it was assumed that there was no yard in this authority.

Table 33: Residential yards for Travelling Showpeople from information provided by local authorities and the Showmen's Guild

| Site | Known plots | Comments |
|--|-------------|--|
| Carlisle City Council | | |
| Willowholme | 10 | Permanent plots. Information from the Guild indicates that there are currently 7 separate households on the yard. Remaining plots occupied by equipment. |
| Willowholme | 5 | Permanent plots. Information from the Guild indicates that there are currently 2 separate households on the yard. Remaining plots occupied by equipment. |
| Allerdale Borough Council | | |
| Wigton | 27 | Permanent plots. Information from the Guild indicates that there are currently 21 of these plots being used. Remaining plots occupied by equipment. |
| Maryport | N/A | Established use. Information from the Guild indicates that there are currently 3 separate households on the yard. |
| South Lakeland District Council | | |
| Foulshaw | 5 | Information from the Guild indicates that there is some doubling up on this yard. |

- 14.3 Only Carlisle City Council and Eden District Councils' development plans included policies towards yards for Travelling Showpeople. South Lakeland District Council and Lake District National Park Authority indicated that their development plan did not include Travelling Showpeople, although Lake District National Park Authority said that this would be addressed in the emerging LDF. Allerdale Borough Council and Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council provided no information.
- 14.4 No planning applications had been received for Showpeople yards since 2001 and there had been no instances of the unauthorised development of yards by Showpeople since 2001.
- 14.5 With regards to whether or not authorities expected the number of authorised sites for Travelling Showpeople to increase over the next five years, Carlisle City Council, Eden District Council and Allerdale Borough Council said no; South Lakeland District Council and Lake District National Park Authority did not know, with Lake District National Park Authority adding that they would need better awareness of need; and, Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council did not provide an answer.
- 14.6 No authority identified any area of good practice with regards to engagement with Travelling Showpeople.

Views from Travelling Showpeople

- 14.7 In total 23 interviews were achieved with site (yard) based Travelling Showpeople. These reflect 4 of the 5 known yards in the Study Area.
- 14.8 All households provided details about how many living units and vehicles they possessed. In total, 52% of respondents had 1 living unit, 44% had 2 living units and 4% had 4 living units. The average number of living units was 1.6 units per household. These tended to be larger static units rather than smaller trailers/tourers. Most households had more than one vehicle (including vans and lorries) with the average number being 2. This is a significantly lower number of vehicles in comparison with other GTAAs. This may be due to 7 respondents who were not actively working as Travelling Showpeople. A total of 16 households were currently working; five were retired; one was not currently working; and, one was a full time carer for a relative.
- 14.9 All households stated that they had sufficient room for their living quarters although one respondent reported that space will be an issue in the future,
- “My children are growing up. In 10 years we are going to have a problem here. I don't mind if the council lend land to us, we need more places to live.”*
- 14.10 In addition, all of the households with vehicles reported having enough space for them on the yards.
- 14.11 The households on both private yards and socially rented yards viewed a number of factors quite positively, particularly the location of the yard (very good or good 96%); neighbours (very good or good 78%); size of plot (very good or good 74%); facilities on yard (very good or good 70%); and, design of yard (good 61%). Five respondents reported that facilities on their yard were poor or very poor.

14.12 All households had access to most of the facilities we enquired about (including water and electric supply, WC, rubbish collection) although some households lacked having access to laundry facilities and a bath. Although all households had access to electricity and water supplies this was described as sub-standard as the water pressure was low and their electricity supply was intermittent with poor electricity boxes. WC facilities were provided by chemical toilets.

14.13 A total of 39% of households had concerns about health and safety on their yard. One such concern was around security and problems with theft and vandalism. Another concern related to one yard, which had flooded in the past with some residents being worried that this could happen again. This was a significant issue for current residents with some having moved off the site until redevelopment takes place. There were many mixed comments about the flooded site and the local authority's redevelopment of that site:

"The council where we live [Carlisle City Council] have been so helpful to us because of the floods. We have a good working relationship, long may that continue."

"We would like to be better informed as to when we shall be moved so the redevelopment can take place. It would give us peace of mind."

"We are still living in the yard two years after the floods, we were promised they would put us on a temporary site to improve facilities ie landscaping, water, drives, improve surface and general improvements, this has not happened yet"

14.14 We asked all households to comment upon what improvements they would like to see made to their yard. These included:

- Security gate
- More street lighting
- Better flood defences
- Improved electricity and water supply
- General clean up/yard maintenance

14.15 One of the issues which emerged through the consultations was the issue of tenure. A number of Travelling Showpeople we spoke to during the assessment talked about how they objected to being residents on private rented yards, which were owned by or leased to an individual, who sublet plots on the yard to Travelling Showpeople families. As one respondent commented:

"These individuals operate purely for profit. Many Showmen resent this, paying for a lifetime for something they will never have anything to show for. No security and no future for their families. If sites are provided on this format Showmen simply won't take them"

14.16 A large number (91%) of households had lived on the yards for 5 years or more. A total of 52% of households thought they would remain on the yard indefinitely, and 9% (2 households) expected to leave their yards within one to three years. The 2 respondents both stated that they were planning return to a yard in Carlisle

- that they previously lived on, which they had left due to flooding. A total of 39% of households reported that they did not know how long they would remain on the yards.
- 14.17 A total of 96% of households were local to the area in some way and those that still worked fairs travelled for significant periods (from 4 to 11 months of the year). The average period of travelling for work was 8 months of the year. Northumberland was the main venue for fairs; however, respondents also worked in Cumbria, Scotland, the Scottish Borders, Tyne and Wear and Lancashire.
- 14.18 There was a clear preference for how people preferred to live when working and that was to stay in a trailer on the land where their fair was taking place. Only three respondents reported that they would prefer to stay on private transit accommodation when they are travelling for work. One household preferred to commute daily from their residential yard to their workplace with a mobile catering unit.
- 14.19 A total of 8 additional households were thought to require independent accommodation over the next 5 year period (6 Allerdale and 2 Carlisle). All were the children of the respondent's and all were thought to want to live near to their families in trailer-based accommodation.
- 14.20 The survey also looked at some of the ways in which Travelling Showpeople would like to see accommodation options change and what some of their preferences and aspirations were around accommodation. Twelve respondents (52% of the sample) stated that they would move to another residential yard. The majority of respondents would like a yard to be within their local area or within the Study Area. The most favourable type of future accommodation was a private yard owned and lived on by the respondent, followed closely by living on a yard owned by the local council or another Showperson. The least favourable type of accommodation was a house owned by the local council, and then a house owned by the respondent. Living on a yard owned by a private landlord (ie not a Showperson) was also considered unfavourably.
- 14.21 When asked about the ideal size a yard should be, a number of respondents indicated no more than 20 plots; enough to accommodate immediate family and some extended family. Many respondents also commented that the number of plots would depend on the amount of the land available:
- "Depends how big the yards are. Personally I would like my yard to contain my family and my extended family."*
- "If the yard is moderate in size it won't cause problems with local people ie schools."*
- "Showpeople, like all minority groups like to live near each other for safety and to keep in contact with your family and friends. We still have family values and we are proud of that. That's why the yards need to be big enough for family and extended family say 20 plots."*
- 14.22 One respondent indicated that a plot should be around ½ an acre in size, which would accommodate an extended family of around five living units and equipment.

14.23 Because so little is known about how Travelling Showpeople live and want to live, we wanted to provide respondents with as much chance to talk to us about their needs as was possible. We therefore asked respondents for additional comments, some of which are below:

“Local authorities need to include Showpeople in their masterplans for the future. I’m pleased to see this assessment being carried out, at last someone knows we are here”

“Unless people actually know you we can be stigmatised by authorities or councils and some local people, including Police.”

“We need more places to live. The council don’t do enough for us, why isn’t there funding available for Showpeople, they do it for Gypsies”

14.24 It was clear that Travelling Showpeople were keen for the local authorities to offer them greater acknowledgement and recognition as a cultural minority, but also offer more support with regards to planning for yards. Respondents were keen to stress that land for future yards needed to be large enough to be able to accommodate the number of living units and vehicles which Travelling Showpeople require.

15. An Assessment of Need for Residential Pitches

- 15.1 Nationally, there are no signs that the growth in the Gypsy and Traveller population will slow significantly. Indeed, population characteristics emerging from research around Gypsy and Traveller accommodation agree that the formation of new households is inevitable.²⁹ Although the supply of authorised accommodation has declined since 1994, the size of the population of Gypsies and Travellers does not appear to have been affected to a great extent. Rather, the way in which Gypsies and Travellers live has changed, including an increase in the use of unauthorised sites; innovative house dwelling arrangements (ie living in trailers in the grounds of houses); overcrowding on sites; and, overcrowding within accommodation units (trailers, houses, chalets, etc.). From an analysis of the data presented throughout this report there is every indication that the Cumbria sub-region will share, to some extent, in this national growth.
- 15.2 Given the presence of unauthorised encampments, household concealment, and future household formation, the current supply of appropriate accommodation appears to be significantly less than the 'need' identified. It is the conclusion of the project team that there is a need for more site accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers within the Cumbria sub-region. The following sections look in depth at this issue, considering residential and transit pitch need for Gypsies and Travellers, specific pitch needs for Travelling Showpeople and needs relating to bricks and mortar accommodation.

Calculating accommodation supply and need

- 15.3 The methods of assessing and calculating the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers are still developing. In 2003 a crude estimation of additional pitch provision was made at a national level based predominantly on information contained within the Caravan Count.³⁰ The Guidance on Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments also contains an illustration of how need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation might best be calculated.³¹ In addition, guidance for Regional Planning Bodies has been produced, which outlines a systematic checklist for helping to ensure that GTAA's are accurate in their estimation of accommodation need based upon a range of factors.³² It is from combining these guides that our estimation of supply and need is drawn. In particular, residential accommodation need is considered by carefully exploring the following factors:

Current residential supply

- Socially rented pitches
- Private authorised pitches

²⁹ Niner, P. (2003) Local Authority Gypsy/Traveller Sites in England, London: ODPM.

³⁰ Niner, P. (2003) Local Authority Gypsy/Traveller Sites in England, London: ODPM.

³¹ CLG (2007) Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments, Guidance.

³² http://www.communities.gov.uk/pub/209/PreparingRegionalSpatialStrategyreviewsonGypsiesandTravellersbyregionalplannings_id1508209.pdf

Residential need 2007-2012

- Temporary planning permissions, which will end over the assessment period.
- Allowance for family growth over the assessment period.
- Need for authorised pitches from families on unauthorised developments.
- Allowance for net movement over the assessment period between sites and housing.
- Allowance for potential closure of existing sites.
- Potential need for residential pitches in the area from families on unauthorised encampments.

Pitch supply 2007-2012

- Vacant pitches over the assessment period.
- Unused pitches, which are to be brought back into use over the assessment period.
- Known planned site developments.

15.4 Each one of these factors is taken in turn, and illustrated at a Cumbria sub-regional area level initially. These factors are then applied to each district and broken-down by local authority.

15.5 Within the guidance for producing GTAAs there is also the consideration of 'new households likely to arrive from elsewhere'. It remains unclear from the findings if movement between the Study Area and elsewhere will affect the numbers of Gypsies and Travellers requiring residential accommodation across the Study Area. It is understood that generally speaking, the Study Area is a popular area for Gypsies and Travellers looking for both residential and short-stay/transit accommodation.

15.6 As this accommodation assessment (in line with other accommodation assessments), with the exception of a handful of interviews, only included Gypsies and Travellers within the boundaries of the Study Area, it is impossible to present a reliable estimation on the need for accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers currently living elsewhere. In considering the large number of rented pitches available in the area it is felt that those Gypsies and Travellers who arrive from elsewhere will probably be balanced by those Gypsies and Travellers who move on from the area and leave vacancies. For simplicity, both elements (new households and private site vacancies) are omitted.

15.7 Although it is not possible to provide an evidence-based numerical assessment of need arising from outside the Study Area to be met within, or vice versa, drawing upon the findings of the existing regional and sub-regional GTAAs³³ it is possible

³³ This refers to the Cheshire GTAA, Lancashire GTAA and the North West Regional GTAA.

to provide some comment upon how this need might be influenced by populations outside the area.

- 15.8 None of these reports provided any firm indication that there was a desire for movement from other sub-regions to the Cumbria Study Area. However, the pattern of existing provision and identified need on areas surrounding the Cumbria Study Area, particularly Lancaster, highlights that there may be evidence of displaced demand for pitch accommodation within this authority. Lancaster currently provides 142 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and has had a need for around 15 pitches identified for 2006-2011. It is possible that Lancaster is home to a certain level of displaced demand from households who would rather live in the Cumbria authorities. If this is the case it is possible that the numbers of pitches required in the Cumbria Study Area, as outlined below, would increase.

A cautionary note on local authority pitch allocation

- 15.9 Because of the historical inequalities in pitch provision, Gypsies and Travellers have constrained choices as to where and how they would choose to live if they had real choice. So while choices for the non-Travelling community are generally much wider, as there is social housing available in every authority in the country, there are no local authority sites in 138 of the 353 local authorities in England, and only in 71 authorities is there more than one site. Some authorities have no authorised private sites. Over time, this has inevitably meant that Gypsies and Travellers have generally moved to areas they see as offering the best life chances; for example, an authority which provides a site; an authority which is perceived as having more private authorised sites than others; or, an authority that is attractive in some other way (slower enforcement, transport links, friends and family resident, etc.). Therefore, there is a tendency, when the need for additional accommodation is assessed, for the needs assessment to further compound these inequalities in site provision. For example, authorities which already provide Gypsy and Traveller accommodation (publicly or privately) are assessed as having greater need for additional pitch provision than authorities with little or no pitch provision. This is compounded further the longer-term the assessment is made (ie to 2016).
- 15.10 As requested in the research brief, we have identified Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs at a sub-regional and a local level. This has been done on a **'need where it is seen to arise'** basis. However, the results of this apportionment should not necessarily be assumed to imply that those needs should be actually met in that specific locality. This distribution reflects the current uneven distribution of pitch provision and the Gypsy and Traveller population across the Study Area. Decisions about where need should be met should be strategic, taken in partnership with local authorities, the County Councils and the Regional Assembly - involving consultation with Gypsies and Travellers and other interested parties - which will take into account wider social and economic planning considerations such as equity, choice and sustainability.

A note on the assessment period

- 15.11 The assessment period referred to above relates to the 2007-2012 period with an alternative approach taken to making estimates beyond this point for 2012-2016. As a result of the impact that the creation of more authorised pitches may have

on the Gypsy and Traveller community (in terms of households characteristics, travelling patterns, settlement patterns) it is unwise to consider each of the above factors beyond the initial assessment period. Instead we use a simple estimate of family/household growth to illustrate likely natural increase in the Gypsy and Traveller population. This is applied to both a Cumbria sub-regional area and local authority level.

- 15.12 Table 34 below summarises the model for residential pitch requirements in the Study Area between 2007-2012. Each requirement is expanded upon below. Due to the lack of accurate information and data about the entire Gypsy and Traveller population it is likely that these requirements represent the minimum additional accommodation provision required.

Table 34: Summary of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople requirements by local authority area (2007-2016)

| Element of supply and need | | Study Area Total | Allerdale Borough Council | Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council | Carlisle City Council | Copeland | Eden District Council | Lake District National Park Authority | South Lakeland |
|----------------------------|---|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| | Current residential supply | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Socially rented pitches | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Private authorised pitches | 74 | 0 | 0 | 30* | 0 | 44# | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Total authorised pitches | 74 | 0 | 0 | 30* | 0 | 44# | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Plots for Travelling Showpeople | 38 | 24 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Residential pitch need 2007-2012 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | End of temporary planning permissions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | New household formation | 16 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| 7 | Unauthorised developments | 9 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | Movement between sites and housing | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 1 |
| 9 | Closure of sites | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | Unauthorised encampments | 29 | 9 | 2 | 13 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 11 | Additional residential need | 58 | 11 | 5 | 29 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | | | | | | | |

| | Additional supply 2007-2012 | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|----|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | Pitches currently closed but re-entering use | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | Pitches with permission but not developed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | New sites planned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | Vacancies on socially rented sites | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | Supply 2007-2012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Requirement for extra residential pitches (2007-2012) | 58 | 11 | 5 | 29 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 4 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Requirement for extra residential pitches (2012-2016) | 14 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Suggested requirement for extra transit pitches (2007-2012) | 35 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Requirement for plots for Travelling Showpeople (2007-2012) | 13 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | Requirement for plots for Travelling Showpeople (2012-2016) | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

* It is understood that there are 30 pitches provided however, we understand that 10 of these are being used for short-stay purposes. The occupants currently on short-stay pitches have not been used as a factor in assessing residential need. # It is understood that there are 44 pitches provided however, we understand that approximately 10 of these are being used for short-stay purposes. The occupants currently on short-stay pitches have not been used as a factor in residential assessing need.

Current residential supply

Row 1: The number of pitches on socially rented sites provided by local authority information.

Row 2: The number of pitches on private authorised sites provided by local authority information

Row 3: Sum of 1 + 2

Row 4: The total number of authorised plots provided for Travelling Showpeople. Due to the levels of vehicle overcrowding on these yards the actual number of households present on the yards have been used rather than the potential total number of plots for which there is permission.

Residential pitch need 2007-2012

Row 5: There are no temporary planning permissions of sites due to end during the assessment period.

Row 6: The number of new pitches required from new household formation. This requires estimates of:

- a) The number of new households likely to form;
- b) The proportion likely to require a pitch; and,
- c) The proportion likely to remain within the Study Area.

Household formation findings from sites and houses are presented separately. This element includes households who are currently concealed/over-crowded and households expected to require independent accommodation over the next 5 years (ie young people who are currently in their mid-late teens).

New households forming on sites

Finding: The analysis of the survey showed that the number of individuals requiring their own accommodation in the next 5 years from authorised sites was the equivalent of 14% of respondents.

Assumptions:

From what is known about household formation from sites in other GTAA areas this seems at quite a 'low' level

Treating all individuals as requiring separate accommodation may usually over-state need as there may be some inter-marrying within the Study Area of individuals.

There is only private provision available in the Study Area for residential accommodation. Such provision often enables the flexibility of land families' require in order to accommodate any future household growth. Therefore, when households were asked about their views on future household formation we believe there was a certain level of under-claiming from households.

In balancing these factors no adjustment has been made to the figures (upwards or downwards)

Calculation: 14% grossed to total current population on residential pitches = 14% of 54 = 8 households/pitches.

New households forming in housing

Finding: The analysis of the survey showed that the number of individuals requiring their own accommodation in the next 5 years from bricks and mortar accommodation was the equivalent of 7% of respondents.

Assumptions: due to the relatively low level of this no adjustment has been made to account for factors such as inter-marrying within the Study Area.

Calculation: 7% of estimated minimum housed population (120 households) = 8 households. It is likely that these households represent a small proportion of housed Gypsies and Travellers. As a result this figure is likely to under-state. From the information provided via the survey there was a general indication that the majority of these households will wish to live in trailer based accommodation - although this is not predictive of actual behaviour. However, because of the known movement from housing to sites which occurs as young people begin to form independent households it seems reasonable to plan for the potential site desires from bricks and mortar household growth.

Total pitch need from household formation on authorised sites and bricks and mortar housing = **16 pitches**

Row 7: According to our survey there were 4 unauthorised developments at the time of the assessment comprising of approximately 5 pitches. Since these sites are, by definition, unauthorised, these households are in need of authorised, legal accommodation, whether through the granting of planning

permission on their own site or pitch provision elsewhere. However, we found that these unauthorised developments also had a level of over-crowding on them with potential household formation over the assessment period. We found that there was the equivalent of 4 additional households living on these pitches which required separate accommodation over the assessment period.

It is estimated that there is a need for approximately **9 pitches** to accommodate these households. This need is for permanent residential pitches, as those households who were interviewed on unauthorised developments wanted to stay in the area where they were currently living.

If authorities regularise these developments this would count towards additional pitch provision, but permissions would need to take account current levels of overcrowding on these sites.

Row 8: This is the net figure of estimation of the flow from sites to houses and vice versa.

Finding: 5% of respondents on authorised sites expressed an interest in moving to a house in the Study Area.

Assumptions:

Not all households who desire bricks and mortar accommodation will achieve it immediately. However, over the 5 year period assume all we be allocated a property.

Calculation: 5% grossed to population = 5% of 54 = 3 families/households

Finding: 5% of families/households in bricks and mortar families expressed an interest in a site place in the Study Area

Assumption:

5% of families equates to three households involved in the survey

5% is potentially quite low and expressed in a climate of under-provision in the Study Area

The Study Team consulted with a large number of 'housed' households but were unable to consult with all.

5% is probably about right considering the likelihood of these reported movement desires transferring into actual behaviour

Calculation: 5% of known bricks and mortar population = 7³⁴ families/households

The net movement from housing to sites and sites to housing is 4 families requiring site based accommodation over the assessment period.

³⁴ Adjusted to 7 (from 6) to account for the need to round up to the nearest whole pitch at a local level.

Row 9: Displacement from the closure of sites. Zero - as far as the study team were aware there were no plans to close any of the existing sites which are currently open; however, due to the nature of private provision it is difficult to provide accurate information.

Row 10: This factor takes into account households involved in unauthorised encampments that require a residential pitch in the Study Area. The calculation of need for residential accommodation requires estimates of the number of households involved in unauthorised encampments, and of how many of these need a residential pitch in the Study Area.

Families involved in unauthorised encampments

Findings: The recent Caravan Count shows low numbers of unauthorised encampments for the Study Area as a whole. Survey information from the local authorities indicates that in 2006 there were estimated 57 separate encampments. This was reportedly broadly reflective of previous years.

Assumptions:

Assume that the vast majority of encampments are thought to be either new or regular visitors to the area, as opposed to groups moving between areas. From advice from local officers we assume this to be 80% of encampments.

The average encampment size during 2006 was around 3 caravans. The survey showed an average of 1.5 caravans per household. There was an average of 2 families on each encampment.

Calculation: 80% of encampments during 2006 multiplied by average encampment size = 80% of 57 times 2 = 91 families.

Need for residential pitches from unauthorised encampments

Finding: According to the survey 30% of households on unauthorised encampments were interested in moving to a residential pitch in the Study Area.

Assumptions:

30% seems reasonable based upon the views of stakeholders and from findings from other GTAAs

This is treated as a single year element rather than a 'flow' of new families each year. Other households on unauthorised encampments should be incorporated into other GTAAs.

Calculation: 30% of households involved in unauthorised encampment = 30% of 91 = 27 households + rounding to nearest whole pitch at a local level = 29 households in need of residential accommodation from unauthorised encampments

Row 11: Sum of rows 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

Additional supply 2007-2012

Row 12: Zero - there are no pitches which are currently closed due to enter re-use.

Row 13: Zero - there are no pitches for which planning permissions have been granted but which are not yet developed

Row 14: Zero - there were no plans reported to develop new socially rented sites.

Row 15: Zero - there were no socially rented sites in the Study Area

Row 16: Sum of rows 12, 13, 14 and 15.

Row 17: Row 11 minus Row 16 = total residential pitches required for the Study Area.

Permanent residential accommodation need over the next period 2012-2016

The current shortage of sites and pitches for Gypsies and Travellers means that it is difficult to predict trends in living arrangements once GTAA's across the country have been implemented in the form of nationally increased site/pitch provision. There is no means of knowing how Gypsies and Travellers will decide to live in the next decade. There may be an increase in smaller households, moves into bricks and mortar housing may be more common or household formation may happen at a later age. However, in order to take a strategic view, it is important to be able to plan for the longer-term. Therefore, in order to balance the complexity of issues with a need to plan for the longer term we have used an assumed rate of household growth of 3% a year compound as applied to the projected number of pitches which should be available by 2012.³⁵ This figure is also quoted in the recent CLG report.³⁶ All households on sites are assumed to require pitches. It is assumed there will be no unauthorised developments over the next period and that any households on unauthorised encampments will not require permanent residential accommodation in the Study Area.

Row 18: (of Table 31) the total requirement for the Study Area over the period 2012-2016 is approximately an additional 14 residential pitches.

³⁵ Household growth rates of 2% and 3% a year were suggested as appropriate in Pat Niner, *Local Authority Gypsy/Traveller Sites in England*, ODPM, 2003. In the Republic of Ireland a report noted that the 4% family growth rate assumed by the Task Force on the Travelling Community had proved very accurate between 1997 and 2004 (*Review of the Operation of the Housing (Traveller Accommodation) Act 1998*. Report by the National Traveller Accommodation Consultative Committee to the Minister for Housing and Urban Renewal, 2004).

³⁶ http://www.communities.gov.uk/pub/209/PreparingRegionalSpatialStrategyreviewsonGypsiesandTravellersbyregionalplannings_id1508209.pdf

Total additional residential pitch need 2007-2016 = 72 pitches. The precise local authority break down for how these pitches would need to be created is based on the 'needs where it arises' approach and is shown in Table 34.

A note on Cumbria as contained in the North West regional GTAA

As previously mentioned (see Chapter 3) the North West regional GTAA calculated a requirement for pitches for the Cumbria sub-region of 42 pitches over the 2006-2016 period. As this regional study used assumptions and trends identified at a much broader level the findings presented in this GTAA should supersede these requirements and this GTAA should be seen as the most reliable source on pitch requirements for the Study Area.

16. An Assessment of Need for Transit Pitches

- 16.1 Although nomadism and travelling is currently restricted to a certain extent, this remains an important feature of Gypsy and Traveller identity and way of life, even if only to visit fairs or visit family. Some Gypsies and Travellers are still highly mobile without a permanent base, and others travel for significant parts of the year from a winter base. More Gypsies and Travellers might travel if it were possible to find places to stop without the threat of constant eviction. Currently the worst living conditions are commonly experienced by Gypsies and Travellers living on unauthorised encampments, who do not have easy access to water or toilet facilities, as well as difficulties in accessing education and health services.
- 16.2 National policy is clear that there should be provision in order for Gypsies and Travellers who chose to travel to do so without resorting to stopping illegally or inappropriately. During the course of this assessment we have found clear evidence as to the need for authorities to make additional provision for Gypsies and Travellers in transit. This excludes, where possible, the pull of Appleby Fair - issues relating to encampments and the Fair are dealt with in the more specific Appleby Fair report. The need for transit provision in the Study Area is shown by:
- The records of local authorities and the information in Caravan Counts, both of which show, historically, a number of encampments within the Study Area;
 - The presence of unauthorised encampments in spite of (private) transit provision being available;
 - The views and experiences of officers and stakeholders who encounter families on unauthorised encampments; and,
 - The level of interest in the provision of transit sites/stopping places in the area by households on authorised sites (ie for family members to visit).

Assessing the need for transit pitches

- 16.3 The assessment of need for transit provision uses the need for regularisation as evidenced by unauthorised encampments; as a result, the methodology for calculating the need for transit provision is similar to that for calculating the need for residential provision from unauthorised encampments.

Households involved in unauthorised encampments

Findings: The recent Caravan Count shows low numbers of unauthorised encampments for the Study Area as a whole. Survey information from the local authorities indicates that in 2006 there were estimated 57 separate encampments. This was reportedly broadly reflective of previous years.

Assumptions:

Assume that the vast majority of encampments are thought to be either new or regular visitors to the area, as opposed to groups moving between areas. From advice from local officers we assume this to be 80% of encampments.

The average encampment size during 2006 was around 3 caravans. The survey showed an average of 1.5 caravans per household. There was an average of 2 families on each encampment.

Calculation: 80% of encampments during 2006 multiplied by average encampment size = 80% of 57 times 2 = 91 families.

Need for transit provision

Finding: According to the survey 35% of households on unauthorised encampments were interested in moving to a transit pitch in the Study Area.

Assumptions:

35% seems reasonable based upon the views of stakeholders and from findings from other GTAA's.

Calculation: 35% of households involved in unauthorised encampment = 35% of 88 = 32 households/pitches.

- 16.4 This indicates that the authorities can expect to see an estimated 32 households require short-stay accommodation during one calendar year.
- 16.5 By taking into account that the main travelling months are, generally speaking, between April-October it seems reasonable to assume that the vast majority of this travelling will be done within this 6 month period. If a transit pitch has an upper time limit of stay of 4 weeks this means that one 10 pitch transit site during the summer will have the capacity to cater for around 60 households - assuming that these households leave the area.
- 16.6 Although the development of one 10 pitch transit site should offer the level of vacancies required it is unlikely that the creation of one transit site across the Study Area would meet the needs of those households requiring short-stay accommodation. This is because:

- the nature of the Study Area - most of the current encampments occur in the more northerly local authorities but there are a small number of encampments in all authorities; the provision of one transit site would not provide for the apparent geographic need.
- a single transit site would force the mixing of differing groups (family and ethnic) and could lead to potential tensions.
- the needs of the groups for travelling is often a mixture of motivations (ie work, family and holiday). A uniform transit site may not meet the differing requirements.
- It is likely that a number of people will want to move onto another transit site within the Study Area.

A note on current transit provision

It is noted that there already exists the possibility to meet this requirement for transit accommodation from existing stock within the Study Area on the two authorised private sites. However, all of the pitches on one of these sites have been closed/made unavailable, while on the other site, the number available for transit use is unknown. If the closed pitches were re-opened it is likely that there would be the capacity to cater for the number of households requiring transit accommodation. In spite of this reliance on just two existing sites may not provide the most sustainable option due to both their restricted geographical location (only in Carlisle and Eden) and past tensions.

16.7 Therefore, in practice it is estimated that the provision of around **35 transit pitches** would be required, which takes into consideration the number of places for transit households that were removed from the Study Area during the fieldwork from the private site within Carlisle City Council, as well as the possibility that as the number of authorised pitches are increased, there may be an increase in travelling after 2012.

Options for the provision of transit pitches

- 16.8 It is clear that travelling and resulting unauthorised encampments are complex phenomena. In order to assist Gypsies and Travellers in maintaining their cultural practices, the development of sites need to accommodate the diversity of travelling. It is important to note that the provision of an inappropriate form of transit accommodation may fail to reduce unauthorised encampment.
- 16.9 It is therefore important that flexibility is built into the provision of transit accommodation. There are two fundamental aspects here:
1. Larger pitches on residential sites provide the potential to meet the needs of short-term visitors.
 2. Variety in transit provision is needed to cater for the variety of needs. This might include formal transit sites; less-equipped stopping places used on a regular basis; or, temporary sites with

temporary facilities available during an event or for part of the year.

- 16.10 Although transit need could be met by the creation of 'hard' purpose made pitches/sites it is also recommended that the authorities balance the need for the development of such 'hard' pitches with the possibility of 'soft' transit pitches (ie designated stopping places). Such 'softer' options would provide Gypsies and Travellers with somewhere authorised and more secure to stop whilst creating a minimal environmental impact.
- 16.11 As discussed above, at a partnership level, a single transit site makes little sense. Travelling occurs at various scales. The partner authorities are in an ideal position in order to plan, devise and implement a network of transit accommodation between the local authorities. In addition, the provision of transit accommodation is an area of opportunity where local authorities and the County can work with sub-regions and adjoining regions in order to pool information and to ensure that proposals make sense in the wider context.
- 16.12 In order to provide the local authorities with a guide for how transit pitches may be provided across the Study Area we have tentatively outlined 3 possible options for delivery. It should be noted we are not advocating that any one of these options is more appropriate than another; however, we would advocate the creation of transit provision in each local authority in order to reduce possible enforcement costs, improve the life chances and well-being of Gypsies and Travellers, and assist in enabling a travelling way of life. Table 35 summarises these options in terms of pitch requirements.

Option 1 - the equitable split

- 16.13 This option means that each local authority should create at least 5 transit pitches which would provide the capacity required to cater for the households identified as being in need of transit accommodation. It is noted that the size of transit pitches should be larger than standard residential pitches (2 caravan to a pitch), and that transit pitches should be able to accommodate at least 3 caravans per pitch. These pitches should be distributed across the Study Area; most urgently in those authorities which experience the greatest number of encampments (ie Carlisle City Council and Allerdale Borough Council).

Option 2 - based on the current 'known' incidence of unauthorised camping

- 16.14 Based on the information provided by each of the authorities about the levels of unauthorised camping they experienced during 2006, this option would entail providing the 35 pitches proportionally according to this incidence. This equates to 'need where it arises' for transit provision.

- Allerdale Borough Council 11 pitches
- Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council 2 pitches
- Carlisle City Council 16 pitches

- Copeland Borough Council 1 pitch
- Eden District Council 3 pitches
- Lake District National Park Authority N/A
- South Lakeland District Council 2 pitches

16.15 Similar to the issues related to the provision of need where it arises for residential accommodation, this distribution reinforces the current status quo based on a number of factors including: differing enforcement practices, land availability, and historical local authority practices.

Option 3 - based on the known population and location of Gypsies and Travellers

16.16 It is widely thought that one of the main reasons Gypsies and Travellers travel to certain areas and stay on unauthorised encampments is to visit family and friends who are resident in, or near, these areas. This option would entail providing the 35 pitches proportionally based on the location of the known population living on private authorised accommodation and in bricks and mortar housing.

- Allerdale Borough Council 4 pitches
- Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council 2 pitches
- Carlisle City Council 14 pitches
- Copeland Borough Council 0 pitches
- Eden District Council 11 pitches
- Lake District National Park Authority N/A
- South Lakeland District Council 4 pitches

16.17 Again, this is fundamentally a 'need where it arises' approach, and is based on the assumption that Gypsies and Travellers travel to visit friends and family resident in particular authorities. This means that more transit provision will be required by those authorities that have more Gypsies and Travellers accommodated with their districts. Although this distribution may reflect a significant driver for mobility, this may also serve to reinforce the current status quo of household concentration, as well as ignoring new developments which may change the location of the population over time, and ignoring other drivers of mobility such as 'holidays' and 'work'.

Table 35: Apportionment of transit pitches by local authority based on three options

| Option | Study Area Total | Allerdale Borough Council | Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council | Carlisle City Council | Copeland Borough Council | Eden District Council | Lake District National Park Authority | South Lakeland District Council |
|---|------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Option 1: Equity (pitches) | 35 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Option 2: Based on encampments (pitches) | 35 | 11 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 3 | N/A | 2 |
| Option 3: Based on known population (pitches) | 35 | 4 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 11 | N/A | 4 |

17. An Assessment of Need for Travelling Showpeople Pitches

- 17.1 Circular 04/07 requires that the accommodation needs of Travelling Showpeople are included within GTAAAs as such, because of the separate planning issues for Travelling Showpeople, and their differing accommodation needs, we have produced a separate calculation of residential need. It must be noted that pitches (commonly referred to as 'plots') for Travelling Showpeople are significantly larger than that required for other groups of Travellers.

Travelling Showpeople accommodation need

- 17.2 The fieldwork with Gypsies and Travellers and survey of local authority information revealed that the population of Travelling Showpeople are of equal significance, in terms of the numbers of families living in the area, as is other Gypsy and Traveller groups.
- 17.3 All of the factors that are used to determine Gypsy and Traveller accommodation need are considered in order to calculate need for accommodation for Travelling Showpeople; however, a number of these are significantly different for Travelling Showpeople. In particular, this includes:
- *Unauthorised sites* - Travelling Showpeople tend not to camp illegally on land which they do not have permission for to the same extent as is experienced by other Travelling groups. Consultations with the Showmen's Guild indicated that the maintenance of good working relationships with local authorities is important to their businesses; therefore, any illegal activity by Travelling Showpeople, whose occupation relies on having permission by an authority to operate, potentially risks the ability to work. As a result Travelling Showpeople will rarely appear as unauthorised encampments, preferring instead, during the fair season, to double-up on authorised sites, use a stopping place, (often with agreement with the land owner) or travel back to their authorised pitch.
 - *Movement from other areas* - The areas in which Travelling Showpeople live are heavily influenced by the circuit of fairs that each household attends. As a result, there is a tendency to want/need to live within 'their patch' of preferred fairs, which in turn means that Travelling Showpeople will move to other areas for short-periods only rather than to seek permanent accommodation.
- 17.4 Table 33 below summarises the model for residential plot requirements in the Study Area between 2007-2012 local authority requirements for these plots can be found in Table 34 in Chapter 15. However, for the purposes of further clarity each requirement is expanded upon below.

Table 36: Summary of estimated need for residential plots for Travelling Showpeople at a Study Area level 2007-2012

| Element of supply and need | | Plots |
|----------------------------|---|-----------|
| | Current residential supply | |
| 1 | Socially rented pitches | 0 |
| 2 | Private authorised pitches | 38 |
| 3 | Total authorised pitches | 38 |
| | | |
| | Residential pitch need 2007-2012 | |
| 4 | End of temporary planning permissions | 0 |
| 5 | New household formation | 13 |
| 6 | Unauthorised developments | 0 |
| 7 | Closure of yards | 0 |
| 8 | Additional residential need | 13 |
| | | |
| 9 | Additional supply 2007-2012 | 0 |
| | | |
| 10 | Requirement for extra pitches | 13 |

Current residential supply

Row 1: Zero - The number of plots on residential socially rented yards provided by local authority information.

Row 2: The total number of authorised plots provided for Travelling Showpeople. Due to the levels of vehicle overcrowding on these yards the

actual number of households present on the yards have been used rather than the potential total number of plots for which there is permission.

Row 3: Sum of 1 + 2

Residential plot need 2007-2012

Row 4: There are no temporary planning permissions due to end during the assessment period.

Row 5: The number of new pitches required from new household formation. This requires estimates of:

- a) The number of new households likely to form;
- b) The proportion likely to require a pitch; and,
- c) The proportion likely to remain within the Study Area.

Finding: The analysis of the survey showed that the number of individuals requiring their own accommodation in the next 5 years from authorised yards was the equivalent of 35% of respondents.

Assumptions: From what seems reasonable we assume that a need equal to 35% of the existing population seems in line with similar findings from elsewhere. All are assumed to require their own accommodation (own plot), all are assumed to want to stay in the Study Area.

Calculation: 35% grossed to total current population on sites. The site population does not equal the current provision of plots as a number of plots are occupied by equipment/vehicles. It is estimated that there are 33 households across the Study Area. 35% of 33 = 11 households/plots³⁷.

Row 6: According to the information received from the local authorities there was no unauthorised development of yards at the time of the assessment.

Row 7: The research team understood that there was no intention to close any yards within the Study Area.

Row 8: Sum of rows 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Row 9: Zero - due to the nature of the provision in the area (private) the research team was not aware of any supply of plots within the Study Area

Row 10: Sum of row 8 minus row 9. There is a need for 13 residential permanent plots for Travelling Showpeople (see row 20 of Table 34).

³⁷ Adjusted to 11 (from 12) to account for the need to round up to the nearest whole pitch at a local level.

Permanent residential accommodation need over the next period 2012-2016

Similar to Gypsies and Travellers the current shortage of sites and pitches for Travelling Showpeople means that it is difficult to predict trends in living arrangements once GTAA's across the country have been implemented in the form of nationally increased site/pitch provision. However, in order to take a strategic view, it is important to be able to plan for the longer-term. Therefore, in order to balance the complexity of issues with a need to plan for the longer term we have used an assumed rate of household growth of 2% a year compound as applied to the projected number of pitches which should be available by 2012.³⁸ All households on yards sites are assumed to require plots. It is assumed there will be no unauthorised developments over the next period.

The total requirement for the Study Area, adjusted for local level rounding to whole pitches, over the period **2012-2016** is an additional **5 residential plots** (see row 21 of table 34).

Total additional residential pitch need 2007-2016 = 18 plots

³⁸ Although household growth rates of 3% a year are typically used for Gypsies and Travellers 2% has been used here to account for the smaller families of Travelling Showpeople in comparison to Gypsies and Travellers.

18. Recommendations

- 18.1 This final chapter provides some recommendations, based on the findings of the study, for the Partner Authorities, as well as stakeholders, for how a number of areas might progress.
- 18.2 Each of the local authorities, in partnership with key agencies, should take a proactive approach to the provision of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in order to meet the accommodation need identified in this assessment. The over-arching recommendation from the study is that the authorities involved aim to work in a pro-active fashion to meet the accommodation needs which have been identified as a result of this assessment.
- 18.3 Each authority has a significant amount of work to do in order to create greater synergy between the current situation of the Gypsy and Traveller population and situation enjoyed by the vast majority of the non-Traveller communities. The following aims to provide the authorities concerned with conclusions and recommendations, emerging during the course of this assessment, as to how the need identified can be best met. There are six broad headings: overall strategy, systems and policy framework; accommodating transient Gypsies and Travellers; communication and engagement; developing accommodation; health and housing-related support issues; and, Travelling Showpeople accommodation.
- 18.4 Although there is a general theme of joined-up working in these recommendations, it must be remembered that each of the authorities will need to develop their own responses to this need in order to provide locally intelligent accommodation options for resident Gypsy and Traveller households. A number of the recommendations, and variations thereof, have been made within other GTAA's that the authors have been involved in within the North West region. We have brought our experience of practice (both good and bad) to this assessment in order to make these recommendations. We believe it is important that local authorities begin to take a common approach to embedding Gypsy and Traveller issues into their plans and good practice sharing - this should happen both within and across areas. It is acknowledged that some of these recommendations are quite generic; therefore, those authorities who are not already implementing these recommendations should begin, and those authorities already engaged in such work should continue to do so.

Strategy, systems and policy framework

- 18.5 The Cumbria Study Area authorities have important, strategic and facilitating roles to play in order to support local authorities and each other in developing pitch provision for Gypsies and Travellers. It is important that partnerships between the authorities are maintained after the assessment of need and this is linked into work of neighbouring authorities, both with Lancashire and the North East. Both within and across authorities fora for planning for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation issues already exist. This is particularly the case for the Cumbria wide Joint Agency Strategic Planning Group which is currently composed of a wide and diverse stakeholder base (see p. 61).

Recommendation 1: The Joint Agency Strategic Planning Group will provide a useful vehicle for change in ensuring that the authorities develop a meaningful and co-ordinated approach to Gypsy and Traveller accommodation and related issues. Consideration should be given to providing this group with the resources required in order to enable the joined-up process needed.

Recommendation 2: All authorities should ensure an internal working group exists within each authority, which cuts across service areas, in order to better co-ordinate the response and approach on Gypsy and Traveller issues and avoid potential duplication of work. Each group should then feed into the Joint Agency Group.

- 18.6 Although, in comparison to other areas, some local authorities had access to much more information around the make-up of the local Gypsy and Traveller communities, there is a need to improve information collection and sharing.

Recommendation 3: Each authority needs to ensure that there is a standardised and centralised method of recording occurrences of unauthorised encampments and the needs of households on these encampments. Steps should be taken to produce a Cumbria wide Caravan Count in order to take a much more strategic and accurate view of accommodation need, travelling patterns and trends. Each authority should be party to joint protocols in order to respond effectively and fairly towards unauthorised encampments.

Recommendation 4: In order to adhere to the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, and to ensure the high quality of on-going monitoring, authorities should ensure that Gypsies and Travellers are recognised as separate categories (ie Romany Gypsy and Irish Traveller) in all their ethnic monitoring forms, most urgently in relation to housing and planning applications.

- 18.7 With an increase in the provision of pitches and sites for Gypsies and Travellers, there will be a need to ensure that access to these sites embrace transparency and equality. It should be noted that Gypsies

and Travellers are one of the most diverse groupings in UK society. This diversity can at times lead to potential conflict.

Recommendation 5: If socially rented accommodation is to be made available the waiting lists for these sites should be:

- Accessible to all resident Gypsies and Travellers in Cumbria
- Available to be accessed in advance and outside the area via telephone or ICT systems
- Clear and transparent in terms of allocation policies
- Formalised
- Centralised
- Standardised

Recommendation 6: Authorities should ensure that principles of equality, in relation to Gypsies and Travellers, are embedded in the wide range of services provided. In particular this includes:

- Housing policies
- Homeless policies
- Harassment
- Communication and engagement
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Site management
- Housing-related support
- Choice-Based Lettings
- Allocation policies
- Planning policies
- Absence policies
- Equality Impact Assessments

Recommendation 7: Authorities should be sensitive to the different cultural and support needs of Gypsies and Travellers who may present as homeless and those who may require local authority accommodation.

Recommendation 8: All authorities should ensure they take a common approach to the Welfare Needs Assessment; this should be grounded in good practice and be pro-active in meeting the needs of Gypsies and Travellers. The assessment should also be broadened to include a range of issues such as travelling patterns, reasons for

visiting etc which could help to better monitor accommodation need from unauthorised encampments within the Study Area.

Recommendation 9: Housing officers, site managers and other relevant personnel should liaise to ensure that advice on allocation policies and procedures is always up-to-date and that site managers or other liaison staff can assist people through the system.

Recommendation 10: For residential sites the practice of licensing pitches should be discontinued and replaced by more formal tenancies. A tenancy would assure the resident of greater security and encourage feelings of ownership in their site/accommodation.

- 18.8 Although there are currently no socially rented sites in the area the experience of socially rented provision in other areas has demonstrated that inappropriate management can foster and encourage a perception of partisanship and divisiveness, doing little to build social cohesion on sites and lessen social exclusion for members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities.

Recommendation 11: If socially rented sites are created within the Study Area the authorities should:

- Implement the principles contained within the emerging guidance for site management published by the CLG.
- Evaluate the management of sites at regular intervals

Accommodating transient Gypsies and Travellers

- 18.9 It is clear that travelling and any resulting unauthorised encampment are complex phenomena. In order to assist Gypsies and Travellers in maintaining their cultural practices, the development of sites need to accommodate the diversity of travelling. Provision of an inappropriate form of transit accommodation may fail to reduce unauthorised encampments (ie a mixture of residential and transit provision may not work in all cases because of possible community tension between 'settled' and 'highly mobile' Gypsies and Travellers, or varying reasons for travelling).

- 18.10 In addition, the authorities that make up the Study Area appear to be attractive areas for seasonal, short stay or stop-over travelling. Although calculations have been produced, such travelling is difficult to quantify as need in terms of pitch provision, so the authorities will need to develop a range of appropriate strategies to meet this often unpredictable need.

- 18.11 It is therefore important that flexibility is built into the provision of transit accommodation. There are three fundamental recommendations here:

Recommendation 12: There needs to be variety in transit provision in order to cater for the variety of needs. This might range from formal transit pitches, through less-equipped stopping places used on a

regular basis to temporary sites with temporary facilities available during an event or for part of the year;

Recommendation 13: There is a need to work across districts, with private landowners and key Gypsy and Traveller groups in order to provide feasible and appropriate options for mass gatherings, should they occur.

Recommendation 14: The level of accommodation provision across Cumbria should remain under constant review.

Communication and engagement

18.12 Communication with local Gypsy and Traveller households will be imperative during the coming years of change and upheaval caused by an increase in accommodation provision (both locally and nationally). Such communication will require co-ordination and sensitivity. The process of developing pitches for Gypsies and Travellers provides an opportunity to begin a clear and transparent dialogue with members of the 'settled community', including local residents and parish and district councillors, local authorities and Gypsies and Travellers.

Recommendation 15: The authorities should engage in efforts to raise cultural awareness issues and dispel some of the persistent myths around Gypsies and Travellers.

Recommendation 16: Authorities should develop their communication and engagement strategies already in place for consultation with non-Travelling communities and tailor these, in an appropriate manner, to Gypsy and Traveller community members. The Local Engagement and Employment Strategy should make direct references to Gypsy and Travellers.

Recommendation 17: Gypsies and Travellers within the Study Area should be encouraged and facilitated to form a Gypsy/Traveller led support/advisory group. This group could then act as a bridge between the authorities/stakeholders and the wider Gypsy/Traveller communities.

18.13 As not all pitches identified here need to be met through socially rented provision (although the absence of socially rented provision in the area means that some people are currently excluded from the area), and the overwhelming aspiration of the community is to be owner-occupiers, there is a need to develop a constructive dialogue between Gypsies and Travellers seeking to develop private sites and planning authorities. Initial and appropriate discussions with the planning authority could avoid the economic fallout which occurs when land is developed and planning permission is later refused.

Recommendation 18: Planning departments should offer appropriate advice and support to Gypsies and Travellers on the workings of the planning system and the criteria to be considered in applications.

18.14 Our experience of collecting data about the Gypsy and Traveller community across each authority has highlighted that certain sections of some local authorities are more involved in Gypsy and Traveller issues than others and have a clear lead on these issues. Other authorities adopted a more ad hoc approach and the responsibility of Gypsy and Traveller issues occasionally went to an officer who had shown an interest. There are two recommendations here.

Recommendation 19: Each authority should identify a clear lead officer (preferably a corporate officer) who manages each authority's response to Gypsies and Traveller issues.

Developing accommodation

18.15 Clearly the process of developing accommodation to meet the need identified here will require significant funding, much of which will be directed at the Gypsy and Traveller Site Grant held by Communities and Local Government. A number of stakeholders noted that until the need for residential accommodation was satisfied it will be challenging to develop transit accommodation/sites/places without them turning into residential sites by default.

Recommendation 20: Those officers and agencies leading the planning, design and development of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation should involve the target Gypsy and Traveller population in all stages. In turn site (both residential and transit) and design should be approached in a creative and innovative manner. Preferences and aspirations of Gypsies and Travellers should be taken into consideration. Important things to consider include:

- Location to local services and transport networks
- Pitch size
- Amenities
- Sheds
- Management
- Mixture of accommodation (chalet, trailer, etc.)
- Utility of outside space (driveways, gardens, etc.)
- Homes for life principles
- Health and related support issues
- Tenure Mix
- Space for short-term visitors

Recommendation 21: Authorities should ensure that existing statutory guidelines and emerging good practice are used in relation to

residential and transit site design, management and health and safety issues.

- 18.16 Although we did not monitor fiscal levels during the study, households clearly had varying income levels. Discounted for sale, shared ownership and trailer rental are just three of the methods which may help increase the economic mobility and engender a greater sense of belonging for Gypsy and Traveller households.

Recommendation 22: The principles and methods used by authorities and RSLs of promoting affordable accommodation to members of the non-Traveller communities should be adapted to the accommodation used by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities.

- 18.17 It was clear that the limited number of sites in the Study Area, coupled with their private ownership, meant that a number of families/households were excluded from pitch based accommodation. It is also clear that this created some suppressed need from families in bricks and mortar housing who would rather be in trailers on pitches and some reluctant unauthorised developments - who saw buying land and living on that land their only viable option for accommodation.

Recommendation 23: There should be the creation of at least one socially rented site in the Study Area.

Recommendation 24: The requirements identified as a result of this assessment should be met by new site development. As a result of the exclusion that has occurred in the past existing sites should not be extended unless there is a pressing case for this to happen or the management of the sites change/is improved.

Health and housing-related support Issues

- 18.18 The indications are that although the sample for this study generally experienced few incidences of ill health and disability, when this was not the case the suggestions are that health needs are a significant factor in influencing accommodation need. This affects decisions to continue to reside on 'sites', which without support were seen as difficult to do so, or houses where adaptations were easier to accommodate. There were a number of issues which emerged during the assessment that would improve the life of a number of Gypsies and Travellers and provide different sections of the communities with independence.

Recommendation 25: It will be an important component, in order to produce sustainable solutions for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation provision, for all relevant statutory departments to engage with Gypsy and Traveller needs. Supporting People teams should be embedded in the strategic planning and delivery of services. Any specific training needs should be met where needed.

Recommendation 26: Authorities should work with Supporting People to create additional floating Gypsy and Traveller housing support

workers. Such officers could offer support and assistance to enable those people wishing to remain in bricks and mortar accommodation or live on sites, to do so.

Recommendation 27: Supporting People teams should network with Supporting People teams locally, regionally and nationally in order to share and disseminate good practice on meeting the housing-related support needs of Gypsy and Traveller community members.

Recommendation 28: The profile of Home Improvement Agencies (HIAs) should be raised in relation to Gypsies and Travellers who wish to remain in their own homes. It is important that such agencies are able to engage with people living on private sites as well as those living in bricks and mortar accommodation.

Recommendation 29: Housing-related support should be flexible in order to offer support when it is needed (i.e. settlement on a site/in a house), with scope to withdraw it on a phased basis or continue as required.

Recommendation 30: In order to assist with the development of more authorised accommodation, adjustment to sites/houses and the regularisation of Gypsies and Travellers, each Gypsy and Traveller in all the authorities in the area should have access to housing-related support in the form of floating support units. This will require review over time and the number of units needed may reduce.

Recommendation 31: Housing-related support should develop appropriate strategies to respond to the key areas of support required, identified in this study.

- 18.19 A major source of recurring tension within the non-Traveller community is around the abandonment of household and occupational waste on areas which have been encamped upon. Gypsies and Travellers however often only have vans and light haulage vehicles as their means of transport. Such transport often prohibits the use of local recycling centres without a charge being paid. Although some Gypsies and Travellers do discard such waste on land which they have used/encamped upon it has also been known for non Gypsies and Travellers to use such sites as fly-tipping areas in order to deflect blame from themselves to transient Gypsies and Travellers.

Recommendation 32: Options should be devised by each authority for Gypsies and Travellers on unauthorised sites who have no means to dispose of their household waste to do so.

Recommendation 33: The authorities need to develop ways in which to deal with households who leave occupational waste in areas where encampments have happened rather than discard this at the appropriate recycling centre.

Travelling Showpeople accommodation

18.20 Authorities should consider the above recommendations as applying to all Gypsy and Traveller groups, inclusive of Travelling Showpeople. However, because of the unique position afforded to Travelling Showpeople in the planning guidance, coupled with a changing labour market and living arrangements for Travelling Showpeople households, accommodating Travelling Showpeople poses particular challenges.

Recommendation 34: Authorities should consult with the local branch of the Showmen's Guild to discuss plans to increase and develop the accommodation provision for Travelling Showpeople. Issues of tenure, management and size are important issues which will need to be discussed fully if additional provision is to be made.

Recommendation 35: Authorities should be aware of and implement the guidance issued by the CLG around planning and Travelling Showpeople sites.

Recommendation 36: Authorities should identify specific pieces of land that could be used by Travelling Showpeople in the future.

Appendix 1: Local Plan Policies on Gypsy Site Provision

| Box 1 : Local Plan Policies on Gypsy Site Provision | |
|--|--|
| Allerdale Local Plan | |
| | <p>Policy HS18: In considering planning applications for residential or transit gypsy sites, the Council will take into account the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the location of the site in relation to adjoining land uses; in particular residential uses; and (ii) the access to the site; and (iii) the cost of providing the necessary utility services; and (iv) the degree of natural screening available on the site. <p>It is no longer the duty of Local Authorities to provide caravan sites for the gypsy population. However, the need for sites still exists, although the demand in Allerdale is modest. The maximum anticipated number of caravans in the Borough is about 20. Any proposal for sites will be assessed against the above criteria but will be expected to cater for both residential pitches to meet the needs of gypsies living in the Borough and transit pitches to cater for those visiting the Borough.</p> |
| Borough of Barrow-in-Furness Local Plan Review - Housing Chapter Alteration 2006 | |
| | <p>POLICY B24</p> <p>In assessing applications for the development of travellers/gypsy sites, the Authority</p> <p>will use the following locational criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Sites should not result in the loss of any land of nature conservation, agricultural or amenity value; b) Sites should be within a reasonable distance of local services and facilities and within 10 minutes walk of a frequent public transport service; c) Sites should not encroach on the undeveloped open countryside; and d) Sites should be located in areas where there will be minimal disruption to residential amenity. |

| Carlisle District Local Plan 2001-2016 | |
|---|---|
| | <p>POLICY H14</p> <p>Where there is an identified need the City Council will consider the provision of Gypsy Caravan Sites. Proposals for Gypsy sites will be acceptable providing that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the proposal is not within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or County Landscape; and 2. there would be no adverse impact on the local landscape; and 3. appropriate access and parking can be achieved; and 4. the proposed site is reasonably accessible to community services; and 5. the proposal would not adversely affect the amenities of adjacent occupiers by way of noise, vehicular or other activities on site. |
| Copeland Local Plan (June 2006) | |
| | <p>Policy HSG 26 : Gypsy Caravan Sites</p> <p>Where there is an identified need the Council will consider proposals for Gypsy caravan sites. To be acceptable proposals for such sites must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. not involve locations within or adjoining: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Bees Head Heritage Coast • Landscapes of County Importance • areas of nature conservation interest including SSSIs, Local Nature Reserves and Sites of Wildlife Importance • Conservation Areas or in the vicinity of Listed Buildings or Scheduled Ancient Monuments • or otherwise have an adverse impact on the local landscape or undeveloped coast 2. be on a site which is well related to an existing settlement and the main highway network 3. incorporate appropriate access and parking arrangements 4. involve a site which provides reasonable access to community services |

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| | <p>5. not adversely affect the amenities of adjacent occupiers by way of noise, vehicular or other activities on site</p> <p>Proposals must also be in accordance with other relevant Local Plan policies.</p> <p>Policy HSG 27: Accommodating Travelling Showpeople</p> <p>The provision of winter quarters for travelling showpeople for residential purposes and the maintenance of fairground equipment will be assessed against the following requirements. To be acceptable proposals for such sites must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. not involve locations within or adjoining: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St Bees Head Heritage Coast • Landscapes of County Importance • areas of nature conservation interest including SSSIs, Local Nature Reserves and Sites of Wildlife Importance • Conservation Areas or in the vicinity of Listed Buildings or Scheduled Ancient Monuments • or otherwise have an adverse impact on the local landscape or undeveloped coast 2. be on a site which is well related to an existing settlement and the main highway network 3. incorporate appropriate access and parking arrangements 4. involve a site which provides reasonable access to community services 5. not adversely affect the amenities of adjacent occupiers by way of noise, vehicular or other activities on site. <p>Proposals must also be in accordance with other relevant Local Plan policies.</p> |
| Eden Local Plan 1996 | |
| | <p>Policy HS13</p> <p>Proposals for the development of sites involving the stationing of caravans for occupation by gypsies and other travelling people will be assessed against the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) impact on the amenity of nearby residents; ii) impact on landscape, agriculture, nature conservation, archaeology or other interests of recognised importance; |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>iii) adequacy of road access; and</p> <p>iv) capacity of the local infrastructure to service the development.</p> <p>3.42 Government Circular 1/94 asks that local planning authorities should indicate the basis on which proposals to meet gypsy needs will be assessed. In Eden several sites already provide accommodation to meet this need. In the event that further proposals are forthcoming, Policy HS13 indicates the range of criteria which will form a basis for their evaluation.</p> |
|--|---|

Appendix 2: CLG Caravan Count results for the Study Area by local authority between July 2005 and July 2007

| Authority area | Count | Authorised Socially Rented Sites | Authorised Private Sites | Unauthorised Developments | Unauthorised Encampments | Total Caravans |
|-----------------------------|----------|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | | |
| Total for the Study Area | Jul 2007 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 19 | 107 |
| | Jan 2007 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 6 | 166 |
| | Jul 2006 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 10 | 121 |
| | Jan 2006 | 0 | 124 | 0 | 8 | 132 |
| | Jul 2005 | 0 | 143 | 6 | 11 | 160 |
| | | | | | | |
| Allerdale | Jul 2007 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Jan 2007 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Jul 2006 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Jan 2006 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Jul 2005 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 14 |
| | | | | | | |
| Barrow-in- Furness | Jul 2007 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| | Jan 2007 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| | Jul 2006 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| | Jan 2006 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| | Jul 2005 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| | | | | | | |
| Carlisle | Jul 2007 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 44 |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---|-----|---|----|-----|
| | Jan 2007 | 0 | 108 | 0 | 6 | 114 |
| | Jul 2006 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| | Jan 2006 | 0 | 81 | 0 | 4 | 85 |
| | Jul 2005 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| | | | | | | |
| Copeland | Jul 2007 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Jan 2007 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Jul 2006 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Jan 2006 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Jul 2005 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| | | | | | | |
| Eden | Jul 2007 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 5 | 37 |
| | Jan 2007 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| | Jul 2006 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 3 | 41 |
| | Jan 2006 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| | Jul 2005 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 3 | 40 |
| | | | | | | |
| South Lakeland | Jan 2007 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 14 |
| | July 2006 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Jan 2006 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 |
| | July 2005 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| | Jan 2005 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Appendix 3: Consultation event



Cumbria Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation and Wider Needs Assessment
and

Appleby Fair Report

Presentation

14th April 2008

Cumbria County Council, the six district authorities and the Lake District National Park Authority, have completed their Assessment of Gypsy and Traveller needs (GTAA) and the Appleby Fair report, which formed a distinct assessment of issues arising from the Fair.

The event will be held at Penrith Rugby Club and will include a buffet lunch, guest speakers and presentations by the Consultants, Salford University.

The agenda is:

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 10.00 | Arrival: coffee and introduction by Cllr Richard Turner, Chair of Cumbria Housing Group |
| 10.30 | Cllr. Richard Bennett, Local Government Association |
| 10.45 | Caroline Keightley, Gypsy and Traveller Unit, CLG |
| 11.00 | Michael Gallagher, Director of Planning, Transport and Housing, Northwest Regional Assembly |
| 11.30 | Coffee |
| 11.45 | GTAA: Findings, Phil Brown, Lisa Hunt & Jenna Condie Salford University |
| 12.45 | Lunch |
| 1.45 | Appleby Fair Report: Findings, Phil Brown & Lisa Hunt |
| 2.25 | Discussion and coffee |
| 3.30 | Close |

For further details please contact:

Lee Walker

Eden District Council

Mansion House

Penrith CA11 7QU

Tel: 01768 212 489

Email: lee.walker@eden.gov.uk

Consultation event attendees

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Alan Day | Ken Sharples |
| Alison Heine | Kerry Courts |
| Andrew Shaddock | Kevin Douglas |
| Andrew Yates | Kevin Lancaster |
| Angela Harrison | Kim Suttle |
| Angus Hutchinson | Kirk Mulhearn |
| Anne Rogers | Lee Skelton |
| Anne Taylor | Lee Walker |
| Cllr Brenda Gray | Cllr Les Lishman |
| Billy Welsh | Lisa Hunt |
| Brian Morris | Lisa Marie Smith |
| Caroline Keightley | Louise Jeffrey |
| Chris Isherwood | Louise Wannop |
| David Ingham | Malcolm Smith |
| David Sheard | Cllr Margaret Jackson |
| Dawn Taylor | Maria Keity |
| Diane Astil | Marianne Slater |
| Diane Whitehead | Martin Garside |
| Dorothy Blair | Cllr Mary Warburton |
| Elaine Lomas | Michael Eyles |
| Elizabeth Murphy | Patricia Bell |
| Fiona Moss | Paula Allen |

| | |
|------------------|------------------|
| Glenys Lumley | Phil Brown |
| Graham Hale | Richard Turner |
| Helen Houston | S Cubbins |
| Helen Lewis | Sheila Orchard |
| Cllr Ian Stewart | Simon Taylor |
| Irene Herety | Stuart Pate |
| Jane Hurn | Terrence Belshaw |
| Janice Caryl | Tim Stoddard |
| Jenna Condie | Tracy Carruthers |
| Jenny Rutter | Trevor Gear |
| Jeremy Hewitson | |
| Jill Elliott | |
| Jim Fay | |
| Jo Dowling | |
| Jo Murray | |
| Joel Rasbash | |
| Judith Quigley | |
| Cllr Judy Prest | |
| Julie Dodd | |
| Julie Jackson | |
| Julie Ward | |
| Katrina Heggie | |
| Keith Morgan | |

Consultation event feedback

One of the main priorities of the event, apart from information sharing, was to provide attendees with an opportunity to feedback upon the report findings. At the event there were two main ways to do this: by placing anonymous notes on display boards enquiring about different issues relating to the report, and by contributing to the discussion session where questions were posed to the report authors and other guest speakers.

What follows is a summary of the comments raised in relation to the display boards as well as general comments raised during the question and answer sessions.

What needs to take place in order for the proposals for pitch/plot numbers to be met?

Many of the responses and comments revolved around the need to involve and engage more with members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities:

“Talk to the Gypsy and Traveller population first, then form a consultation group where Gypsies and Travellers feel valued and able to get involved in such debates.”

“Listen to the Travellers and what they need!”

A further event to inform members of the travelling community about the report findings and the future of site provision within the Study Area was requested by Gypsy and Traveller representatives. Greater communication is needed with the Gypsy and Traveller community in order for them to be aware of events such as this one which are relevant and important to them:

“Some of our travelling community weren’t aware of this [event] until we actually told them.”

Another comment related to the problem of finding suitable land for pitches and plots:

“My problem relates to finding land to allocate it for permanent sites or for transit sites.”

What types of sites, pitches and plots are most needed?

Some people commented via the post-it note display board as to what types of sites, pitches and plots are most needed:

“Any pitch would be nice.”

“Big ones.”

“With toilets and showers available.”

Again the need to engage with the Gypsy and Traveller communities was emphasised:

“We are not the people to ask - talk to the Gypsy and Traveller community!”

Some attendees mentioned that consideration should be given to the specific needs of Travelling Showpeople in terms of the size of plots and the need for fair equipment and vehicles to be stored in the same place as Showpeople's homes:

"Please remember, Showmen's sites need more space to accommodate vehicles and equipment. Our vehicles are inseparable from our homes."

In addition, the issue of security of tenure was raised by Gypsy and Traveller representatives. One attendee stated that the travelling community are treated inequitably to house-dwellers in relation to being able to buy your own home:

"Why don't Travellers get the right to buy their slab on council run pitch? Yet Mr Joe Blog can buy his council home after three years at a discounted rate, and we would all like to think we're equal."

Where are the biggest needs for sites, pitches and plots?

Some attendees mentioned specific places where more sites, pitches and plots are required:

"Allerdale/Copeland"

"Cumbria"

"Carlisle"

"Carlisle/Allerdale"

Other attendees expressed concern that the provision of site accommodation is inequitably distributed between the different local authorities in Cumbria and stated that this issue needs resolving. One person asked,

"Based on the Accommodation Needs Assessment, what incentives exist to get a fairer distribution of sites between authorities?"

Other comments

Below are some of the other comments that were made by attendees of the event:

"I think that this meeting is very promising. Let's hope that we all carry out what's been highlighted in this meeting."

"Little less talking and more action to support the Traveller community"

"I don't see anybody saying sorry for letting down the travelling community. How embarrassing!"

"Who is going to drive the recommendations forward?"

"Everybody needs to work together and support the Travellers in their way and lifestyle."