

**Merseyside and West Lancashire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment for
Knowsley Council,
Liverpool Council,
Sefton Council,
St Helens Council,
West Lancashire Borough Council, and
Wirral Council**

Final Report

August 2014

Revised January 2015



Main Contact: Michael Bullock

arc⁴ Ltd

Email: michael.bullock@arc4.co.uk

Website: www.arc4.co.uk

©2015 arc⁴ Limited (Company No. 06205180)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Executive Summary for Merseyside and West Lancashire GTAA 2013 | 7 |
| Introduction | 7 |
| Methodology | 7 |
| The current picture: population and pitch provision | 7 |
| Household Survey Data: Key Information | 8 |
| Stakeholder consultation | 9 |
| Future Pitch Requirements | 9 |
| Transit Requirements | 11 |
| 1. Introduction | 13 |
| Study Components | 14 |
| Report structure | 14 |
| 2. Legislative and Policy Context | 16 |
| Legislative background | 16 |
| Policy background | 16 |
| CLG Caravan Counts | 21 |
| CLG Design Guidance | 22 |
| 3. Methodology | 24 |
| Phases 1 and 2: Literature/desktop review and stakeholder consultation | 24 |
| Phase 3: Survey of Gypsies and Travellers across Merseyside and West Lancashire | 25 |
| 4. Review of Current Provision | 28 |
| Provision of authorised and unauthorised sites | 28 |
| 5. Review of Current Population | 33 |
| Population Estimates | 33 |
| Caravan Counts and Authorised Pitches | 33 |
| Ethnicity of respondents | 38 |
| Tenure of respondents | 39 |
| Facilities on pitches | 40 |
| Amenities elsewhere on the site | 41 |
| Repairs and improvements | 42 |
| Space Requirements | 43 |
| Satisfaction with location of your home | 45 |
| Feelings about neighbourhood, safety and security | 46 |
| Location to amenities | 47 |
| Overcrowding | 49 |
| Facilities shared with other households | 49 |
| Cost of accommodation and services | 50 |
| Moving | 51 |
| Household mobility | 52 |
| 6. Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Requirements | 54 |
| Modelling of short term needs | 54 |
| Description of factors in the model | 56 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Longer-term pitch requirements (six to 15 years)..... | 61 |
| Type of new provision..... | 65 |
| Transit requirements..... | 66 |
| 7. Travelling Showpeople Plot Requirements | 76 |
| Understanding travel patterns..... | 76 |
| Understanding the location of and need for accommodation | 77 |
| Showperson plot requirements | 77 |
| Understanding what sort of provision..... | 78 |
| Tenure preference and site management | 78 |
| Summary..... | 78 |
| 8. Travelling practices and experiences | 80 |
| 9. Stakeholder consultation..... | 83 |
| Overview | 83 |
| Provision of facilities and support | 84 |
| Provision of Accommodation | 85 |
| Need for Additional Permanent and Transit Sites | 86 |
| Unauthorised Encampments | 87 |
| Constraints on future provision | 88 |
| 10. Conclusion and Strategic Response..... | 90 |
| Meeting pitch/plot requirements..... | 91 |
| Recommendations for meeting pitch requirements | 95 |
| Other issues to be considered as best practice | 95 |
| Appendix A: Legislative Background..... | 98 |
| Overall approach | 98 |
| Appendix B: Policy and Guidance | 101 |
| Introduction | 101 |
| Appendix C: Fieldwork Questionnaire..... | 111 |
| Appendix D: Stakeholder Consultation | 143 |
| Approach..... | 143 |
| Stakeholder questions and responses | 143 |
| Appendix E: Glossary of Terms | 160 |
| Appendix F: Longer-term pitch requirement analysis..... | 162 |
| Approach 1: 100% household formation rate | 162 |
| Approach 2 50% household formation rate | 163 |
| Approach 3 3% annual growth rate | 165 |
| Conclusion | 166 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| Table ES1 | Summary of Traveller sites and pitches | 8 |
| Table ES2 | Summary of future permanent pitch requirements 2013/14 to 2032/33 | 11 |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|----|
| Table ES3 | Summary of transit pitch requirements 2013/14 to 2017/18 | 12 |
| Table 3.1 | Summary of achieved household interviews by type of dwelling and area | 26 |
| Table 4.1a (Part 1) | List of sites as at 31 st May 2013 | 29 |
| Table 4.1a (Part 2) | Summary of Site Provision | 30 |
| Table 4.1b | List of yards as at 17 th May 2013..... | 32 |
| Table 5.1 | Bi-annual Caravan Count figures Merseyside and West Lancashire 2011 to 2013..... | 35 |
| Table 5.2a | Summary of sites and pitches Gypsies and Travellers | 36 |
| Table 5.2b | Summary of yards and plots Travelling Showpeople | 37 |
| Table 5.3 | Range of responses achieved by ethnicity and dwelling type | 38 |
| Table 5.4 | Tenure of respondents..... | 39 |
| Table 5.5 | Ownership of land where trailer/caravan located..... | 40 |
| Table 5.6 | Facilities provided on pitch..... | 41 |
| Table 5.7 | Amenities provided elsewhere on site | 41 |
| Table 5.8 | State of repair | 42 |
| Table 5.9 | Repair problems by for respondents on LA sites | 42 |
| Table 5.10 | Satisfaction with the location of your home | 45 |
| Table 5.11 | Happy with neighbourhood | 46 |
| Table 5.12 | Location to amenities | 48 |
| Table 5.13 | Do you have to share facilities? | 50 |
| Table 5.14 | Cost of services | 51 |
| Table 5.15 | Respondents planning to move in the next five years | 52 |
| Table 5.16 | Length of residence | 52 |
| Table 5.17 | Summary of the origin of moving households..... | 53 |
| Table 6.1 | Summary of demand and supply factors: Gypsies and Travellers | 59 |
| Table 6.2 | Current authorised pitches occupied by households | 60 |
| Table 6.3 | Summary of current authorised pitch supply and shortfalls 2013/14 to 2017/18..... | 60 |
| Table 6.4 | Baseline information on children likely to form households 2018/19 to 2027/28..... | 61 |
| Table 6.5 | Modelling of future pitch requirements 15 years 2013/14 to 2027/28 | 63 |
| Table 6.6 | Modelling of future pitch requirements for period 2028/29 to 2032/33 | 64 |
| Table 6.7 | Summary of future requirements modelling..... | 64 |
| Table 6.8 | Need for new sites | 65 |
| Table 6.9 | Preferred Site Management Option..... | 65 |
| Table 6.10 | Unauthorised encampments Jan 2011 to June 2013 | 67 |
| Table 6.11 | Unauthorised encampments reported in Knowsley January 2011 to June 2013..... | 68 |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 6.12 | Unauthorised encampments reported in Liverpool January 2011 to June 2013..... | 69 |
| Table 6.13 | Unauthorised encampments reported in St. Helens January 2011 to June 2013..... | 70 |
| Table 6.14 | Unauthorised encampments reported in Sefton January 2011 to June 2013... | 71 |
| Table 6.15 | Unauthorised encampments reported in West Lancashire January 2011 to June 2013..... | 72 |
| Table 6.16 | Unauthorised encampments reported in Wirral January 2011 to June 2013 by reason..... | 73 |
| Table 6.17 | Summary of transit pitch requirements 2013/14 to 2017/18 | 75 |
| Table 7.1 | Summary of overall permanent plot requirements (Showpeople) | 79 |
| Table 8.1 | Travelling behaviour by dwelling type..... | 80 |
| Table 8.2 | Length of time travelling | 80 |
| Table 8.3 | Reasons for travelling | 81 |
| Table 8.4 | Problems whilst travelling..... | 82 |
| Table 10.1 | Summary of overall pitch and plot requirements over five years and up to 2027/28..... | 96 |
| Table 10.2 | Summary of Gypsy and Traveller pitch requirements 2028/29 to 2032/33 | 96 |
| Table 10.3 | Summary of transit requirements [2013/14 - 2017/2018]..... | 97 |
| Table F.1 | Scale of new household formation 2018/19 to 2027/28..... | 162 |
| Table F.2 | Longer-term pitch requirements based on 100% household formation..... | 163 |
| Table F.3 | Scale of new household formation 2018/19 to 2027/28..... | 164 |
| Table F.4 | Longer-term pitch requirements based on 50% household formation..... | 164 |
| Table F.5 | Modelling of future pitch requirements using 3% household growth rate | 165 |
| Table F.6 | Overall pitch requirements 2013/14 to 2027/28..... | 166 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | |
|-------------|--|----|
| Chart 5.1 | Ethnicity of respondents..... | 39 |
| Chart 5.2 | Enough space for trailers, wagons and vehicles | 44 |
| Chart 5.3 | Enough space in amenity blocks/sheds on pitch | 44 |
| Chart 5.4 | Enough space on pitch/plot..... | 45 |
| Chart 5.5 | Do you feel safe in this neighbourhood? | 47 |
| Chart 5.6 | Do you think your home is overcrowded? | 49 |
| Chart 5.7 | Housing costs covered by Housing Benefit..... | 50 |
| Figure 8.1 | Month when travelling takes place | 81 |
| Figure 10.1 | How does CLT model work? | 93 |

LIST OF MAPS

| | | |
|---------|---|----|
| Map 4.1 | Location of Gypsy and Traveller Sites and Showpeople's Yards..... | 31 |
|---------|---|----|

arc⁴ Limited accepts no responsibility or liability for, and makes no representation or warranty with respect to, the accuracy or completeness of any third party information (including data) that is contained in this document.

Executive Summary for Merseyside and West Lancashire GTAA 2013

Introduction

In March 2013 arc⁴ was commissioned by Knowsley Council, Liverpool Council, Sefton Council, St Helens Council, West Lancashire Council and Wirral Council ('the Authorities') to undertake a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment to identify the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (referred to hereafter as "Travellers") from across the area. The overall objective of the research was to provide a robust evidence base to inform future reviews of Local Plans and housing strategies.

Methodology

In order to deliver the requirements of Government Guidance the methodology for this study has comprised:

- Desktop analysis of existing documents, data and pitch information;
- Interviews with Travellers;
- A Key stakeholder on-line questionnaire for professionals who have contact with and knowledge of local Traveller communities; and
- Discussions with community representatives and representative bodies including Irish Community Care Merseyside and the Showmen's Guild of Great Britain North West Section.

The current picture: population and pitch provision

According to the 2011 Census, a total of 465 residents in Merseyside and West Lancashire identified as having a White British Traveller ethnicity (Knowsley six, Liverpool 185, Sefton 120, St Helens 69, Wirral 77, West Lancashire eight). This may include residents living in bricks and mortar accommodation (in Wirral and Knowsley the absence of sites means that this figure does include households living in bricks and mortar).

As the number of pitches on existing sites is known, the main issue of uncertainty is the number of Travellers in bricks and mortar housing. Although the focus was to interview households living on sites, the fieldwork sought to identify and undertake interviews with Travellers living in bricks and mortar accommodation; 17 interviews were achieved with such households.

Overall, there are three Council owned sites in the study area (50 pitches) at Sherdley Road in St Helens (20 pitches), Tara Park in Liverpool (14 pitches) and Red Rose Park in Sefton (16 pitches). There are six private permanent authorised sites that are occupied (33 pitches); and six private unauthorised sites (12 pitches). This equates to 95 pitches across the study area.

In addition there are six authorised private pitches (transit and permanent) at Berrys Lane in St Helens and six authorised private pitches (permanent) at Hoghton Road in

St. Helens. Both of these sites are not occupied but are family-owned and may become occupied in the future. Finally there is a site at Sherdley Road Private Caravan Park in St Helens, next to the Council operated site. The private site has planning permission for permanent pitches and has been occupied in the past but is currently unoccupied. St Helens Council has been in contact with the owners regarding securing the use of the site for Traveller accommodation but it is earmarked for transit/permanent use. This takes the overall total of pitches to 107 excluding any potential pitches at Sherdley Road Private Caravan Park.

Table ES1 Summary of Traveller sites and pitches

| Merseyside and West Lancashire | No. Sites | No. Pitches |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Local Authority owned | 3 | 50 |
| Private authorised (occupied) | 6 | 33 |
| Private authorised (unoccupied) | 3 | 12 |
| Private unauthorised | 6 | 12 |
| TOTAL Authorised | 12 | 95 |
| TOTAL Unauthorised | 6 | 12 |
| GRAND TOTAL | 18 | 107 |

In terms of Travelling Showpeople’s yards, there is one yard in the study area at Burscough in West Lancashire. The yard has 10 plots permitted, with four of these being occupied permanently, and the other six only being occupied seasonally.

Household Survey Data: Key Information

The primary fieldwork for this study was managed by Home Space Sustainable Accommodation (HSSA) and undertaken by Traveller fieldworkers. A total of 111 interviews were secured, 38 with households living on a pitch/plot on a private authorised site, 43 with households living on a local authority site, 17 living in bricks and mortar accommodation, and 13 interviews were undertaken with households living on unauthorised developments. The survey work undertaken with the Travelling community looked at a range of issues that went beyond future accommodation requirements. The full report contains detailed survey results on the following issues:

- Ethnicity;
- Tenure;
- Facilities;
- Repairs and improvements;
- Space standards and overcrowding;
- Location and safety;
- Cost of accommodation and services;

- Planned moves and mobility; and
- Travelling practices and experience.

Stakeholder consultation

A total of 35 responses from a range of organisations were received to the online stakeholder survey. The majority of stakeholders felt that there was not an adequate understanding of the education, health, employment and support needs of Travellers across the study area with variations in provision evident across the study area.

The key issues arising were that:

- More could be done to monitor both the accommodation and support needs of Travellers;
- Better liaison and improved communication between Travellers and service providers is needed;
- More needs to be done by the Authorities to raise awareness of the accommodation and support needs of Travelling communities locally;
- Local Authorities could respond to 'complaints' about Travellers in an informative and factual way;
- Conditions on current Local Authority sites were felt to be generally good or improving;
- Conditions on the private sites varied in the study area;
- Irish Community Care Merseyside state that the preference amongst the majority of their service users is for a pitch on a Local Authority site;
- There was insufficient new provision of both permanent and transit pitches in the study area;
- Local opposition and a lack of funding are key barriers to the delivery of new provision, alongside land availability;
- More could be done to identify and bring forward new sites; and
- A sub-regional and regional approach to the issue should be promoted.

Future Pitch Requirements

The overarching purpose of this study has been to identify the accommodation requirements of Travellers across Merseyside and West Lancashire on the basis of 'need where need arises' as promoted by national guidance.

Short Term Pitch Requirements [next five years]

In line with the guidance, the assessment of current need takes account of existing supply and demand. This was informed by the survey work and information from the Local Authorities. In terms of supply, the assessment considers:

- Total supply of pitches on authorised sites;

- Turnover on existing authorised sites; and
- Vacant pitches on authorised sites.

In terms of need, the assessment considers:

- The number of existing households currently living on sites who are intending to move in the next five years, either between pitches on the same site, to a site elsewhere or to bricks and mortar accommodation;
- The number of existing households currently living in bricks and mortar accommodation who are intending to move onto a site within the study area or elsewhere within the next five years; and
- The number of emerging households (newly forming) in the next five years who are currently living on a pitch or in bricks and mortar and will need their own pitch on the same site, or need to move elsewhere in the study area, outside the study area or to bricks and mortar accommodation.

The assessment then reconciles total need and existing authorised supply by summarising:

- Total need for pitches; and
- Total supply of authorised pitches.

Longer term pitch requirements (six to 15 years)

The prediction of longer-term pitch requirements (six to 15 years) is challenging because the Traveller population requiring pitches within the study area is relatively small and any change in the number of unauthorised pitches cannot easily be forecast. Nevertheless, an indication of long term pitch requirement can be given based on anticipated household formation trends for the Traveller community obtained from the survey work.

Post 2027/28 Pitch Requirement (post 15 years)

For the period beyond 2027/28 it is considered difficult to rely on demographic information as it is not possible to use existing household information obtained from survey work to project accommodation need 15 years plus into the future. Longer term pitch requirements can be calculated using an annual 3% growth rate, in line with CLG guidance, on the total number of pitches for each Local Authority.

Summary of future requirements

Longer-term modelling of pitch need based on the demographic profile of households currently living in the study area indicates a total need for 39 additional pitches over the period 2013/14 to 2027/28 (15 years) and a further need for three pitches over the period 2028/29 to 2032/33 using a standard annual growth estimate of 3%.

Table ES2 Summary of future permanent pitch requirements 2013/14 to 2032/33

| Longer-term projection model | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
|---|------------|----------|-----------|------------|-----------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| 2013/14 to 2017/18 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 30 |
| 2018/9 to 2022/23 | -4 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| 2023/24 to 2027/28 | -4 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| 2028/29 to 2032/33 | -3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Total need 2013/14 to 2032/33 (20 years) | -11 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 22 | 8 | 42 |

Transit Requirements

The two key elements used in determining a need for transit provision were unauthorised encampment data and information from Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officers (GTLOs).

Unauthorised encampment data for the two and a half year period [January 2011 to June 2013] was collated and analysed to give an indication as to the level of activity across the area – as unauthorised encampments are generally indicative of a lack of transit accommodation this is a useful starting point.

Discussions with GTLOs across the study area enabled further analysis of the unauthorised encampment data, and enabled anomalies, such as ‘one off’ large scale encampments to be excluded from the analysis where applicable. It also enabled identification of repeated incidences of unauthorised encampment activity by the same group of households. Refining the unauthorised encampment data in this way enabled us to determine the real extent of need based on past activity. The views of GTLOs as to the extent of provision required were then used to ratify these figures.

Note that by definition the transit pitches would only be used for some parts of the year and it is not assumed that the scale of transit need will change over the five years 2013/14 to 2017/18 or beyond. It is assumed that each transit pitch would accommodate one caravan. However, established practice within the Travelling community means that pitches could accommodate up to two vans if the pitch is being occupied by the same household or members of a family group.

For some Local Authorities it may be more appropriate to consider a form of authorised ‘stopover’ or negotiated stopping provision rather than a conventional formal transit site. Each Local Authority will have to determine through their Local Plans what would be the most appropriate type of site that will best meet the needs of Travellers passing through their area.

Overall, analysis of unauthorised encampment data and contextual information indicates that new transit provision is needed across Merseyside and West Lancashire. It is recommended that provision for 22 transit pitches be made across the study area as a whole.

Table ES3 Summary of transit pitch requirements 2013/14 to 2017/18

| Authority | Five year pitch requirement (single van use) | Total maximum caravans that could be accommodated |
|-----------------|--|---|
| Knowsley | 3 | 6 |
| Liverpool | 4 | 8 |
| Sefton | 4 | 8 |
| St Helens | 3 | 6 |
| West Lancashire | 4 | 8 |
| Wirral | 4 | 8 |
| Total | 22 | 44 |

Travelling Showpeople Requirements

There is currently no provision for Travelling Showpeople within Merseyside and very limited provision within West Lancashire; provision in neighbouring local authority areas is overcrowded with no capacity to meet existing and future need. The primary fieldwork identified no need for new provision for Travelling Showpeople across the study area. However, evidence in respect of the site at Burscough has identified significant overcrowding and the need for provision of a new yard. It is therefore recommended that a new yard with at least one residential plot is delivered within West Lancashire over the next five years (2013/14 to 2017/18).

Conclusions and Recommendations

The study found that the key challenge facing the Authorities is meeting the identified accommodation requirements of Travellers in Merseyside and West Lancashire.

The research has evidenced:

- An overall five year requirement (2013/14 to 2017/18) of 30 permanent Traveller pitches and a further 17 pitches to 2027/28 (excluding the oversupply identified for Liverpool) or a further requirement for nine pitches if the oversupply identified in Liverpool is included;
- A minimum of one Travelling Showperson yard to be provided in West Lancashire in the first five years (2013/14 to 2017/18) with continued engagement with the Travelling Showpeople community to establish any further needs over the period 2018/19 to 2027/28; and
- A recommendation for 22 transit pitches for Travellers across the study area based on past trends of unauthorised encampment activity.

The Authorities, in partnership with Travelling communities, need to consider the options available to help meet identified need, including the expansion of existing sites, re-designation of unauthorised sites, use of Community Land Trusts and exceptions site policies.

It is also recommended that this evidence base be refreshed on a regular basis to ensure that the level of pitch and plot provision remains appropriate for the Traveller population across the study area.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 In March 2013, arc⁴ were commissioned by Knowsley Council, Liverpool Council, Sefton Council, St Helens Council, West Lancashire Council, and Wirral Council (“the Authorities”), to undertake a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment to identify the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople from across the Merseyside and West Lancashire area.
- 1.2 The overall objective of the research was to provide a robust evidence base to inform the production and future review of Local Plans and housing strategies.
- 1.3 The research provides information about the current and future accommodation needs and demands of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople; as well as providing information about their additional support needs.
- 1.4 The study adopts the definition of ‘Gypsies and Travellers’ set out within the Government’s ‘Planning policy for traveller sites’ (March 2012) from which the following definition of Gypsies and Travellers is adopted:
‘Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family’s or dependants’ educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of Travelling Showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.’
- 1.5 Similarly, the following definition from the Guidance in respect of Showpeople is used:
‘Members of a group organised for the purposes of holding fairs, circuses or shows (whether or not travelling together as such). This includes such persons who on the grounds of their own or their family’s or dependants’ more localised pattern of trading, educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excludes Gypsies and Travellers as defined above.’
- 1.6 The following definitions also apply:
‘[A] “pitch” means a pitch on a “gypsy and traveller” site and “plot” means a pitch on a “travelling showpeople” site (often called a “yard”). This terminology differentiates between residential pitches for “gypsies and travellers” and mixed-use plots for “Travelling Showpeople”, which may/will need to incorporate space or to be split to allow for the storage of equipment.’¹
- 1.7 For the purposes of this study, Gypsies and Travellers live on pitches on sites, whilst Travelling Showpeople live on plots on yards.
- 1.8 The overall purpose of the study is to assess overall accommodation need and distribution for each participating Local Authority, undertaken in a manner which conforms to national policy and guidance. The objectives of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment are therefore:

¹ CLG Planning policy for traveller sites Appendix A Glossary (March 2012)

- To establish trends and characteristics of the sub regional Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population, households and their accommodation, including an assessment of drivers of need and demand;
- To establish provision, supply and characteristics of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople's accommodation;
- To provide a clear and robust understanding of the permanent, transit and other accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers, including Travelling Showpeople; and
- To identify key criteria for new provision, including broad locations, and optimum site size and number of pitches, etc.

Study Components

1.9 The study comprised five phases, which are set out below:

- Phase 1: Development of methodology. Collation and review of existing information and literature;
- Phase 2: Stakeholder consultation;
- Phase 3: Survey of Gypsies and Travellers across the study area;
- Phase 4: Data analysis, calculation of needs and report production; and
- Phase 5: Dissemination.

Report structure

1.10 The report structure is as follows:

- **Chapter 1 Introduction:** provides an overview of the study;
- **Chapter 2 Legislative and policy context:** presents a review of the legislative and policy context;
- **Chapter 3 Methodology:** provides details of the study's research methodology;
- **Chapter 4 Review of current provision of sites:** looks at the current provision of sites across the study area to provide a baseline picture of what is currently available;
- **Chapter 5 Review of current population:** reviews estimates of the Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population across the Merseyside and West Lancashire area and the scale of existing site provision. A review of the current accommodation situation of Travellers identifies issues arising;
- **Chapter 6 Pitch requirements:** focuses on current and future pitch requirements. This chapter includes a detailed assessment of drivers of demand, pitch supply and current shortfalls across the study area;

- **Chapter 7 Travelling Showpeople:** reviews information available in respect of the needs and requirements of Travelling Showpeople in relation to the study area;
- **Chapter 8 Travelling practices and experiences:** highlights experiences of and issues relating to travelling;
- **Chapter 9 Stakeholder consultation:** summarises views of stakeholders expressed through the on line survey; and
- **Chapter 10 Conclusion and strategic response:** concludes the report, identifying headline issues, and recommending ways in which these could be addressed.

1.11 The report is supplemented by the following appendices:

- Appendix A Legislative background
- Appendix B Policy and guidance
- Appendix C Fieldwork Questionnaire
- Appendix D Stakeholder survey questionnaire
- Appendix E Glossary of terms
- Appendix F Longer term pitch requirement analysis

2. Legislative and Policy Context

- 2.1 This research is grounded in an understanding of how the national legislative and policy context has affected Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople communities to date.

Legislative background

- 2.2 Since 1960, three Acts of Parliament have had a major impact on Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople:
- Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960;
 - Caravan Sites Act 1968 (Part II); and the
 - Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994.
- 2.3 The 1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act abolished all statutory obligations to provide accommodation, discontinued Government grants for sites and made it a criminal offence to camp on land without the owner's consent.
- 2.4 Since the 1994 Act, the only places where Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople can legally park their trailers and vehicles are:
- Council and Registered [Social Housing] Provider Gypsy caravan sites;
 - Privately owned land with appropriate planning permission;
 - Land with established rights of use, other caravan sites or mobile home parks by agreement or licence along with land required for seasonal farm workers.
- 2.5 The 1994 Act resulted in increased pressure on available sites. It eventually resulted in further reviews of law and policy, culminating in the Housing Act 2004 which placed a requirement (s.225) on local authorities to assess Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation needs.
- 2.6 More detail on the legislation affecting Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople can be found at Appendix A.

Policy background

- 2.7 As part of this research we have carried out a literature review. A considerable range of guidance documents have been prepared by central Government to assist local authorities in discharging their strategic housing and planning functions and numerous research and guidance documents have been published by other agencies. This review examines influential guidance and research which relates specifically to Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople or makes reference to them; more information is provided within Appendices A and B.
- 2.8 Overall, this range of statutory documentation, advisory and guidance notes and accepted good practice has helped set a broad context within which this research can be positioned.

- 2.9 Some of the key themes to emerge from the review of relevant literature include:
- Recognising the long-standing role Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople have played in society and how prejudice, discrimination and legislative change have increasingly marginalised these distinctive ethnic groups;
 - A recognised shortage of provision for Gypsies and Travellers;
 - The importance of understanding Gypsy and Traveller issues in the context of recent housing and planning policy development;
 - Recognition that Gypsies and Travellers are one of the most socially excluded groups in society and are particularly susceptible to a range of inequalities relating to health, education, law enforcement and quality of accommodation; and
 - A need for better communication and improved understanding between, and within, Travelling communities themselves, and between Travelling communities and elected members, service providers and permanently settled communities.

Planning policy

- 2.10 In March 2012 the Government published both the National Planning Policy Framework² and its accompanying 'Planning policy for traveller sites'³. These documents replace all previous national planning policy in respect of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. This new national guidance is now a material consideration in determining planning applications and its overarching aim is '*to ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers*'.
- 2.11 Through planning policy for traveller sites, local planning authorities are encouraged to make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning, and plan for sites over a reasonable timescale. National policy aims to promote more private Traveller site provision '*while recognising that there will always be those travellers who cannot provide their own sites*' (paragraph 4).
- 2.12 The policy also states that⁴:
- Plan making and decision taking should aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments and make enforcement more effective.
 - Planning policies need to be fair, realistic and inclusive; and
 - Planning policies should increase the number of Traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under-provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply.

² CLG National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

³ CLG Planning policy for traveller sites (March 2012)

⁴ CLG Planning policy for traveller sites (March 2012) para 4

- 2.13 It is within this policy context that local planning authorities will have to plan future provision for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople across their respective areas. The National Planning Policy emphasises the role of evidence and how it should be used within this context.
- 2.14 Evidence should be used to plan positively and manage development, and the Policy stresses the need for timely, effective and on-going community engagement (both with Travellers and the settled community). The *'use of a robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of local plans and make planning decisions'* is advocated. Paragraphs 8 and 9 of 'Planning policy for traveller sites' state that:
- 'Local planning authorities should set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling show people which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of travellers in their area, working collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities'*.
- 2.15 *'Local planning authorities should:*
- a) Identify and update annually, a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of sites against their locally set targets;*
 - b) Identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6 to 10 and, where possible, for years 11-15;*
 - c) Consider production of joint development plans that set targets on a cross-authority basis, to provide more flexibility in identifying sites, particularly if a local planning authority has special or strict planning constraints across its area (local planning authorities have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries);*
 - d) Relate the number of pitches or plots to the circumstances of the specific size and location of the site and the surrounding population's size and density; and*
 - e) Protect local amenity and environment.'*
- 2.16 Despite the revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy, the need for strategic planning remains, especially to ensure coherent planning beyond local authority boundaries. To this end the Localism Act 2011 has introduced the Duty to Co-operate which the Planning Advisory Service⁵ advises :
- Requires councils and public bodies to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in relation to planning of sustainable development;
 - Requires councils to consider whether to enter into agreements on joint approaches or prepare joint Local Plans (if a local planning authority); and
 - Applies to planning for strategic matters in relation to the preparation of Local and Marine Plans, and other activities that prepare the way for these activities.
- 2.17 The Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework set out a requirement for local authorities to fulfill the Duty to Co-operate on planning

⁵ PAS A simple guide to Strategic Planning and the Duty to Cooperate

<http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pagelid=2133454>

issues, including provision for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, to ensure that approaches are consistent and address cross border issues with neighbouring authorities. The Duty is intended to act as a driver for change in order to enhance co-operation and partnership working to assist in delivering appropriate provision of future accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers, which can be contentious.

- 2.18 In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development to guide local authorities in the delivery of new developments whilst the 'Planning policy for traveller sites' [sections 7-11] provides specific advice as detailed above.

Progress on tackling inequalities

- 2.19 In April 2012 the Government published a 'Progress report by the ministerial working group on tackling inequalities experienced by Gypsies and Travellers'⁶, which summarised progress in terms of meeting '*Government commitments to tackle inequalities and promote fairness for Gypsy and Traveller communities.*'⁷ The report covers 28 measures from across Government aimed at tackling inequalities, these cover:

- Improving education outcomes;
- Improving health outcomes;
- Providing appropriate accommodation;
- Tackling hate crime;
- Improving interaction with the National Offender Management Service;
- Improving access to employment and financial services; and
- Improving engagement with service providers.

- 2.20 In respect of provision of appropriate accommodation, the report advises that financial incentives and other support measures have been put in place to help councils and elected members make the case for development of Traveller sites within their areas. Changing perceptions of sites is also identified as a priority, and to this end the Government has made the following commitments:

- '*The Department for Communities and Local Government will help Gypsy and Traveller representative groups showcase small private sites that are well presented and maintained*'.
- '*Subject to site owners agreeing to have their homes included we will help produce a case study document which local authorities and councillors, potential site residents and the general public could use. It could also be adapted and used in connection with planning applications.*'⁸

⁶ The study only includes reference to Gypsies and Travellers and not Travelling Showpeople

⁷ www.communities.gov.uk/news/corporate/2124322

⁸ CLG Progress report by the ministerial working group on tackling inequalities experienced by Gypsies and Travellers (April 2012) commitment 12, page 18

- 2.21 Also aimed at improving provision of accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers, the Government has committed to:
- The provision of support, training and advice for elected members services up to 2015; and
 - The promotion of improved health outcomes for Travellers through the planning system; the report states that ‘one of the Government’s aims in respect of traveller sites is to enable provision of suitable accommodation, which supports healthy lifestyles, and from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure.’⁹

Emphasis on enforcement powers

- 2.22 In August 2012, the Government published guidance for local authorities setting out the powers available to them and landowners to remove unauthorised encampments from both public and private land. Commenting on the guidance set out in ‘Dealing with illegal and unauthorised encampments: A summary of available powers’, the Chartered Institute of Housing comments that: *‘Gypsy and Traveller communities are some of the most marginalised communities in modern times. Long standing difficulties in the provision of private and authorised sites, coupled with fewer stopping places across the country, have resulted in increasing numbers of unauthorised sites and the increasing marginalisation of these communities. There is a real need to develop a planning system that enables the provision of well situated, decent and accessible site provision for Gypsies and Travellers.’*¹⁰
- 2.23 On 4th May 2013 the Government revoked regulations governing the issuing of Temporary Stop Notices (TSNs)¹¹ by local planning authorities, which had been in place since the introduction of TSNs in 2005. The regulations were originally introduced to mitigate the likely disproportionate impact of TSNs on Gypsies and Travellers in areas where there is a lack of sites to meet the needs of the Travelling community. Under the previous regulations, TSNs were prohibited where a caravan was a person’s main residence, unless there was a risk of harm to a serious public interest significant enough to outweigh any benefit to the occupier of the caravan. Under the new arrangements, and in the spirit of Localism, local planning authorities are to determine whether the use of a TSN is a proportionate and necessary response. Concerns have been raised that, without the regulations in place, TSNs risk violating the Human Rights of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, especially in areas where there is an under-provision of sites/pitches/plots.
- 2.24 On 1st July 2013 in a Ministerial Statement issued by local government minister Brandon Lewis¹², the issue of inappropriate development in the Green Belt was

⁹ CLG Progress report by the ministerial working group on tackling inequalities experienced by Gypsies and Travellers (April 2012) para 4.13, page 19

¹⁰ www.cih.org Housing policy: Gypsies and Travellers

¹¹ Statutory Instrument 2013 No.830 Town and Country Planning (Temporary Stop Notice) (England) (Revocation) Regulations 2013

¹² <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/planning-and-travellers>

highlighted. The statement specified that *'The Secretary of State wishes to give particular scrutiny to traveller site appeals in the green belt, so that he can consider the extent to which 'Planning policy for traveller sites' is meeting the government's clear policy intentions. To this end he is hereby revising the appeals recovery criteria issued on 30th June 2008 and will consider for recovery appeals involving traveller sites in the green belt.'*

- 2.25 This situation is to apply for a period of six months in the first instance, and a number of appeals have since been recovered in order to 'test' relevant policies at a national level. To this end, the Secretary of State recently upheld the Planning Inspector's decision to find in favour of an applicant seeking to extend an existing site in Runnymede, Surrey, which had previously been refused by the Council. The Secretary of State found that the Council's policy was not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's policies for the protection of the green belt.
- 2.26 The Statement also revoked the practice guidance on 'Diversity and equality in planning'¹³, deeming it to be outdated; the Government does not intend to replace this guidance.
- 2.27 Revised Guidance from Government¹⁴ in respect of dealing with unauthorised encampments was published on 9th August 2013; the updated guidance reflects the recent changes to TSNs. The Guidance states that:

*'As part of the Government's commitment to protecting the nation's green spaces, these powers will help protect Green Belt land and the countryside from illegal encampments. In addition to the powers which are available to councils to remove unauthorised traveller sites, protest camps and squatters from both public and private land, new Temporary Stop Notices now give councils powers to tackle unauthorised caravans, backed up with potentially unlimited fines. With the powers set out in this guide available to them, councils should be ready to take swift enforcement action to tackle rogue encampments and sites.'*¹⁵

CLG Caravan Counts

- 2.28 Snapshot counts of the number of Gypsy and Traveller caravans were requested by the Government in 1979, and have since been made by local authorities on a voluntary basis every January and July¹⁶. Their accuracy varies between local authorities and according to how information is included in the process. A major criticism is the non-involvement of Gypsies and Travellers themselves in the counts. However, the counts, conducted on a single day twice a year, are the only systematic source of information on the numbers and distribution of Gypsy

¹³ ODPM Diversity and Equality in Planning: A good practice guide (2005)

¹⁴ CLG Dealing with illegal and unauthorised encampments: a summary of available powers (9th Aug 2013)

¹⁵ CLG Dealing with illegal and unauthorised encampments: a summary of available powers (2013) Page 3, first para

¹⁶ Historically caravan counts have not included Travelling Showpeople. Since 2010 the Government has requested that January counts include Travelling Showpeople, however, the figures relating to Travelling Showpeople are reported separately and not included in the overall count figures.

and Traveller trailers. The counts include caravans (or trailers) on and off authorised sites (i.e. those with planning permission) but do not relate necessarily to the actual number of pitches (i.e. capacity) on sites.

- 2.29 A major review¹⁷ of the counting system was undertaken in 2003 by the then Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), which made a number of recommendations and improvements to the process.

CLG Design Guidance

- 2.30 The Government's new 'Planning policy for traveller sites' provides no guidance on design for Gypsy and Traveller sites, concentrating instead on the mechanics of the planning process, from using evidence to plan making and decision taking. The new policy does not therefore add to existing design guidance¹⁸ from CLG¹⁹, which suggests that, among other things, there must be an amenity building on each pitch and that this must include, as a minimum:

- Hot and cold water supply;
- Electricity supply;
- A separate toilet;
- A bath/shower room; and
- A kitchen and dining area.

- 2.31 A Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) review (January 2012) of Non-Mainstream Housing Design Guidance found that the CLG Design Guide most 'succinctly outlines the physical requirements for site provision for travellers.' It also identified a number of 'pointers' for future guidance, and these are worth mentioning here:

- The family unit should be considered to be larger and more flexible than that of the settled community due to a communal approach to care for the elderly and for children;
- A distinct permanent building is required on site to incorporate washing and cooking facilities, and provide a base for visiting health and education workers; and
- Clearer diagrams setting out the parameters for design are called for, both in terms of the scale of the dwelling and the site. Incorporating requirements for maintenance, grazing, spacing, size provision, communal spaces, etc. *'would ensure that a set of best practice principles can be established.'*²⁰

¹⁷ Counting Gypsies and Travellers: A Review of the Caravan Count System, Pat Niner, ODPM (Feb 2004,)

¹⁸ This guidance does not apply to the provision of new yards for Travelling Showpeople. Further information about good practice in the provision of yards can be obtained from the Showmen's Guild of Great Britain.

¹⁹ CLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide (May 2008)

²⁰ HCA Non-Mainstream Housing Design Guidance Literature Review, (January 2012) page 63

2.32 The HCA Review suggested the following design considerations:

- Travelling Showpeople should be considered in the development of provision for temporary/transit sites;
- Vehicular access is a requirement and not an option;
- Open space is essential for maintenance of vehicles and grazing of animals;
- Open play space for children needs to be provided;
- A warden's office is required for permanent sites;
- Communal rooms for use of private health/education consultations are required; and
- An ideal ratio of facilities provision (stand pipes, parking area, recreation space) to the number of pitches.

3. Methodology

- 3.1 In order to deliver the requirements of Government Guidance²¹ the methodology for this study has comprised:
- Desktop analysis of existing documents, data and pitch information;
 - Interviews with Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople;
 - A Key Stakeholder on-line questionnaire for professionals who have contact with and knowledge of local Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople communities; and
 - Discussions with community representatives and representative bodies including Irish Community Care Merseyside and the Showmen's Guild of Great Britain North West Section.
- 3.2 The information gathering has been carried out in three phases, as outlined below.

Phases 1 and 2: Literature/desktop review and stakeholder consultation

- 3.3 This phase comprised a review of available literature, including legislative background and best practice information; and available secondary data relating to Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
- 3.4 Relevant regional, sub-regional and local information has been collected, collated and reviewed, including information on:
- The national policy and legislative context;
 - Current policies towards Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople; and
 - Analysis of existing data sources available from stakeholders²².
- 3.5 This information has helped to shape the development of this report, and in particular the review of the legislative and policy context set out in Chapter 2.
- 3.6 The views of a range of key stakeholders identified by the Authorities have been sought as part of this study, and these are summarised at Chapter 9. Stakeholders consulted as part of this process include: providers, education officers, housing and planning professionals, Gypsy and Traveller liaison officers, and community representatives, including Irish Community Care Merseyside (ICCM).

²¹ CLG Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments Guidance (October 2007) https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7838/accommneedsassessments.pdf

²² This includes CLG caravan count data and information on unauthorised encampment data provided by the Authorities (see chapter 6 for more information on this data)

Phase 3: Survey of Gypsies and Travellers across Merseyside and West Lancashire

- 3.7 The primary fieldwork for this study comprised survey work with Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. This work was managed by Home Space Sustainable Accommodation (HSSA) and undertaken by Gypsy and Traveller fieldworkers. HSSA was involved in the design of the questionnaire and in the recruitment of fieldworkers.
- 3.8 Fieldwork interviews commenced in late June, ran throughout July and into early August 2013; further interviews were carried out in late August and September 2013²³. Interviews were carried out with residents living on a range of sites and yards including authorised local authority and private sites across the study area, as well as on unauthorised sites. Interviews were not held with Travellers currently resident outside the study area. Additional interviews were held with Gypsy and Traveller respondents living in bricks and mortar accommodation. The overarching aim of the fieldwork was to maximise the number of interviews secured from households living on sites/plots within the Merseyside and West Lancashire area, with additional interviews of households living in bricks and mortar accommodation. Consulting with stakeholders, including ICCM ensured that the fieldwork team had a good understanding of the local issues facing Travellers and helped to maximise the community's participation in the study. Table 3.1 provides information from the January 2013 caravan²⁴ count which helped to inform the expected number of interviews to be carried out in each Local Authority area.
- 3.9 Interviews were undertaken by trained members of the Gypsy and Traveller community. Using members of the community as interviewers helps secure a good response rate, and ultimately deliver a more comprehensive picture of need.
- 3.10 The cultural needs of Gypsies and Travellers differ from those of the rest of the population and consideration of culturally specific requirements such as the need for additional permanent caravan sites and/or transit sites and/or stopping places (or improvements to existing sites) are key to this study. The research has therefore explicitly sought information from Travelling households across Merseyside and West Lancashire living in housing, on authorised sites, unauthorised encampments and unauthorised developments.
- 3.11 A total of 111 interviews were secured, 38 with households living on a pitch/plot on a private authorised site, 43 with households living on a local authority site, and 17 living in bricks and mortar accommodation. 13 interviews were undertaken with households living on unauthorised developments. The survey field team aimed to secure responses from households living on all occupied pitches across the study area. There are a total of 95 pitches currently located across the study area and a total of 94 interviews were achieved from

²³ Interviews were offered to households currently resident within the study area during the course of the fieldwork period. The fieldwork period was extended into a second phase to maximise response rates and minimise missing out households away travelling during the initial fieldwork period.

²⁴ Department for Communities and Local Government Caravan Counts – (January 2013, last five counts) http://data.gov.uk/dataset/gypsy_and_traveller_caravans

households living on these pitches. This is a high proportion of returns from a hard to reach group and is considered to be sufficiently robust to be representative of the community.

Table 3.1 Summary of achieved household interviews by type of dwelling and area

| | Liverpool | Sefton | St Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Knowsley | Total |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------------|----------|----------|------------|
| Unauthorised development | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| LA Site | 12 | 17 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Private Site – Gypsy and Traveller | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| Private Site-Travelling Showperson | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Bricks and Mortar | 2 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 17 |
| Total | 14 | 21 | 59 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 111 |
| Estimated Caravans (based on Jan 13 Count) | 15 | 27 | 42 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| Bricks and Mortar households contacted* | 7 | 7 | 14 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 34 |
| Bricks and Mortar household interviews achieved | 2 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 17 |

*Note that 34 households in bricks and mortar accommodation were contacted. A total of 17 participated in the survey, four were not interested in participating and 13 were contacted on multiple occasions (up to eight) but interviews were not achieved.

Note this data relates to households interviewed which may differ from the number of pitches for each Local Authority, as a pitch may accommodate more than one household. Pitches may also have been vacant at the time the fieldwork was undertaken.

3.12 In conjunction with interviews with members of the Travelling community, a range of complementary research methods have been used to permit the triangulation of results. These are brought together during the research process and inform the outputs of the work and include:

- Desktop analysis of existing documents and data;
- Preparing a database of authorised and unauthorised sites; and
- Conducting a key stakeholder on-line questionnaire for professionals who have direct contact with local Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople communities across the Merseyside and West Lancashire area.

3.13 Good practice guidance and evidence from other studies emphasises that building trust with Travelling communities is a prerequisite of meaningful research. In this case it has been achieved by using interviewers from Gypsy and Traveller communities to conduct the interviews, by engaging with Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople groups, by using local resources and

workers to make links, and working with officers who have already established good relationships with local Travelling communities.

3.14 We have also used the following sources of information:

- The bi-annual caravan count for CLG [from January 2011 to January 2013]; and
- Local Authority information on existing site provision and unauthorised developments.

3.15 The assessment of pitch [and plot] requirements has been calculated by utilising information on current supply of pitches and the results from the survey. The overall number of pitches has been calculated using Local Authority information, with likely capacity through turnover assessed through the survey. A detailed explanation of the analysis of pitch requirements is contained in Chapter 6 but briefly comprises analysis of the following elements:

- Current pitch provision, households living in bricks and mortar accommodation; households planning to move in the next five years, and emerging households to give total demand for pitches; and
- Turnover on existing pitches and total supply.

3.16 The approach used then reconciles the demand and supply data to identify overall pitch and plot requirements.

3.17 To identify the need for transit provision, data on unauthorised encampment activity has been collated and analysed, the results of this analysis are assessed alongside other contextual information to identify an appropriate target for transit provision in each of the Local Authority areas. The assessment of transit requirements is based on the average number of caravans per transit related unauthorised encampment for the 30 month period January 2011 to June 2013.

4. Review of Current Provision

- 4.1 This chapter considers the current provision of sites across Merseyside and West Lancashire. This is based on information provided by the Authorities, supplemented with observations from the fieldwork team.

Provision of authorised and unauthorised sites

- 4.2 Data on the provision of sites considers both authorised and unauthorised sites and yards across Merseyside and West Lancashire. Broadly speaking, authorised sites are those with planning permission and can be on either local authority, Registered [social housing] Provider or privately owned land. Unauthorised sites are made up of either longer term²⁵ unauthorised encampments²⁶, that have been in existence for some considerable time and so can be considered to be indicative of a permanent need for accommodation (in some instances local authorities class these as tolerated sites and decide not to take enforcement action to remove them); and unauthorised developments, where Travellers are residing upon land that they own and that does not have planning permission (see Appendix E for more detailed definitions).
- 4.3 Overall (see Table 4.1a), there are three Council owned sites in the study area (50 pitches) at Sherdley Road in St Helens (20 pitches), Tara Park in Liverpool (14 pitches) and Red Rose Park in Sefton (16 pitches). There are six private permanent authorised sites that are occupied (33 pitches); and six private unauthorised sites (12 pitches). This equates to 95 pitches across the study area.
- 4.4 In addition there are six authorised private pitches (transit and permanent) at Berrys Lane in St Helens and six authorised private pitches (permanent) at Houghton Road in St. Helens. Both of these sites are not occupied but are family-owned and may become occupied in the future. Finally there is a site at Sherdley Road Private Caravan Park in St Helens, next to the Council operated site. The private site has permission for permanent pitches and has been occupied in the past but is currently unoccupied. St Helens Council has been in contact with the owners regarding securing the use of the site for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation but it is earmarked for transit/permanent use. This takes the overall total of pitches to 107 excluding any potential pitches at Sherdley Road Private Caravan Park.

²⁵ Approximately three months or longer.

²⁶ Please note that unauthorised encampments also encompass short-term illegal encampments, which are more indicative of transit need, see Chapter 6 for more information on these encampments.

Table 4.1a (Part 1) List of sites as at 31st May 2013

| Site Name | Site Location | Type of Site | Ownership | Total number of pitches on site |
|------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Tara Park | Liverpool | Permanent | Council owned and managed with planning permission | 14 |
| Broad Lane, Formby | Sefton | Permanent | Private with planning permission [personal consent] | 2 |
| Red Rose Park, Broad Lane, Formby | Sefton | Permanent | Local Authority | 16 |
| Coronation Drive | St Helens | Permanent | Private with planning permission | 4 |
| Hoghton-Road * | St Helens | Permanent | Private site with planning permission but not occupied * | 6 |
| Manville Street | St Helens | Permanent | Private with planning permission | 6 |
| Suez Street | St Helens | Permanent | Private with planning permission | 14 |
| Berrys Lane * | St Helens | Permanent | Private site with planning permission but not occupied * | 6 |
| Sherdley Road | St Helens | Permanent | Council owned and managed, with planning permission | 20 |
| Lionel Street/Penlake Lane | St Helens | Permanent | Private - Lawful by passage of time | 6 |
| Sherdley Road Private Caravan Park | St Helens | Site earmarked for transit provision | Private site | Unoccupied |
| Southworth Road | St Helens | UAD | Private appeal decision pending | 2 |
| Glover Street | St Helens | UAD | Private planning permission refused, currently subject to appeal together with amended application | 1 |
| Aveling Drive, Banks | West Lancs | UAD | Private, currently subject to planning appeal | 1 |
| Aveling Drive, Banks | West Lancs | UAD | Private, currently subject to planning application | 4 |
| Pool Hey Lane, Scarisbrick | West Lancs | UAD | Private, no planning permission | 3 |
| Sugar Stubbs Lane, Banks | West Lancs | Private authorised | Private, planning permission for 1 static caravan only, granted not specifically for G&T use – replaced a lawful hut | 1 |
| Tranmere | Wirral | UAD | Unauthorised development on private drive | 1 |

* Note although there are no caravans actually present at these locations, all pitches are unavailable as they are family owned and assigned to existing households


Source: Merseyside and West Lancashire Local Authorities

Table 4.1a (Part 2) Summary of Site Provision

| Site Type | No sites | No pitches |
|---|-----------------|---|
| Total Authorised Permanent (Private) | 6 | 33 |
| Total Authorised Permanent (Local Authority) | 3 | 50 |
| Total Unauthorised Development | 6 | 12 |
| TOTAL (Occupied) | 15 | 95 |
| Total Authorised Permanent/Transit (not occupied) | 3 | 12 plus potential pitches on Sherdley Road Caravan Park, St Helens |
| Grand Total | 18 | 107 plus potential pitches on Sherdley Road Caravan Park, St Helens |

Source: Merseyside and West Lancashire Local Authorities

Map 4.1 Location of Gypsy and Traveller Sites and Showpeople's Yards²⁷



²⁷ Red sites are Traveller Sites, yellow site is Travelling Showpeople yard

4.5 In terms of Travelling Showpeople’s yards (see Table 4.1b), there is one yard in the study area at Burscough in West Lancashire. The yard has 10 plots permitted, with four of these being occupied permanently, and the other six only being occupied seasonally. Due to overcrowding, seasonal plots are frequently used for storage of equipment irrespective of the time of year.

4.6 The location of yards is illustrated in Map 4.1.

Table 4.1b List of yards as at 17th May 2013

| Yard Name | Site Location and Housing Market Area | Type of Yard | Ownership | Total Number of Plots on Yard |
|--|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Silcocks Site adjacent to Leeds Liverpool Canal, A59 Burscough | West Lancs | Permanent | Private with planning permission | 10, of which 4 are permanent and 6 seasonal ²⁸ |
| TOTAL | | | | 10 |
| TOTAL AUTHORISED (PERMANENT) | | | | 4 |
| TOTAL AUTHORISED | | | | 10 |

Source: West Lancashire Council

4.7 Consultation with the Showmen’s Guild between April and July 2013 confirmed that the yard at Burscough is currently the only provision for Showpeople in Merseyside and West Lancashire. There was formerly a site at Thatto Heath in St Helens, however this was closed and the Showpeople living there had to move out of the area to find alternative accommodation. The Guild have indicated that attempts to provide a yard in St Helens have been made in the past and that there is demand for this type of provision, however a suitable site has not yet been identified. Chapter 7 of the report has more information in respect of Travelling Showpeople.

²⁸Habitation linked to operation of ‘Pleasureland’ at Southport during the months of March to October; storage of vans only for the remainder of the year (Nov-Feb).

5. Review of Current Population

- 5.1 This chapter considers the current population of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople across Merseyside and West Lancashire. Information from the 2011 Census is used to help estimate the current population of Travellers living in the study area, whilst the ethnicity of the Travelling population is reviewed based on findings from the Traveller survey.
- 5.2 The chapter then reviews the extent of pitch provision across the study area and provides details on the nature of this provision. Information from the caravan count, along with information from the survey of Travellers, provides an overview of current pitch provision, whilst data from the Traveller survey gives an indication as to the tenure, condition of accommodation, facilities and space requirements of Travellers.

Population Estimates

- 5.3 According to the 2011 Census²⁹, a total of 465 residents in Merseyside and West Lancashire identified as having a White British Gypsy and Traveller ethnicity (Knowsley six, Liverpool 185, Sefton 120, St Helens 69, Wirral 77, West Lancashire eight). This may include residents living in bricks and mortar accommodation (in Wirral and Knowsley the absence of sites means that this figure does include households living in bricks and mortar). As the number of pitches on sites is known, the main issue of uncertainty is the number of Gypsies and Travellers in housing. Although the focus was to interview households living on sites, the fieldwork sought to identify and undertake interviews with Gypsies and Travellers living in bricks and mortar accommodation; 17 interviews were achieved with such households³⁰. Where appropriate, the findings of the household survey are presented for Gypsies and Travellers living on sites, and Gypsies and Travellers living in bricks and mortar accommodation. To avoid any breaches in confidentiality, data are not reported for individual local authorities.

Caravan Counts and Authorised Pitches

- 5.4 Based on CLG published data, the figures for the last five caravan counts for the Merseyside and West Lancashire authorities are set out in Table 5.1 below. This indicates that the number of caravans on sites varies widely between authorities. In Knowsley and Wirral there were no recorded caravans on sites. In West Lancashire there were no recorded authorised caravans on sites, however, there were on average 11.6 caravans recorded on unauthorised sites over this period, with activity dropping from a high of 17 caravans in January 2011 to eight in January 2013. Despite this fall in the number of unauthorised caravans recorded,

²⁹ ONS 2011 census table QS201EW published 30th Jan 2013 relating to census day of 27th March 2011

³⁰ It should be noted that there is no definitive listing available of households living in bricks and mortar and therefore it is not possible to categorically state how many Gypsy and Traveller households there are living in bricks and mortar accommodation.

the persistent level of unauthorised activity within West Lancashire could be indicative of a need for permanent pitches on sites, not just within West Lancashire but across adjacent areas.

- 5.5 In Liverpool the average number of caravans per count was 15.6, ranging from a high of 20 in July 2012 to a low of 14 in January 2011 and 2012. All the caravans recorded in Liverpool were on socially rented pitches on sites; no unauthorised caravans were recorded during this period³¹.
- 5.6 Sefton and St Helens have the highest recorded number of caravans. In Sefton the vast majority of caravans are on socially rented sites with planning permission, 25.6 on average over the period. The highest number of caravans recorded was 28 in July 2011, followed by 27 in January 2013 and July 2012 (three of the latter count being on private sites). The lowest number recorded in Sefton was 24 caravans in January 2012.
- 5.7 The five count average for St Helens was 33.6 caravans, which ranged from a low of 26 in January 2011 to a high of 44 in July 2012. There is a strong element of private as well as social rented provision in St Helens, with the five count averages being 17.6 on private sites and 12.4 on social rented. The trend over the five counts has been upward for both types of provision in St Helens, with the number of caravans on private sites increasing from 14 in January 2011 to 19 in January 2013. In January 2011 there were nine caravans on social rented sites, this figure had increased to 13 in January 2013. St Helens has also experienced a consistent level of unauthorised activity, there being an average of 3.6 unauthorised caravans over the period – the highest number of unauthorised vans was recorded in July 2012 (nine) and the lowest (two) in January 2013, January 2012 and July 2011.
- 5.8 If the actual figures submitted to CLG for the January 2013 count in St Helens are used (see italics in Table 5.1) the average count increases to 35 caravans; the average number of unauthorised caravans increases to 4.6, whilst the average number of caravans on authorised sites is 30.6.
- 5.9 Overall the figures for Sefton and Liverpool are fairly consistent during this period, with no unauthorised caravans recorded in either area on caravan count days. The figures for St Helens are higher overall, and have shown an upward trend over the period.

³¹ No unauthorised caravans were recorded as part of the caravan counts during this period for Liverpool.

Table 5.1 Bi-annual Caravan Count figures Merseyside and West Lancashire 2011 to 2013³²

| Count | Authorised sites with planning permission | | Unauthorised pitches without planning permission | Total |
|------------------|---|---------------|--|------------------|
| | Knowsley | Social Rented | Total Private | |
| 17 Jan 2013 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 Jul 2012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 Jan 2012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28 Jul 2011 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 27 Jan 2011 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 count average | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Liverpool | | | | |
| 17 Jan 2013 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 19 Jul 2012 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 19 Jan 2012 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 28 Jul 2011 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 27 Jan 2011 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 5 count average | 15.6 | 0 | 0 | 15.6 |
| Sefton | | | | |
| 17 Jan 2013 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| 19 Jul 2012 | 24 | 3 | 0 | 27 |
| 19 Jan 2012 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| 28 Jul 2011 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| 27 Jan 2011 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| 5 count average | 25.6 | 0.6 | 0 | 26.2 |
| St Helens | | | | |
| 17 Jan 2013 | 13 | 19 | 2 | 34 ³³ |
| | 19 | 16 | 7 | 42 ³⁴ |
| 19 Jul 2012 | 16 | 19 | 9 | 44 |
| 19 Jan 2012 | 13 | 19 | 2 | 34 |
| 28 Jul 2011 | 11 | 17 | 2 | 30 |
| 27 Jan 2011 | 9 | 14 | 3 | 26 |
| 5 count average | 12.4 | 17.6 | 3.6 | 33.6 |
| | 13.6 | 17 | 4.6 | 35.2 |

Continued/....

³² Note these counts relate only to Gypsies' and Travellers' caravans and not caravans occupied by Travelling Showpeople.

³³ As reported by CLG Caravan Count, last five counts (January 2013).

³⁴ Actual figures submitted by St Helens MBC.

Table 5.1 (continued)

| Count | Authorised sites with planning permission | | Unauthorised pitches without planning permission | Total |
|-----------------|---|---------------|--|-------|
| | West Lancashire | Social Rented | Total Private | |
| 17 Jan 2013 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 19 Jul 2012 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| 19 Jan 2012 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 28 Jul 2011 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| 27 Jan 2011 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 17 |
| 5 count average | 0 | 0 | 11.6 | 11.6 |
| Wirral | | | | |
| 17 Jan 2013 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 Jul 2012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19 Jan 2012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28 Jul 2011 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 27 Jan 2011 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 count average | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Source: CLG Caravan Count, last five counts (January 2013)

5.10 It should be noted that there may be more than one caravan or trailer per pitch and in the case of households doubling up on pitches there could be several trailers. For a number of reasons, such as people travelling, Gypsies and Travellers living on sites may not be present on the days on which the counts are conducted.

5.11 Tables 5.2a and 5.2b summarise the range of sites and yards known to the Local Authorities across Merseyside and West Lancashire.

Table 5.2a Summary of sites and pitches Gypsies and Travellers

| Merseyside and West Lancashire | No. Sites | No. Pitches |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Local Authority owned | 3 | 50 |
| Private authorised (occupied) | 6 | 33 |
| Private authorised (unoccupied) | 3 | 12 |
| Private unauthorised | 6 | 12 |
| TOTAL Authorised | 12 | 95* |
| TOTAL Unauthorised | 6 | 12 |
| GRAND TOTAL | 18 | 107* |

Source: Merseyside and West Lancashire Local Authorities

*Plus potential pitches on Sherdley Road Private Caravan Park, St. Helens

Table 5.2b Summary of yards and plots Travelling Showpeople

| Total | No. Yards | No. Plots |
|---------------------------|-----------|------------------------|
| Council owned | 0 | 0 |
| Private authorised | 1 | 10 |
| Private unauthorised | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL Authorised | 1 | 10³⁵ |
| TOTAL Unauthorised | 0 | 0 |
| GRAND TOTAL | 1 | 10³⁶ |

Source: Merseyside and West Lancashire Local Authorities

- 5.12 Residents across these sites and yards were contacted and asked to participate in the study. The survey field team aimed to secure responses from households living on all occupied pitches across the study area. There are a total of 95 occupied pitches currently located across the study area and a total of 94 interviews were achieved from households living on these pitches.
- 5.13 This is a high proportion of returns from a hard to reach group and is considered to be sufficiently robust to be representative of the community. The achieved interviews identified 43 emerging households (of whom 41 intend to remain in the Merseyside and West Lancashire area). These are households expecting to form and mainly comprise young people intending on forming their own household in the next five years.
- 5.14 The fieldwork team used a number of approaches to identify households living in bricks and mortar accommodation including:
- Using the Council's Education Liaison services to advise communities about the study and pass on contact details;
 - Working with ICCM to identify households wishing to participate in the study. ICCM also followed up contacts to encourage as many households as possible to participate in the study; and
 - The Fieldwork Team's own network of local contacts.
- 5.15 Overall 34 bricks and mortar interviews were attempted for the study area, with 17 interviews successfully achieved. Multiple call back attempts were made to non-respondents.
- 5.16 In order to maintain confidentiality of responses, data are presented at Merseyside and West Lancashire-wide level for: Gypsies and Travellers living on sites (local authority, private authorised and unauthorised), and Gypsies and Travellers living in bricks and mortar accommodation. Data from Showpeople is included in the Gypsy and Traveller living on sites data to ensure the confidentiality of respondents.

³⁵ This comprises four permanent plots and six seasonal plots (March to October linked to Southport Pleasureland)

³⁶ This comprises four permanent plots and six seasonal plots (March to October linked to Southport Pleasureland)

General note to readers of this report

5.17 When reviewing the findings of the household survey please consider the number of responses when reporting any figures.

Ethnicity of respondents


5.18 The ethnicity of respondents (Table 5.3 and Chart 5.1) as reported in the household survey³⁷ indicates there are a range of ethnicities within the Gypsy and Traveller community across Merseyside and West Lancashire with the biggest single group being Romany Gypsies (43.1%), followed by Irish Travellers (27.5%), English Gypsies (15.6%) and English Travellers (11%).

Table 5.3 Range of responses achieved by ethnicity and dwelling type

| Ethnicity of Head of household | Dwelling type (Number) | | | | | Total % |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|---------|
| | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total | |
| Romany Gypsy | 7 | 21 | 14 | 5 | 47 | 43.1% |
| English Gypsy | 2 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 17 | 15.6% |
| English Traveller | 2 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 12 | 11.0% |
| Irish Traveller | 2 | 16 | 2 | 10 | 30 | 27.5% |
| Welsh Gypsy | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.9% |
| Travelling Showperson | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.9% |
| Other | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.9% |
| Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 15 | 109 | 100.0% |
| Missing cases (non-response) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 | |

³⁷ The household survey provides the only source of ethnicity as the 2011 Census does not split the Gypsy, Traveller and Showperson communities so it is not possible to compare the results of the survey with other data.

Chart 5.1 Ethnicity of respondents



Tenure of respondents

5.19 Overall, 56.8% of respondents stated that they own their own home [caravan or bricks and mortar house], 27.9% rent from a Council, 8.1% rent privately, and 2.7% rent from a Housing Association; 3.6% stated other tenures (Table 5.4).

Table 5.4 Tenure of respondents

| Tenure | Dwelling type (%) | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| Rent from Council | 0.0% | 60.5% | 0.0% | 29.4% | 27.9% |
| Rent privately | 0.0% | 0.0% | 13.2% | 23.5% | 8.1% |
| Rent from Housing Association/ Registered Provider / RSL | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.6% | 11.8% | 2.7% |
| Own home | 92.3% | 37.2% | 76.3% | 35.3% | 56.8% |
| Not applicable | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.6% | 0.0% | 0.9% |
| Other | 7.7% | 2.3% | 5.3% | 0.0% | 3.6% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Base (valid responses) | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

Note: this is data as reported by households

5.20 According to the responses given by respondents, the majority of those living on pitches rent the land they live on with planning permission (78.7%). Of these 41.5% rent from a council and 37.2% rent privately. A further 4.3% own the land where they live with planning permission; 8.5% neither own nor rent the land where they live, and 2.1% stated another form of land ownership.

Table 5.5 Ownership of land where trailer/caravan located

| Land ownership | Dwelling type (%) | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| Own land where trailer/wagon is normally located (with planning permission) | 7.7% | 0.0% | 7.9% | 0.0% | 4.3% |
| Own land where trailer/caravan is normally located (no planning permission) | 7.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.1% |
| Rent pitch from Council | 0.0% | 95.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 41.5% |
| Rent pitch privately (with planning permission) | 15.4% | 0.0% | 86.8% | 0.0% | 37.2% |
| Rent pitch privately (with no planning permission) | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.6% | 0.0% | 1.1% |
| Neither own or rent the land (unauthorised) | 53.8% | 2.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.5% |
| Tolerated site | 7.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.1% |
| Not Applicable | 0.0% | 2.4% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 3.2% |
| Other | 7.7% | 0.0% | 2.6% | 0.0% | 2.1% |
| Total (%) | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Base (Valid Responses) | 13 | 41 | 38 | 2 | 94 |
| Missing cases | 0 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 17 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

Facilities on pitches

- 5.21 CLG guidance states that pitches should provide, as a minimum, access to a separate toilet, bath/shower room, and a kitchen and dining area should be provided.
- 5.22 Respondents were asked to identify the facilities they had on their pitch (Table 5.6). Overall, most respondents living on pitches had access to mains water and electricity (90.3% and 88.2% respectively), a toilet and mains sewerage (84.9% and 80.6%). Very few had access to a living room (7.5%) and mains gas supply (6.5%).

Table 5.6 Facilities provided on pitch³⁸

| Facilities on Pitch | Unauthorised development (%) | LA Site (%) | Private Site (%) | Total (%) |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------|
| Slab | 76.9% | 100.0% | 94.6% | 94.6% |
| Shed | 53.8% | 100.0% | 83.8% | 87.1% |
| Kitchen | 53.8% | 55.8% | 29.7% | 45.2% |
| Laundry | 30.8% | 67.4% | 35.1% | 49.5% |
| Laundry drying area | 38.5% | 60.5% | 16.2% | 39.8% |
| Bath | 7.7% | 67.4% | 21.6% | 40.9% |
| Shower | 69.2% | 72.1% | 64.9% | 68.8% |
| Toilet | 69.2% | 100.0% | 73.0% | 84.9% |
| Living room | 0.0% | 4.7% | 13.5% | 7.5% |
| Mains water | 92.3% | 95.3% | 83.8% | 90.3% |
| Mains sewerage | 84.6% | 95.3% | 62.2% | 80.6% |
| Mains electricity | 84.6% | 95.3% | 81.1% | 88.2% |
| Gas supply | 30.8% | 2.3% | 2.7% | 6.5% |
| Base (Valid Responses) | 13 | 43 | 37 | 93 |
| Missing Cases | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 94 |

Amenities elsewhere on the site

5.23 The majority of respondents had access to car parking (73.2%), and half had access to toilets on their sites (Table 5.7).

Table 5.7 Amenities provided elsewhere on site³⁹

| Facilities on site | Unauthorised development (%) | LA Site (%) | Private Site (%) | Total (%) |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------|
| Amenity block | 87.5% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 22.0% |
| Toilets | 100.0% | 25.0% | 41.4% | 51.2% |
| Showers | 87.5% | 0.0% | 31.0% | 39.0% |
| Laundry | 87.5% | 0.0% | 6.9% | 22.0% |
| Car parking | 100.0% | 0.0% | 75.9% | 73.2% |
| Space for storing loads | 75.0% | 0.0% | 27.6% | 34.1% |
| Play area | 12.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.4% |
| Other | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 4.9% |
| Base (Valid Responses) | 8 | 4 | 29 | 41 |
| Missing Cases | 5 | 39 | 9 | 53 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 94 |

³⁸ Responses from those living in bricks and mortar accommodation have been excluded from this question, hence just 94 responses

³⁹ Responses from those living in bricks and mortar accommodation have been excluded from this question, hence just 94 responses

Repairs and improvements

5.24 Overall the vast majority (86.9%) of respondents described the state of repair of their home as being good or very good (Table 5.8). Only 4.7% of respondents described their home as being in a poor or very poor state of repair. Issues with poor repair were evident with those respondents living on local authority sites, where 19% identified their home as being in neither good nor bad repair, and 11.9% identified it as being in a poor or very poor state.

Table 5.8 State of repair

| State of repair | Dwelling type (%) | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| Very Good | 92.3% | 42.9% | 97.3% | 93.3% | 74.8% |
| Good | 7.7% | 26.2% | 2.7% | 0.0% | 12.1% |
| Neither Good nor Poor | 0.0% | 19.0% | 0.0% | 6.7% | 8.4% |
| Poor | 0.0% | 7.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.8% |
| Very Poor | 0.0% | 4.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.9% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Base (valid responses) | 13 | 42 | 37 | 15 | 107 |
| Missing Cases | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

5.25 Over half of respondents (68 or 61.8%) stated that they had no repair problems; of the 39 respondents identified as having repair problems, all of these households were living on local authority sites. No repair problems were identified by households living in bricks and mortar accommodation or on private sites. Of those stating a repair problem, kitchen and bathroom facilities presented the biggest issues (64.3% and 57.1% respectively).

Table 5.9 Repair problems by for respondents on LA sites

| Repair problem | LA Site | % stating repair problem |
|------------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| More space on pitch | 5 | 16.1 |
| Slab/drive | 13 | 41.9 |
| Roof | 3 | 9.7 |
| Doors/windows | 9 | 29.0 |
| Kitchen facilities | 24 | 77.4 |
| Bathroom facilities | 23 | 74.2 |
| Other | 8 | 25.8 |
| Base (valid responses) | 31 | |
| Missing Cases | 12 | |
| Grand Total | 43 | |

Note: Respondents living in unauthorised developments, private sites and bricks and mortar did not state any repair problems, hence just 43 responses


Space Requirements

- 5.26 Whilst there is no set pitch size, CLG guidance states that there should be sufficient space on pitches to allow for:
- Manoeuvrability of an average size trailer of up to 15 metres in length;
 - Capacity for larger mobile homes of up to 25 metres on a number of pitches on a site; and
 - A minimum of six metres between every trailer, caravan or park home that is separately occupied on a site.
- 5.27 Feedback from the Travelling community is that sites with between six and 12 pitches are preferable. Government guidance identifies that *‘there is no one ideal size of site or number of pitches although experience of site managers and residents alike suggest that a maximum of 15 pitches is conducive to providing a comfortable environment which is easy to manage. However, smaller sites of three to four pitches can also be successful, particularly where designed for one extended family.’*⁴⁰
- 5.28 The Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain has published a *‘Model Standard Package’* (revised September 2007) and *‘Best Practice Advice on Provision of Showmen’s Permanent Parking Sites’* (4th June 2008), which identify space and design requirements for yards.
- 5.29 The Model Standard Package advocates that the density on yards *‘should not exceed 20 caravans per hectare, calculated on the basis of usable area allocated for residential purposes on that site and excluding lakes, communal services and other areas unsuitable for the siting of caravans. The density should be consistent with safety standards and health and safety requirements.’*⁴¹
- 5.30 In terms of space for trailers, wagons and vehicles (Chart 5.2), 81.4% respondents felt they had enough space, although the proportion was lower for those living on local authority sites (63.4%) compared to those on private (94.6%) and unauthorised developments (90.9%).

⁴⁰ CLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide (May 2008) paragraph 4.7

⁴¹ The Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain Model Standard Package (2007) section 7 paragraph 4


Chart 5.2 Enough space for trailers, wagons and vehicles



| | Unauthorised Development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| Base (Valid responses) | 11 | 41 | 37 | 8 | 97 |
| Non response/not relevant | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 14 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

5.31 Of respondents living on pitches, overall the majority felt that there was enough space in their amenity block/shed (70.4%). However for those living on local authority sites only half of respondents felt that they had sufficient space in this regard.


Chart 5.3 Enough space in amenity blocks/sheds on pitch



| | Unauthorised Development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| Base (Valid responses) | 10 | 40 | 31 | 0 | 99 |
| Non response/not relevant | 3 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 12 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

5.32 72.2% of respondents living on a pitch on a site felt there was sufficient space overall on their pitch (Chart 5.4); for those on local authority sites however this figure is lower at 60%.

Chart 5.4 Enough space on pitch/plot



| | Unauthorised Development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| Base (Valid responses) | 12 | 40 | 20 | 0 | 72 |
| Non response/not relevant | 1 | 3 | 18 | 17 | 39 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

Satisfaction with location of your home

5.33 Satisfaction with the location of the home is relatively high (Table 5.10), with 91% of respondents overall stating that they were very satisfied or satisfied; 2.7% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their location.

Table 5.10 Satisfaction with the location of your home

| Satisfaction with location of your home | Dwelling type (%) | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| Very satisfied | 38.5% | 58.1% | 71.1% | 64.7% | 61.3% |
| Satisfied | 46.2% | 30.2% | 26.3% | 23.5% | 29.7% |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 7.7% | 7.0% | 2.6% | 11.8% | 6.3% |
| Dissatisfied | 0.0% | 2.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.9% |
| Very dissatisfied | 7.7% | 2.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.8% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Base (Valid Response) | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |
| Non response | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

Feelings about neighbourhood, safety and security

5.34 Interviewees were asked how happy they were with the neighbourhood in which they were located (Table 5.11); overall the majority of respondents were either very happy or happy (93.7%) with their neighbourhood. Only 4.5% were neither happy nor unhappy and 1.8% were unhappy; none were very unhappy.


Table 5.11 Happy with neighbourhood

| Happy with Neighbourhood | Dwelling type (%) | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| Very happy | 53.8% | 67.4% | 50.0% | 70.6% | 60.4% |
| Happy | 30.8% | 30.2% | 44.7% | 17.6% | 33.3% |
| Neither happy nor unhappy | 7.7% | 2.3% | 5.3% | 5.9% | 4.5% |
| Unhappy | 7.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5.9% | 1.8% |
| Very unhappy | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Base (Valid Response) | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |
| Non response | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

Safety

5.35 In terms of safety (Chart 5.5), virtually all respondents felt safe in their neighbourhood (96.4%), although 3.6% of respondents stated they did not feel safe and this was highest for Gypsies and Travellers living on local authority sites (7.0%).

Chart 5.5 Do you feel safe in this neighbourhood?



Dwelling type (%)

| | Unauthorised Development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| Base (Valid Response) | 13 | 40 | 37 | 17 | 107 |
| Non response | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

Location to amenities

5.36 Respondents were asked if they felt being near to a range of amenities was important, slightly important or not important to them (Table 5.12). Over 96% felt it was important to be close to doctors and public houses; with the importance of being close to main roads (84.3%) and public transport (76.5 %) also noted.

Table 5.12 Location to amenities


| Amenity | Importance | Dwelling type (%) | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|--------|
| | | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| Primary School nearby | Important | 50.0% | 61.5% | 61.3% | 64.3% | 60.6% |
| | Slightly Important | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.5% | 0.0% | 2.1% |
| | Not Important | 50.0% | 38.5% | 32.3% | 35.7% | 37.2% |
| | Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Secondary School nearby | Important | 40.0% | 30.3% | 24.0% | 53.8% | 33.3% |
| | Slightly Important | 10.0% | 15.2% | 36.0% | 7.7% | 19.8% |
| | Not Important | 50.0% | 54.5% | 40.0% | 38.5% | 46.9% |
| | Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Doctors nearby | Important | 100.0% | 93.0% | 100.0% | 94.1% | 96.4% |
| | Slightly Important | 0.0% | 4.7% | 0.0% | 5.9% | 2.7% |
| | Not Important | 0.0% | 2.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.9% |
| | Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Public house nearby | Important | 92.3% | 97.6% | 97.4% | 94.1% | 96.4% |
| | Slightly Important | 7.7% | 2.4% | 2.6% | 5.9% | 3.6% |
| | Not Important | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| | Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Shops nearby | Important | 20.0% | 25.0% | 23.3% | 69.2% | 30.6% |
| | Slightly Important | 10.0% | 9.4% | 26.7% | 0.0% | 14.1% |
| | Not Important | 70.0% | 65.6% | 50.0% | 30.8% | 55.3% |
| | Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Public Transport nearby | Important | 63.6% | 68.6% | 81.0% | 100.0% | 76.8% |
| | Slightly Important | 27.3% | 5.7% | 4.8% | 0.0% | 7.3% |
| | Not Important | 9.1% | 25.7% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 15.9% |
| | Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Main Roads nearby | Important | 72.7% | 94.9% | 69.2% | 92.9% | 84.4% |
| | Slightly Important | 18.2% | 0.0% | 19.2% | 7.1% | 8.9% |
| | Not Important | 9.1% | 5.1% | 11.5% | 0.0% | 6.7% |
| | Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Access to open space | Important | 18.2% | 58.8% | 31.6% | 23.1% | 40.3% |
| | Slightly Important | 18.2% | 8.8% | 5.3% | 0.0% | 7.8% |
| | Not Important | 63.6% | 32.4% | 63.2% | 76.9% | 51.9% |
| | Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Access to place of work | Important | 10.0% | 25.8% | 38.1% | 38.5% | 29.3% |
| | Slightly Important | 0.0% | 12.9% | 9.5% | 0.0% | 8.0% |
| | Not Important | 90.0% | 61.3% | 52.4% | 61.5% | 62.7% |
| | Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Access to place of worship | Important | 90.9% | 44.4% | 56.0% | 38.5% | 52.9% |
| | Slightly Important | 0.0% | 0.0% | 24.0% | 7.7% | 8.2% |
| | Not Important | 9.1% | 55.6% | 20.0% | 53.8% | 38.8% |
| | Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Base (all households) | | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

Note: percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding

Overcrowding

5.37 A limited number of respondents felt that their home was overcrowded (6.5%); of these, respondents living on unauthorised developments and on local authority sites were most likely to experience overcrowding (15.4% and 9.3% respectively) (Chart 5.6). None of the respondents living in bricks and mortar felt overcrowded.

Chart 5.6 Do you think your home is overcrowded?



| | Unauthorised Development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| Base (Valid Responses) | 13 | 43 | 38 | 14 | 108 |
| Non response | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

Facilities shared with other households

5.38 Sharing toilet facilities was mentioned by 12 respondents living on a pitch on a site, whilst 11 respondents indicated that they shared a bathroom, 10 shared laundry facilities and six shared kitchen facilities.

Table 5.13 Do you have to share facilities?

| Sharing facilities | Dwelling type (number) | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| Bathroom | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 11 |
| Toilet | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 12 |
| Kitchen | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Laundry | 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| Base (Households responding) | 6 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 13 |
| Non response | 7 | 40 | 34 | 17 | 98 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

Note: Percentage figures have not been included because of the low number of responses received

Cost of accommodation and services

5.39 Overall, 19.3% of respondents have all of their housing costs met through Housing Benefit, a further 10.5% have some of their housing costs met through Housing Benefit. However, the vast majority of respondents (70.2%) have none of their housing costs met by Housing Benefit.

5.40 Receipt of full Housing Benefit was highest amongst Gypsies and Travellers living in bricks and mortar accommodation (41.7%), followed by those living on local authority pitches (36.4%).

Chart 5.7 Housing costs covered by Housing Benefit



| | Unauthorised Development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| Base (Valid Responses) | 7 | 11 | 27 | 12 | 57 |
| Non response | 6 | 32 | 11 | 5 | 54 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

- 5.41 Please note that it was not deemed culturally sensitive to ask about income in the survey.
- 5.42 The extent to which all respondents felt that the cost of services (gas, electricity, oil and water) were 'okay' or 'not okay' is presented in Table 5.14. This shows that 58.3% of respondents felt that the price of electricity was OK, 61.4% that the price of gas was OK, 58.3% that the price of oil was OK and 65% that the price of water was OK.

Table 5.14 Cost of services

| Service | | Dwelling type (%) | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| | | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| How do you find the cost of electricity? | OK | 84.6% | 27.9% | 81.1% | 66.7% | 58.3% |
| | Not OK | 15.4% | 72.1% | 18.9% | 33.3% | 41.7% |
| | Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Base (Valid Response) | 13 | 43 | 37 | 15 | 108 |
| | Non response | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |
| How do you find the cost of gas? | OK | 72.7% | 47.4% | 70.0% | 78.6% | 61.4% |
| | Not OK | 27.3% | 52.6% | 30.0% | 21.4% | 38.6% |
| | Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Base (Valid Response) | 11 | 38 | 20 | 14 | 83 |
| | Non response | 2 | 5 | 18 | 3 | 28 |
| | Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |
| How do you find the cost of oil? | OK | 100% | 62.5% | 0.0% | 100% | 58.3% |
| | Not OK | 0.0% | 37.5% | 100% | 0.0% | 41.7% |
| | Total | 100.0% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Base (Valid Response) | 1 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| | Non response | 12 | 35 | 36 | 16 | 99 |
| | Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |
| How do you find the cost of water? | OK | 90.0% | 46.5% | 81.3% | 66.7% | 65.0% |
| | Not OK | 10.0% | 53.5% | 18.8% | 33.3% | 35.0% |
| | Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Base (Valid Response) | 10 | 43 | 32 | 15 | 100 |
| | Non response | 3 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 11 |
| | Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

Moving

- 5.43 Respondents were asked whether they planned to move over the next five years. The vast majority of respondents plan to stay where they are (94.3%); those living in bricks and mortar accommodation indicated the highest level of intent to move elsewhere (17.6%).

Table 5.15 Respondents planning to move in the next five years

| Moving intention | Dwelling type (%) | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| Planning to stay where you are based now | 90.9% | 95.2% | 100% | 82.4% | 94.3% |
| Planning to move elsewhere* | 9.1% | 4.8% | 0.0% | 17.6% | 5.7% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Base (Valid Response) | 11 | 42 | 35 | 17 | 105 |
| Non response | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

*Only three respondents actually stated where they were planning to move to and as this is such a small response the figures cannot be quoted.

Household mobility

5.44 The household survey identified a limited degree of mobility, with 62.2% of households having lived at their present address for over five years (with 81.4% of respondents on LA sites living there for five years or more compared with 35.3% of respondents living in bricks and mortar accommodation). Only 8.1% of respondents had lived at their present address for two years or less.

Table 5.16 Length of residence

| Length of residence | Dwelling type (%) | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Unauthorised encampment | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| Up to one year | 23.1% | 2.3% | 2.6% | 0.0% | 4.5% |
| Over one and up to two years | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.6% | 17.6% | 3.6% |
| Over two and up to three years | 7.7% | 7.0% | 10.5% | 11.8% | 9.0% |
| Over three and up to four years | 0.0% | 2.3% | 18.4% | 5.9% | 8.1% |
| Over four and up to five years | 0.0% | 7.0% | 15.8% | 29.4% | 12.6% |
| Five years or over | 69.2% | 81.4% | 50.0% | 35.3% | 62.2% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Base (Valid Response) | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |
| Non response | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

5.45 Of households moving in the past five years, 20.8% had moved from within the Liverpool City Region and 12.5% had moved from Greater Manchester; 16.7% had moved from elsewhere in Lancashire. 20.8% had relocated from Cheshire

and 12.5% from the North East⁴². It appears that local authorities in the study area are tolerant of unauthorised encampments given that 69.2% of respondents living on an unauthorised encampment have been living there for five years or more. Of those respondents living in bricks and mortar accommodation, the majority of these (35.3%) have been living in their homes for five years or more.

Table 5.17 Summary of the origin of moving households

| Origin | Total |
|--|-------|
| Within Study Area (Liverpool, Wirral, Sefton, St Helens, West Lancs, Knowsley) | 20.8% |
| Cheshire | 20.8% |
| Greater Manchester | 12.5% |
| Elsewhere in Lancashire and Cumbria | 16.7% |
| North East and Yorkshire/Humber | 12.5% |
| Elsewhere UK | 16.7% |
| Total | 100% |
| Base (moving households in past five years stating origin) | 24 |
| Missing cases | 18 |
| Grand Total (all moving households in past five years) | 42 |

⁴² Note that a household may be from the Merseyside and West Lancashire area originally and had subsequently returned to their home area.

6. Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Requirements

- 6.1 This section reviews the overall need for pitches for Gypsies and Travellers across Merseyside and West Lancashire, in terms of both short and long term permanent provision, and transit provision. It takes into account current supply and need as well as future need, based on modelling of data, as advocated by the CLG. Requirements for Gypsies and Travellers are reviewed in this chapter. The requirements for Travelling Showpeople are reviewed in Chapter 7. This chapter also considers planning issues.

Modelling of short term needs

- 6.2 The calculation of pitch requirements is based on CLG modelling as advocated in Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment Guidance (CLG, 2007). The CLG Guidance requires an assessment of the current needs of Gypsies and Travellers and a projection of future needs. The focus of the calculation of pitch needs is the need arising from Local Authorities within the study area. The Guidance advocates the use of a survey to supplement secondary source information and derive key supply and need information.
- 6.3 The GTAA has modelled current and future need and current and future supply. The various need and supply factors considered in the model are summarised, followed by application of the model to assess specifically the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers. The initial needs assessment focuses on accommodation required within the five year period 2013-2018, which is used to inform the assessment of longer-term projected requirements examined further on in this chapter (6.27).
- 6.4 In terms of **need** the analysis considers:
- The baseline number of households living on pitches on all sites (as at 31st May 2013) which establishes a baseline number of pitches which are occupied. Analysis assumes one household per pitch and the field team did not report any incidences of ‘doubling up’ where two separate households are occupying a single pitch. Note that a household may occupy more than one caravan on a pitch (see table 5.2a);
 - The number of households living in bricks and mortar accommodation (a minimum baseline based on achieved interviews);
 - The number of existing households currently living on sites who are intending to move in the next five years, either between pitches on the same site, to a site elsewhere or to bricks and mortar accommodation;
 - The number of existing households currently living in bricks and mortar accommodation who are intending to move onto a site within the study area or elsewhere within the next five years;
 - The number of emerging households (newly forming) in the next five years who are currently living on a pitch or in bricks and mortar and will need their own pitch on the same site, or need to move elsewhere in the study area, outside the study area or to bricks and mortar accommodation. Note this

element of the model factors in any concealed households who expect to move; to derive a figure for

- The total need for pitches.
- 6.5 It is important to distinguish between accommodation need and preference. The model and the data focus on accommodation need, akin to homelessness (ie lack of a pitch), or unsuitable accommodation (ie overcrowding). Hence the priority of the survey work was to interview households resident on pitches on sites. The model does not take into account households who would 'prefer' to live on a pitch elsewhere if they are already adequately accommodated on a pitch within the study area. Similarly, with households residing in bricks and mortar accommodation, the assessment focuses on accommodation need and not a preference to move to a different location.
- 6.6 In terms of **supply**, the CLG model considers :
- Total supply of pitches on authorised sites;
 - Turnover on existing authorised sites;
 - Vacant pitches on authorised sites; and
 - Total supply of permanent authorised pitches⁴³ based on turnover [i.e. the rate at which pitches become available] and existing pitch provision (as set out at Table 4.1a). When assessing turnover, the model assumes that any pitches becoming available would be occupied by households either currently residing in the local authority or who have a local connection.
- 6.7 The model then reconciles total need and existing authorised supply by summarising:
- Total need for pitches; and
 - Total supply of authorised pitches.
- 6.8 The assessment of current need should, in line with the Guidance, take account of existing supply and demand. In the CLG model, current residential supply refers to local authority residential sites and authorised privately owned sites and assumes one household per pitch.
- 6.9 In this assessment we have reported the existing number of pitches on authorised local authority and private sites (as the actual number of pitches on sites available for occupancy at 31st May 2013).
- 6.10 Although we have secured a high level of response from households living on pitches, survey data have been weighted slightly for some Local Authority areas to reflect the total number of authorised pitches across Merseyside and West Lancashire. This is explained further in paragraph 6.12.

⁴³ This does not include temporary authorised or unauthorised pitches.

Description of factors in the model

- 6.11 Table 6.1 provides a summary of the future pitch requirement calculation. Each component in the model is now described to ensure that the process is transparent and the assumptions clearly stated.

Need

6.12 Current households on pitches (1a to 1e)

These figures are derived from Local Authority data relating to households currently occupying pitches, and the model assumes one household per pitch. The total number of pitches on permanent authorised and unauthorised sites is included as an expression of total need. It is assumed that the permanent occupation of unauthorised pitches is a direct indication of unmet need. Note that a weighting factor is applied to ensure that the model reflects the total number of households living on authorised pitches. For instance, if there are 100 occupied pitches and 80 achieved interviews, results are weighted by 1.25. Weightings were applied to the data for Liverpool (1.08) and Sefton (1.06) reflecting a slightly lower overall response rate relative to the total number of occupied pitches in each of these areas. Data for the other Local Authorities was not weighted because the total number of achieved interviews overall reflected the total number of households living on occupied pitches. Please note that Table 6.2 gives the details of the occupancy of authorised pitches across the study area. 1e specifically relates to authorised private sites in St. Helens, which are not currently occupied. These are excluded from the total calculation.

6.13 Current households in bricks and mortar accommodation (2)

This is a figure based on the respondents who were interviewed as part of the fieldwork. There were a total of 17 households interviewed.

6.14 Existing households planning to move in the next five years (3)

This was derived from information from the household survey for respondents currently on authorised and unauthorised pitches and respondents in bricks and mortar accommodation who would prefer to live on a site. It should be noted that the one household at row 3d (currently on site and planning to move outside the study area) is included in the needs figure as there is no specific information on where the household would wish to move to or any guarantee that this household will ultimately leave the study area. The net impact of existing households planning to move is considered in analysis (i.e. if a household states it is planning to move within the same site this results in no net additional pitch requirement).

6.15 Emerging households (4)

This is the number of households expected to emerge in the next five years based on household survey information from respondents living on authorised and unauthorised pitches and also people living in bricks and mortar accommodation. Analysis considers where emerging households are planning to move to. Out of 43 emerging households identified in the survey, 25 plan to live on the current site they are on, seven plan to live on a site elsewhere in the Local Authority they currently live in, two are currently on sites but have indicated a

preference to live outside Merseyside and West Lancashire, nine are currently in bricks and mortar accommodation and want to move to a site in Merseyside and West Lancashire. It should be noted that the two households at row 4c (currently on sites and planning to move outside the study area) are included in the needs figure as there is no specific information on where the households would wish to move to or any guarantee that these Travellers will ultimately leave the study area. It should be noted that two types of emerging households are considered: firstly, those households who are 'ready' to emerge, for instance a young married couple still living on the family pitch who could also be classified as a concealed household; and those households 'expecting' to emerge in the next five years, for instance a 16 year old who is planning to get their own pitch.

6.16 Total need for pitches (5)

This is a total of current households on pitches (authorised and unauthorised), households planning to move in the next five years (either on pitches or in bricks and mortar accommodation) and need from emerging households (who plan to live in the study area). Note that the analysis specifically considers evidenced need and not preference for sites. Where emerging households living in bricks and mortar accommodation have stated a move to a pitch, this is accepted as need rather than a preference or aspiration.

Supply

6.17 Current supply of authorised pitches (6)

The current supply of authorised pitches is based on data collected from the Local Authorities and was correct at 31st May 2013. This information is presented in detail in Table 6.2.

6.18 Summary of need and supply excluding turnover (7)

This is the scale of need evidenced relative to supply of authorised pitches without factoring in any turnover on pitches.

6.19 Turnover on existing authorised pitches (8)

Turnover has been calculated based on the likely level of turnover expected to take place on authorised sites over a five year period. This is based on the number of pitches expected to become available on authorised sites and has been considered on a site-by-site basis and takes into account past mobility and the future moving intentions of households living on sites. Specifically, the model considers the number of households who have actually moved onto their pitch in the past five years. It should be noted that the study assumes no turnover on some sites because they are family sites with no pitches likely to come available for non-family members. It is also assumed that if a pitch becomes available it could be used to offset the need for pitches from households from within the local authority area.

The five year turnover assumptions adopted in the modelling are:

| | |
|------------|-----------|
| Liverpool | 5 pitches |
| Sefton | 2 pitches |
| St. Helens | 6 pitches |

West Lancashire 0 pitches

Wirral 0 pitches

It is recommended that turnover on all sites is regularly monitored to confirm the turnover assumptions remain appropriate as part of the assessment of overall pitch requirements.

6.20 **Total supply (9)**

This figure is based on the total number of authorised permanent pitches available which are either occupied or vacant and expected turnover. The total number of occupied authorised pitches is 70 (44 local authority and 26 private authorised pitches). The total number of vacant authorised pitches is 13 (6 local authority pitches and 7 on private authorised pitches). Turnover is expected to result in 13 pitches becoming available over the next five years. Hence the total pitch supply is expected to be 96 pitches over the five year period 2013/14 to 2017/18.

6.21 Table 6.1 calculates short term needs based on the survey data and information at the base date of 31 May 2013. Table 6.2 summarises the number of current authorised pitches occupied by households.

Table 6.1 Summary of demand and supply factors: Gypsies and Travellers

| NEED | | | Merseyside & West Lancs | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St Helens | West Lancs | Wirral |
|---|--|--|-------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|
| 1 | Current households on pitches | 1a. On LA Site | 44 | 13 | 0 | 16 | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 1b. On Private Site – Authorised | 26 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 23 | 1 | 0 |
| | | 1c. On Private Site – tolerated | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 1d. Unauthorised | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 1 |
| | | 1e. Private site-authorized but not currently occupied* | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 1f. TOTAL (1a to 1d) | 82 | 13 | 0 | 18 | 41 | 9 | 1 |
| 2 | Current households in bricks and mortar accommodation (baseline info only) | 2a. TOTAL | 17 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | Existing households planning to move in next 5 years | Currently on sites | | | | | | | |
| | | 3a. To another pitch/same site | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 3b. To another site in study area | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 3c. To Bricks and Mortar | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 3d. To a site/B&M outside study area | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | | Currently in Bricks and Mortar | | | | | | | |
| | | 3e. Planning to move to a site in LA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 3f. Planning to move to another B&M property | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| | 3g. TOTAL net impact (3e-3c+3f) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| 4 | Emerging households (5 years) | 4a. Currently on site and planning to live on current site | 25 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 6 | 0 |
| | | 4b. Currently on site and planning to live on another site in LA | 7 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 4c. Currently on site and planning to move outside study area | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 4d. Currently in B&M planning to move to a site | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| | | 4e. TOTAL (4a+4b+4c+4d) includes all emerging households identified | 43 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 21 | 6 | 4 |
| 5 | Total Need | 1f+3g+4e | 126 | 19 | 0 | 24 | 62 | 15 | 6 |
| SUPPLY | | | Merseyside & West Lancs | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St Helens | West Lancs | Wirral |
| 6 | Current supply of authorised pitches | 6a. Current occupied authorised pitches (1a+1b) | 70 | 13 | 0 | 18 | 38 | 1 | 0 |
| | | 6b. Current vacancies available on authorised pitches (see Table 6.2) | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 6c. TOTAL current authorised supply (6a+6b) | 83 | 14 | 0 | 18 | 50 | 1 | 0 |
| 7 | Summary of need and supply excluding turnover | 7a. Need – supply (5-6c) | 43 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 14 | 6 |
| 8 | Turnover on existing permanent authorised pitches | 8a. Annual | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 8b. 5 years | 13 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | Total supply of pitches (5 yrs) | 9a. Current authorised pitch provision and turnover (6a+8b) | 83 | 18 | 0 | 20 | 44 | 1 | 0 |
| | | 9b. Current vacancies on authorised pitches available for occupancy (6b) | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| | | 9c. TOTAL (9a+9b) | 96 | 19 | 0 | 20 | 56 | 1 | 0 |
| RECONCILING NEED AND SUPPLY | | | Merseyside & West Lancs | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St Helens | West Lancs | Wirral |
| 10 | Total need for pitches | 5 years (from 5) | 126 | 19 | 0 | 24 | 62 | 15 | 6 |
| 11 | Total supply of authorised pitches | 5 years (from 9c) | 96 | 19 | 0 | 20 | 56 | 1 | 0 |
| 5 YEAR AUTHORISED PITCH SHORTFALL (2013/14 TO 2017/18) | | | 30 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 6 |

*This relates to Berrys Lane and Houghton Road sites in St. Helens which are authorised sites. Vacant pitches on these two sites are not included as current supply at row 6b or elsewhere in this table as they were not considered available at the time of the survey.

Note some numbers may not sum correctly due to rounding.

Table 6.2 Current authorised pitches occupied by households

| Site | District and Number of pitches occupied/ Total Number of Pitches | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|------------|--------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St Helens | West Lancs | Wirral |
| LA site | 13/14 | 0/0 | 16/16 | 15/20 | 0/0 | 0/0 |
| Private site - Authorised | 0/0 | 0/0 | 2/2 | 23/30 | 1/1 | 0/0 |
| Total | 13/14 | 0/0 | 18/18 | 38/50 | 1/1 | 0/0 |

Reconciling short term supply and demand

- 6.22 It is our view that the interviews carried out provide a robust body of evidence from which an assessment of future pitch requirements can be established.
- 6.23 In summary, there is a total shortfall over the next five years (2013/14 to 2017/18) of 30 pitches in Merseyside and West Lancashire based on the analysis of households currently living in the area as at the base date of 31 May 2013.
- 6.24 Analysis at this stage does not factor in the potential for additional pitches which are subject to planning permission, nor any expansion of existing sites. The potential for additional pitches should be explored by each Local Authority as part of their response to the need for pitches evidenced in this report.
- 6.25 Table 6.3 summarises current supply and future need arising from the Authorities over the period 2013/14 to 2017/18.
- 6.26 This should be viewed as a minimum requirement based on the current supply of pitches and the views expressed by Gypsies and Traveller households who have been interviewed. The demand for pitches should be regularly reviewed to determine the extent to which this minimum requirement is changing over time.

Table 6.3 Summary of current authorised pitch supply and shortfalls 2013/14 to 2017/18

| | Current supply ⁴⁴ | Total shortfall |
|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Liverpool | 14 | 0 |
| Knowsley | 0 | 0 |
| Sefton | 18 | 4 |
| St Helens | 62 | 6 |
| West Lancashire | 1 | 14 |
| Wirral | 0 | 6 |
| Total | 95 | 30 |

⁴⁴ Includes pitches on authorised sites (Council and Private Authorised) and excludes turnover. Includes vacant pitches.

Longer-term pitch requirements (six to 15 years)

6.27 The prediction of longer-term pitch requirements (six to 15 years) is challenging because the Gypsy and Traveller population requiring pitches within the study area is relatively small and any change in the number of unauthorised pitches cannot easily be forecast. Assessing the short term pitch requirements of Gypsies and Travellers (first five years) has been based on detailed information obtained from the household survey. This exercise should be repeated at least every five years to ensure that the evidence base is up to date. Nevertheless, an indication of long term pitch requirement can be given based on anticipated household formation trends for the Gypsy and Traveller community.

Future household formation

There are a number of approaches to calculating future household formation. These can be summarised as follows:

- Using demographic information and assuming a 100% household formation rate, i.e. assume that all children will form a household in the Local Authority when they reach 18;
- Using demographic information and assuming a 50% household formation rate. i.e. assume that half the children will form a household in the Local Authority when they reach 18; or
- Using a standard 3% annual growth rate across each Local Authority.

This study uses the first approach, i.e. the 100% household formation rate up to 2028, as it is considered this offers the most robust assessment in the absence of the detailed intentions of future householders, i.e. those that cannot be determined at this stage such as marriage. An assessment of each of these methods is provided in Appendix F for comparison.

6.28 The following table summarises the number of children who are expected to form households over the period 2018/19 to 2027/28 based on current demographic information.

Table 6.4 Baseline information on children likely to form households 2018/19 to 2027/28

| Time period | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
|---|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|-----------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| 2018/19-2022/23 people likely to form emerging households | 1 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 23 |
| 2023/24-2027/28 people likely to form emerging households | 1 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 18 |
| Total | 2 | 0 | 16 | 14 | 8 | 1 | 41 |

Note: where applicable weighting has been applied to these data, as per that applied to Table 6.1, explained in paragraph 6.12

- 6.29 Modelling has been carried out using known household structure information from the household survey. On the basis of the age of children in households, it is possible to determine the extent of 'likely emergence', which assumes that a child is likely to form a new household at the age of 18⁴⁵. The year when a child reaches 18 has been calculated and it is possible to assess how many newly forming households may emerge over the five year periods 2018/19 to 2022/23 and 2023/24 to 2027/28, with the assumption that they remain in the same district and that all children will form individual households when they reach 18.
- 6.30 There are a series of further assumptions to this modelling which are now presented:
- There may be differences in household formation outcomes amongst males and females, with anecdotal evidence that females are more likely to move away on marriage. However, evidence from the household survey would suggest that both males and females were expecting to remain on the site where they currently live. It would not be possible for the model to take account of expected marriages between children currently identified as potentially emerging households, although it is accepted that this may take place. The modelling therefore assumes that 100% of all children identified in the survey will form a new household;
 - The modelling assumes that all additional pitches in line with the evidenced need are developed by 2017/18 and the underlying trends in pitch turnover remain constant across all pitches; and
 - The household survey specifically focuses on mobility patterns over the preceding five years and expected mobility over the next five years. Anticipated patterns of mobility (including in and out migration) as evidenced in the five year analysis (Table 6.1) are assumed to continue unchanged for the longer-term projections as there is no other data available. Whilst the interviews assessed potential out-migrants, this is not balanced with data on those moving into the study area as the study does not interview Travellers in neighbouring authorities or indeed those further afield. Whilst this is accepted as a weakness, making provision for every emerging household helps to establish an overall scale of future need and it is accepted this will include some households moving in, and the potential that not all children will form new households.
- 6.31 Future household formation modelling assumes that all people evidenced in Table 6.4 form new households within the study area and will require a pitch within the district within which they already live. This analysis begins with the results of the analysis of pitch requirements for the period 2013/14 to 2017/18. For the period 2018/19, it is assumed that the baseline number of pitches increases to address the additional requirements for the 2013/14 to 2017/18 period, and that the underlining trends in need from existing households remain

⁴⁵ Travellers are more likely to establish their own household at a relatively early age; it is not uncommon for a Traveller to be living in their own household by the age of 18.

constant (this means that assumptions regarding migration and the movement of existing households remain constant).

6.32 This analysis suggests a total net additional pitch requirement of 39 across the study area over the 15 year period 2013/14 to 2027/28. It is important to note that for Liverpool modelling suggests sufficient capacity on its authorised sites. This primarily occurs because of the relatively high turnover of pitches that currently occur on Liverpool's permanent site. Whilst the current turnover rate has been used in future calculations the situation in Liverpool is finely balanced and it is strongly recommended that Liverpool closely monitor future turnover rates. A reduction in future turnover rates will see a reduction in the apparent future over-supply of permanent Traveller pitches.

Table 6.5 Modelling of future pitch requirements 15 years 2013/14 to 2027/28

| 2013/14 to 2017/18 | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
|--|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| Baseline authorised pitches | 14 | 0 | 18 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 83 |
| Total Need (row 5 of needs model) | 19 | 0 | 24 | 62 | 15 | 6 | 126 |
| Total Supply (row 9c of needs model) | 19 | 0 | 20 | 56 | 1 | 0 | 96 |
| Reconciling need and supply | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 30 |
| 2018/19-2022/23 | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
| Baseline authorised pitches (assuming previous 5 year shortfall is addressed) | 14 | 0 | 22 | 56 | 15 | 6 | 113 |
| 5 year turnover on revised authorised pitch figure | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 15 |
| Additional newly-forming need | 1 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 23 |
| Reconciling need and supply | -4 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| 2023/24-2027/28 | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
| Baseline authorised pitches (assuming previous 10 year shortfall is addressed) | 14 | 0 | 28 | 57 | 18 | 7 | 124 |
| 5 year turnover on revised authorised pitch figure | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| Additional newly-forming need | 1 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 18 |
| Reconciling need and supply | -4 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
| Total net need 2013/14 to 2027/28 | -8 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 20 | 7 | 39* |

*The Merseyside and West Lancashire totals are inclusive of the negative figures for Liverpool and hence are net totals and will be different if Liverpool's oversupply is exceeded. This will not alter recommendations for others districts who should meet their own needs [see paragraph 6.32 above].

Post 2027/28 Pitch Requirement

6.33 For the period beyond 2027/28 it is considered difficult to rely on demographic information as it is not possible to use existing household information obtained from survey work to project accommodation need 15 years plus into the future. Longer term pitch requirements can be calculated using an annual 3% growth rate, in line with CLG guidance, on the total number of pitches for each Local Authority. Table 6.6 below sets out the pitch requirement for the five year period 2028/29 to 2032/33, assuming 3% growth per annum for each Local Authority and deducting the turnover.

Table 6.6 Modelling of future pitch requirements for period 2028/29 to 2032/33

| 2028/29-2032/33 | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|------------|-----------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| Baseline authorised pitches (assuming 15 year shortfall is addressed) | 14 | 0 | 32 | 56 | 21 | 7 | 130 |
| 5 year turnover on revised authorised pitch figure | 5 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| Additional newly-forming need [using 3% growth per year] | 2 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 20 |
| Total additional net need 2028/29 to 2032/33 | -3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |

6.34 Similar to the situation from 2018/9 to 2027/28, Liverpool is calculated to have an oversupply of pitches for the period post 2018/9 based on turnover outstripping new need. This should be closely monitored.

Conclusion

6.35 Longer-term modelling of pitch need based on the demographic profile of households currently living in the study area indicates a total need for 39 additional pitches over the period 2013/14 to 2027/28 (15 years) and a further need for three pitches over the period 2028/29 to 2032/33 using a standard annual growth estimate of 3%.

Table 6.7 Summary of future requirements modelling

| Longer-term projection model | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
|---|------------|----------|-----------|------------|-----------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| 2013/14 to 2017/18 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 30 |
| 2018/9 to 2022/23 | -4 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| 2023/24 to 2027/28 | -4 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| 2028/29 to 2032/33 | -3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Total need 2013/14 to 2032/33 (20 years) | -11 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 22 | 8 | 42 |

Type of new provision

- 6.36 Respondents were asked if there is a need for new permanent sites for Gypsies and Travellers and, if so, what sort of provision this should be and where should it be located. Responses to these questions are now looked at in turn.
- 6.37 The majority of respondents (80%) stated that there was a need for new provision across the study area (Table 6.8). Respondents tended to state that new provision should be managed privately by Gypsies and Travellers (67%), although 28.2% indicated that sites should be managed by local authorities (Table 6.9).

Table 6.8 Need for new sites

| Is there a need for a new permanent site(s) in the Study area | Dwelling type (%) | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| Yes | 87.5% | 85.0% | 83.3% | 58.8% | 80.0% |
| No | 12.5% | 15.0% | 16.7% | 41.2% | 20.0% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Base (Valid Response) | 8 | 40 | 30 | 17 | 95 |
| Non response | 5 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 16 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

Table 6.9 Preferred Site Management Option

| Site management | Dwelling type (%) | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| Councils | 0.0% | 50.0% | 20.0% | 6.3% | 28.2% |
| Private (Gypsy/Traveller) | 90.0% | 47.6% | 77.1% | 81.3% | 67.0% |
| Private (non-Gypsy/ Traveller) | 10.0% | 0.0% | 2.9% | 6.3% | 2.9% |
| Registered Social Landlord/ Housing Association | 0.0% | 2.4% | 0.0% | 6.3% | 1.9% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Base (Valid Response) | 10 | 42 | 35 | 16 | 103 |
| Non response | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

Note: Respondents could tick more than one option so the percentage figures relate to the percentage of respondents who would consider the option.

- 6.38 Respondents were asked how many new pitches they felt were needed in their local authority area now and in the next five years. In terms of requirements now, 67 households responded to the question. The median number of new pitches required now was 50 and the mode (most frequently mentioned number) was 50. In terms of requirements over the next five years, 70 households responded to the question and the median number of new pitches was 100 and the mode (most frequently mentioned number) was 50. The views of Travellers provide a

useful insight into the perceived need for new provision from within local Travelling communities. However, this anecdotal information does not represent an objective assessment of need for new provision; it is a reflection of the subjective points of view of respondents to the household survey.

Transit requirements

- 6.39 The CLG Guidance suggests that, in addition to the need for permanent provision, an assessment should be made of the need for temporary places to stop while travelling. Temporary, or transit, sites are intended for short-term use while in transit. These sites are authorised and usually permanent but there is a limit on the length of time residents can stay. In practice the length of stay on a transit pitch is generally limited to a maximum of 12 weeks (three months); however, no time limits are set out in any Government guidance.
- 6.40 Local authorities have a legal duty to provide emergency accommodation within their own areas if Travellers present themselves in that area. Whilst a local authority has no duty to find an authorised pitch or site, they are expected to facilitate the traditional [Traveller] way of life. A number of other requirements⁴⁶, in relation to welfare of children, access to essential services and right to private and family life, make it important that local authorities seek to provide sufficient pitches in their own area to reflect current, and meet possible future transit needs.
- 6.41 The extent to which transit provision is required across Merseyside and West Lancashire is now explored with reference to the views of survey respondents, the scale of unauthorised encampment activity and interviews with local authority officers working directly with the Travelling communities in the respective local authority areas.
- Step 1 identifies the overall identified level of unauthorised encampment activity across the study area;
 - Step 2 identifies the actual level of unauthorised encampment activity as it relates to transit need; repeat incidents of unauthorised encampment activity linked to a need for permanent accommodation (based on Local Authority evidence), and one-off or 'abnormal' events are discounted so that a more accurate and realistic assessment of transit need can be made; and
 - Step 3 identifies the proposed requirement for transit provision based on transit related unauthorised encampment activity and the average number of vans per encampment over the 30 month period in question (January 2011 to June 2013).
- 6.42 Generally speaking, a transit pitch can accommodate up to two caravans. However, doubling up is only generally appropriate where a single or related household is travelling together or when encampments are for short periods. Therefore, analysis assumes one caravan for each pitch but the pitch could

⁴⁶ These are set out in a number of acts and regulations, including The Housing Act 1996; The Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994; and The Human Rights Act 1998.

technically accommodate up to two caravans if this is appropriate to the households travelling.

Step 1: overall unauthorised encampment activity

6.43 In order to establish the potential requirement for transit provision in Merseyside and West Lancashire it is important to understand the extent of short term unauthorised encampment activity across the Local Authority areas. Generally these unauthorised encampments are of short duration (anything from one day to at most eight to 12 weeks). They occur as Gypsies and Travellers pass through an area whilst travelling, and are indicative of a lack of stop over or transit provision. Table 6.10 summarises unauthorised encampment data for the study area for the period January 2011 to June 2013.

Table 6.10 Unauthorised encampments Jan 2011 to June 2013

| Authority | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 (Jan to June) | Total |
|-----------------|------|------|--------------------|------------------|
| Knowsley | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Liverpool | 1 | 9 | 4 | 14 ⁴⁷ |
| Sefton | 9 | 2 | 5 | 16 ⁴⁸ |
| St Helens | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| West Lancashire | 8 | 3 | 2 | 13 |
| Wirral | 21 | 14 | 10 | 45 ⁴⁹ |
| Total | 41 | 30 | 22 | 93 |

Source: Merseyside and West Lancashire local authorities

6.44 In addition to the unauthorised encampments recorded in the table above, it is considered possible that additional encampments could have occurred within the study area over this time period, however, details of these encampments have not been recorded fully by the Authorities. This may be due to the remote location or short duration of the encampment, or because the relevant authorities have not been notified of the full details of the encampments.

6.45 Whilst the unauthorised encampment figures provide a useful indication of overall activity they can be misleading, and it is important to understand unauthorised encampment activity as it relates to transit and not permanent need. In other words, how many unauthorised encampments relate to households travelling through an area.

⁴⁷ This includes three encampments of the same group of people. This has been classed as a single encampment for transit requirement analysis.

⁴⁸ This includes a 'one-off' abnormal encampment at Blundellsands in 2011, which is considered to be exceptional and is therefore excluded from transit requirement analysis.

⁴⁹ 43 of these encampments relate to a single family grouping requiring permanent accommodation and are therefore excluded from the transit analysis (see table 6.15 for more detail).

Steps 2 and 3: transit related activity and requirements

Knowsley

- 6.46 Over the period January 2011 to June 2013 (30 months) there were two reported incidences of unauthorised encampment in Knowsley (Table 6.11).

Table 6.11 Unauthorised encampments reported in Knowsley January 2011 to June 2013

| Date | Location | Duration (days) | No. caravans | No. Caravan Days (Duration x no. caravans) |
|--------|---|-----------------|--------------|--|
| Jul-12 | Randles Road, Knowsley Business Park | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Apr-13 | Changing Rooms, Moss Lane, Kirkby and Alchemy Business Park, Knowsley Industrial Park | 2 | 4 | 8 |

Summary

| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Total unauthorised encampments | 2 |
| Total caravan days | 18 |
| Number of months | 30 |
| Average caravan days each month | 0.6 |
| Average caravan days each year | 7 |
| Average no. caravans | 5 |
| Average duration (days) | 2 |
| Range of caravans | 4 to 5 |

- 6.47 Discussions with officers working with Travelling communities in Knowsley indicate that unauthorised encampments in the Borough last generally between one and three days. The encampments consist of groups of Travellers passing through the Borough en route to alternative destinations, usually Appleby Fair or family gatherings. They do not last long enough for enforcement proceedings to be seen through and are generally limited to small encampments of four to five vans based on unauthorised encampment data. Whilst this level of activity is not problematic it is indicative of a transient need as Travellers pass through the Borough.
- 6.48 Unauthorised encampment data demonstrates that recent encampments have been concentrated in the Knowsley Industrial and Business Park area of the Borough. It may therefore be appropriate for the Authority to consider providing the recommended transit accommodation within this general area.
- 6.49 There is evidence from a neighbouring Authority that, in addition to those encampments listed in the above table, there have been unauthorised encampments in their local area that originated in Knowsley. It is accepted that this could have been the case, although the frequency of these encampments would have been limited over the time period. It is not considered that this issue will impact materially on the recommendations for transit pitch provision within the Knowsley area.

6.50 Given that Knowsley have records to show that encampments are only on site for very short periods (i.e. two days each) it is considered that provision for a minimum of three pitches would be appropriate. This level of provision is capable of accommodating up to six caravans in the right circumstances (for example, for short periods of time or for family groups). This level of provision would have been sufficient to accommodate the recorded instances of unauthorised encampments during the study period.

Liverpool

6.51 Over the period January 2011 to June 2013 (30 months) there were 14 reported incidences of unauthorised encampment (Table 6.12) in Liverpool.

Table 6.12 Unauthorised encampments reported in Liverpool January 2011 to June 2013

| Date | Location | Duration (days) | No. caravans | No. Caravan Days (Duration x no. caravans) |
|--------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
| Mar-11 | Vauxhall | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| May-12 | Otterspool Promenade L17 and L19 | 7 | 5 | 35 |
| Jun-12 | Speke Estuary Park L24 | 6 | 13* | 78 |
| Jun-12 | Evens Road L26 | 5 | 13* | 65 |
| Jun-12 | Evens Road L26 9PB | 2 | 13* | 26 |
| Jun-12 | Prescott Road | 21 | 4 | 84 |
| Jul-12 | Kings Dock Road L2 | 9 | 4 | 36 |
| Aug-12 | Bardsay Road L5 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| Sep-12 | Smithdown Road | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| Oct-12 | Blackstone St | 21 | 7 | 147 |
| Jan-13 | Blackstone St | 28 | 1 | 28 |
| Jan-13 | Taylor St | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Jan-13 | Love Lane | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Feb-13 | Love Lane | 1 | 1 | 1 |

*Welfare checks have shown that these three unauthorised encampments were the same group. For the purpose of the calculations below these are considered as a single occurrence.

Summary

| | |
|---------------------------------|---------|
| Total unauthorised encampments | 12 |
| Total caravan days | 522 |
| Number of months | 30 |
| Average caravan days each month | 17.4 |
| Average caravan days each year | 209 |
| Average no. caravans | 4 |
| Average duration (days) | 9 |
| Range of number of caravans | 1 to 13 |

6.52 In Liverpool unauthorised encampment activity has fluctuated with peaks in numbers being caused by Traveller families encamping on unauthorised sites whilst trying to access a pitch on a permanent site. Officers working with the Travelling community identified that there remains an element of unauthorised

encampment activity linked to Travellers both passing through, and coming to visit, the area. The encampments in June 2012 were a single group that came to Liverpool after being moved on from other areas and is not considered typical of the type of unauthorised encampments in Liverpool.

- 6.53 The average number of vans per encampment is four; therefore provision of transit accommodation to accommodate up to four vans would be appropriate. On the basis of one van per pitch this would equate to four pitches. For short periods or for family groups it is possible that the provision of four pitches could accommodate up to eight caravans. This would have been sufficient to accommodate the majority of the unauthorised encampments in Liverpool from January 2011 to June 2013.

St. Helens

- 6.54 Over the period January 2011 to June 2013 (30 months) there were three reported incidences of unauthorised encampment in St Helens (Table 6.13).

Table 6.13 Unauthorised encampments reported in St. Helens January 2011 to June 2013

| Date | Location | Duration (days) | No. caravans | No. Caravan Days (Duration x no. caravans) |
|------|---|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 2011 | 257 – 259 Derbyshire Hill Rd, St Helens | 10 | 1 | 10 |
| 2011 | Delphwood Drive, St Helens | 6 | 3 | 18 |
| 2012 | Unit 4 Withins Rd, Haydock, WA11 9UD | 3 | 5 | 15 |

Summary

| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Total unauthorised encampments | 3 |
| Total caravan days | 43 |
| Number of months | 30 |
| Average caravan days each month | 1.4 |
| Average caravan days each year | 17 |
| Average no. caravans | 3 |
| Average duration (days) | 6 |
| Range of number of caravans | 1 to 5 |

- 6.55 Officers working with the community were unable to provide a view on the need for transit provision in St Helens, however, provision of additional authorised transit pitches in the Borough would help to reduce the incidence of this type of unauthorised encampment activity.

- 6.56 On the basis that transit related unauthorised encampment activity averaged three vans per encampment, it is recommended that transit provision be made for up to three vans. On the basis of one van per pitch this would equate to three pitches. For short periods or for family groups it is possible that the provision of three pitches could accommodate up to six caravans. This would have been sufficient to accommodate each of the unauthorised encampments in St Helens from January 2011 to June 2013.

Sefton

6.57 Over the period January 2011 to June 2013 (30 months) there were 16 reported incidences of unauthorised encampment in Sefton (Table 6.14). This included an encampment of 35 caravans which was not reflective of the general pattern of smaller numbers of caravans being recorded. This large encampment is therefore assumed to be an 'outlier' and is not factored into the total caravan day count.

Table 6.14 Unauthorised encampments reported in Sefton January 2011 to June 2013

| Date | Location | Duration (days) | No. caravans | No. Caravan Days (Duration x no. caravans) |
|--------|------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
| Jun-11 | Esplanade Car Park, Southport | 5 | 3 | 15 |
| Jun-11 | Crosby Marina | 10 | 2 | 20 |
| Jul-11 | Crosby Marina | 9 | 6 | 54 |
| Jul-11 | Ocean Plaza, Southport | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| Jul-11 | Rainfords, Coastal Road, Southport | 6 | 4 | 24 |
| Aug-11 | Marinas Road, Blundellsands | 4 | 35 | 140 ⁵⁰ |
| Aug-11 | Crosby Marina | 9 | 4 | 36 |
| Aug-11 | Marinas Road, Blundellsands | Not known | 4 | Not known |
| Nov-11 | Crosby Marina | 17 | 4 | 68 |
| May-12 | Princes Park, Southport | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| Sep-12 | Esplande Car Park, Southport | 7 | 3 | 21 |
| Dec-12 | Esplande Car Park, Southport | 7 | 4 | 28 |
| Feb-13 | Esplande Car Park, Southport | 6 | 3 | 18 |
| Jan-13 | Crosby Marina | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Apr-13 | LA Fitness car park, Formby | 6 | 4 | 24 |
| Jun-13 | Princes Park, Southport | 5 | 3 | 15 |

Summary*

| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Total unauthorised encampments | 15 |
| Total caravan days | 348 |
| Number of months | 30 |
| Average caravan days each month | 11.6 |
| Average caravan days each year | 140 |
| Average no. caravans | 4 |
| Average duration (days) | 6.9 |
| Range of number of caravans | 1 to 6 |

*excluding the 35 caravan encampment in Aug 11 in Marinas Road, Blundellsands

6.58 Staff working with Travellers in Sefton felt that there is a definite need for transit provision in the area based on the level of unauthorised encampment activity taking place. Unauthorised encampments in Sefton are generated by Travellers passing through the area, and are generally very short term (four to five days

⁵⁰ This 'one-off' encampment is an exception and has been excluded from the transit requirement calculations.

duration). Typically unauthorised encampments consist of large groups of Travellers so a number of transit pitches would be needed.

6.59 On the basis that there were on average four vans per transit related unauthorised encampment, it is recommended that provision for up to four vans be made in Sefton. On the basis of one van per pitch this equates to four pitches. For short periods or for family groups it is possible that the provision of four pitches could accommodate up to eight caravans. This would have been sufficient to accommodate most of the unauthorised encampments in Sefton from January 2011 to June 2013.

West Lancashire

6.60 Over the period January 2011 to June 2013 (30 months) there were 13 reported incidences of unauthorised encampment in West Lancashire (Table 6.15).

Table 6.15 Unauthorised encampments reported in West Lancashire January 2011 to June 2013

| Date | Location | Duration (days) | No. caravans | No. Caravan Days (Duration x no. caravans) |
|--------|-----------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
| Mar-11 | Greetby Place, Skelmersdale | 6 | 3 | 18 |
| Apr-11 | Pimbo Road, Skelmersdale | 5 | 5 | 25 |
| Apr-11 | Pimbo Road, Skelmersdale | 3 | 5 | 15 |
| Jul-11 | Pimbo Road, Skelmersdale | 18 | 6 | 108 |
| Aug-11 | Vale Lane, Lathom | 7 | 5 | 35 |
| Aug-11 | Pimbo Road, Skelmersdale | 6 | 6 | 36 |
| Aug-11 | Greetby Place, Skelmersdale | 5 | 6 | 30 |
| Aug-11 | Vale Lane, Lathom | 5 | 3 | 15 |
| Jun-12 | Pimbo Road, Skelmersdale | 5 | 5 | 25 |
| Jul-12 | Greetby Place, Skelmersdale | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Aug-12 | Greetby Place, Skelmersdale | 18 | 2 | 36 |
| Jun-13 | Pimbo Road, Skelmersdale | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Jun-13 | Greetby Place, Skelmersdale | 5 | 4 | 20 |

Summary

| | |
|---------------------------------|--------|
| Total unauthorised encampments | 13 |
| Total caravan days | 368 |
| Number of months | 30 |
| Average caravan days each month | 12.3 |
| Average caravan days each year | 148 |
| Average no. caravans | 4 |
| Average duration (days) | 7 |
| Range of number of caravans | 1 to 6 |

6.61 In West Lancashire consultation with the Lancashire Ethnic Minority, Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Achievement Service identified the significance and value of high quality, accessible transit provision and how this benefits families and communities in respect of education by providing a known location and predictable duration of tenure. It is the view of this Service that Travellers

passing through West Lancashire tend to do so in groups of between five and 10 family units. The Service identified two main areas for provision, namely Skelmersdale and Banks/Burscough.

- 6.62 Given that there has been an average of four vans per encampment, it is recommended that provision be made for up to four vans. On the basis of one van per pitch this equates to four pitches. For short periods or for family groups it is possible that the provision of four pitches could accommodate up to eight caravans. This would have been sufficient to accommodate each of the unauthorised encampments in West Lancashire from January 2011 to June 2013.
- 6.63 Given that the majority of unauthorised short-term encampments (i.e. those that justify the provision of a transit site) have been in the Skelmersdale area / M58 corridor over recent years, it is recommended that transit provision be located in the Skelmersdale area / M58 corridor.

Wirral

- 6.64 Over the period January 2011 to June 2013 (30 months) there were 45 reported incidences of unauthorised encampment across the Wirral. Whilst this is the highest level of unauthorised encampment activity in the study area, the majority of these incidents relate to one extended family group who were repeatedly visiting a relative living in bricks and mortar accommodation in the Wirral area (Table 6.16). There were on average four caravans reported for each of these encampments and with a relationship of one van to one pitch, the average of four vans would equate to a need for four transit pitches to meet this need.

Table 6.16 Unauthorised encampments reported in Wirral January 2011 to June 2013 by reason

| Summary | |
|---|-----|
| 2011 | |
| Total unauthorised encampments | 21 |
| Total involving extended family grouping | 20 |
| Total relating to family wedding | 1 |
| Average no. of caravans related to extended family grouping | 4.8 |
| 2012 | |
| Total unauthorised encampments | 14 |
| Total involving extended family grouping | 14 |
| Average no. of caravans related to extended family grouping | 3.7 |
| 2013 | |
| Total unauthorised encampments | 10 |
| Total involving extended family grouping | 9 |
| Other unauthorised encampments | 1 |
| Average no. of caravans related to extended family grouping | 2.8 |
| OVERALL | |
| Total unauthorised encampments involving extended family grouping | 43 |
| Total other unauthorised encampments | 2 |
| Total encampments | 45 |
| Overall average no. of caravans related to extended family grouping | 4.0 |

6.65 The data for this period also indicates that there were two other unauthorised encampments, one of which related to a wedding (30 vans) and one to an extended family passing through the Borough (15 vans). These two relatively large scale unauthorised encampments are considered to be exceptional and not reflective of more typical small scale encampments that would normally be expected within the area. Given this, it is recommended that four transit pitches be provided in the Wirral area to meet the anticipated need from Travellers passing through the Borough. For short periods or for family groups it is possible that the provision of four pitches could accommodate up to eight caravans. This would have been sufficient to accommodate most of the unauthorised encampments in Wirral from January 2011 to June 2013.

Summary of transit need

6.66 Overall, analysis of unauthorised encampment data and contextual information indicates that new transit provision is needed across Merseyside and West Lancashire. It is recommended that provision for 22 transit pitches be made across the study area as a whole (Table 6.17).

6.67 The two key elements used in validating a need for transit provision were:

- Unauthorised encampment data; and
- Contextual information and views of Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officers (GTLOs).

6.68 Unauthorised encampment data for the previous two and half years [January 2011 to June 2013] was collated and analysed to give an indication as to the level of activity across the area – as unauthorised encampments are generally indicative of a lack of transit accommodation this is a useful starting point.

6.69 Discussions with GTLOs across the study area enabled further analysis of the unauthorised encampment data, and enabled anomalies, such as ‘one off’ large scale encampments to be excluded from the analysis where applicable. It also enabled identification of repeated incidences of unauthorised encampment activity by the same group of households. Refining the unauthorised encampment data in this way enabled us to determine the real extent of need based on past activity. The views of GTLOs as to the extent of provision required were then used to ratify these figures.

6.70 The need for transit provision is supported by survey findings that show that over half of respondents felt that more transit pitches were needed across the study area (59.6%); the preference of respondents is for these sites to be managed privately by Travellers (96.3%).

6.71 Note that by definition the transit pitches would only be used for some parts of the year and it is not assumed that the scale of transit need will change over the five years 2013/14 to 2017/18 or beyond. By definition transit pitches are provided to meet the needs of those households travelling through an area, or visiting it temporarily. There is no reason to expect that the current level of this activity will alter significantly over future years beyond 2017/18. Provision of transit accommodation in line with the targets identified (see Table 6.17) should

address these regular and on-going annual transit requirements of Travellers across the study area. The actual occupancy levels of households using transit pitches should be monitored by the local authorities and compared with the anticipated need for transit pitches evidenced in this report.

- 6.72 It is assumed that each transit pitch would accommodate one caravan, however, established practice within the Travelling community means that pitches could accommodate up to two vans if the pitch is being occupied by the same household or members of a family group.
- 6.73 For some Local Authorities it may be more appropriate to consider a form of authorised 'stopover' or negotiated stopping provision rather than a conventional formal transit site. Each Local Authority will have to determine through their Local Plans what would be the most appropriate type of site that will best meet the needs of Travellers passing through their area.

Table 6.17 Summary of transit pitch requirements 2013/14 to 2017/18

| Authority | 5 year pitch requirement (single van use) | Total maximum caravans that could be accommodated |
|-----------------|---|---|
| Knowsley | 3 | 6 |
| Liverpool | 4 | 8 |
| Sefton | 4 | 8 |
| St Helens | 3 | 6 |
| West Lancashire | 4 | 8 |
| Wirral | 4 | 8 |
| Total | 22 | 44 |

- 6.74 If it is assumed that the peak travelling period of summer lasts 100 days [i.e. late May to early September] then the identified provision across the study area equates to a minimum 2,200 caravan days [assuming one caravan per pitch per day]. The information provided by the Local Authorities [set out in Tables 6.11 - 6.15] shows that the total average number of caravan days per year is a little over 500 [although information is not available for Wirral]. This would indicate that the level of transit pitch requirements identified would provide sufficient capacity for the study year even at peak times. It should also be appreciated that transit pitches may be used more frequently in some Local Authorities but the recommendation is to provide a minimum number of pitches to accommodate transit need in each Local Authority area.

7. Travelling Showpeople Plot Requirements

- 7.1 The limited provision for Travelling Showpeople in Merseyside and West Lancashire meant that only one interview with a resident Showperson family was achieved.
- 7.2 Interviews with the Showmen's Guild support historic evidence of need gathered to support an abandoned Partial Review of the now revoked North West Regional Spatial Strategy. The Guild advocate that, from their perspective, despite being dated, the information in respect of accommodation requirements for Showpeople remains unchanged.
- 7.3 The issues and available information in respect of Travelling Showpeople are briefly explored in respect of.
- Understanding travel patterns;
 - Understanding the location of and need for accommodation;
 - Plot requirements; and
 - Understanding what sort of provision.
- 7.4 The RSS Partial Review was cited by both the Showmen's Guild and neighbouring local planning authorities as being of importance to future provision within Merseyside and West Lancashire.

Understanding travel patterns

- 7.5 The Submitted Draft North West Plan Partial Review (July 2009) took into account evidence from a report into *The North West's Travelling Showpeople's Current Base Location, Preferred Base Locations and Operating Patterns*. This report prepared by the Showmen's Guild, was based on data collected in 2007 by the Guild and analysed the travel patterns of Showpeople in the North West, including their journeys outside the Region. The analysis considered both Showpeople's existing and their preferred base locations. The Guild maintains that the findings of this research and the Partial Review Panel Report remain valid in 2014, and it urges local authorities to refer to these documents to understand the accommodation requirements of their members.
- 7.6 However, the 2007 study, which was not undertaken in liaison with local authorities, was not supported by St Helens Council at the examination into the RSS Partial Review. This is because the published study aggregates and reports on preferences, but does not offer evidence of why individual respondents who gave a preference consider they need to locate in certain areas, whether they need a permanent ("winter") site or a stopping place, the size of site required or the tenure of the site required. The study was undertaken from a perspective of redistribution of new facilities rather accommodating need where it arises. Also, the study is not backed up by the experience of the Authority, which has not received any pre-application enquiries about the suitability of sites for Travelling Showpeople nor has any record of unauthorised encampments by Travelling Showpeople. Furthermore, the study is felt to be too dated now to be considered as current evidence.

- 7.7 Analysis of the 2007 study found that West Lancashire, Sefton, St Helens, and Wirral were all identified as potential preferred areas for new provision for Travelling Showpeople at that time. No plot targets were, however, taken forward in Sefton or Wirral as part of the Partial Review.
- 7.8 Current views expressed by the Guild confirm that Southport and other coastal locations in Merseyside continue to form a significant and important element of work for the Region's Travelling Showpeople. The Guild strongly advocate the provision of new yards in parts of Merseyside and West Lancashire in line with the Partial Review to meet the accommodation requirements of their members who they say find themselves living outside Merseyside due to a lack of provision within it.

Understanding the location and need for accommodation

- 7.9 There is currently only one Showpersons' yard in the study area, which is located in West Lancashire. This yard has planning permission for 10 plots, although six of these are seasonal and linked to operations at Southport Pleasureland from the months of March to October.
- 7.10 A yard existed in St Helens until the early 1980's, following its closure Showpeople relocated away from the area. The Showmen's Guild believe that there is need for provision in St Helens based on previous research work undertaken by them. However, St Helens Council do not agree that there is evidence of need for a site in St Helens.
- 7.11 The 2007 study recorded the Burscough site as being overcrowded with six pitches 'doubled up' (two caravans/chalets on a pitch intended for one); the site also had heavy vehicle overcrowding which rendered two of the plots unusable. The yard remains overcrowded, with one family currently based there needing alternative accommodation.
- 7.12 The Burscough yard is the only yard available in the study area to actively serve those Showpeople looking to work the fairs in the area's coastal resorts.

Showperson plot requirements

- 7.13 The fieldwork interview with Travelling Showpeople carried out as part of this study identified no additional need for Showpersons' provision over what is currently available.
- 7.14 Residents at the Burscough yard have spoken to West Lancashire Borough Council independently of this study and the Authority is aware of a family living on the Burscough yard and that are looking for a new yard, so at least one additional yard is required with a minimum requirement of one plot to meet this need. The Burscough yard remains overcrowded with little room for storage and maintenance of equipment.

Understanding what sort of provision

- 7.15 Unlike other Travellers, Showmen travel predominantly for economic reasons, preferring to retain a permanent home base where family members can live all year round, work, attend school and be part of their local community. The key drivers in securing a permanent home base are availability of land and ability to secure planning permission; other important factors are accessibility to fairs, major road networks, and local facilities (schools, shops, doctors, etc.).
- 7.16 Any new provision should ideally be capable of providing both permanent accommodation and temporary places to 'pull on to' ie 'stop over' – practice among Showpeople is to 'stop over' on yards where possible when travelling to fairs and shows. New permanent provision should ideally be up to 0.5ha (i.e. approximately an acre) in size. Guidance on the size, layout and location of new sites is provided by the Showmen's Guild⁵¹.

Tenure preference and site management

- 7.17 There is an overwhelming aspiration amongst Showpeople to acquire a permanent home base from which to commute to fairs and permit spouses and children to have the choice of remaining in one location. In terms of site management, self-owned / managed sites, either individually, in groups or from the Guild, are the most preferred options. Showpeople are generally keen to purchase, own and develop their amenities on land for themselves.

Summary

- 7.18 The revocation of the North West Plan has created a challenging situation for some of the Region's local authorities in respect of addressing the accommodation needs of Showpeople, and it is evident from neighbouring Local Planning Authority responses to the stakeholder survey that addressing this matter under the Duty to Co-operate with the Merseyside and West Lancashire Authorities is a priority for them. It is important that all Local Authorities work with their neighbouring Local Authority partners to agree a way in which this situation can be addressed so that new supply can be identified. The previous Regional Spatial Strategy distributed identified need across the region; however, this approach has been superseded by an approach that assesses need where it arises.
- 7.19 There is currently no provision for Showpeople within Merseyside, and very limited provision within West Lancashire, and provision in neighbouring local authority areas is overcrowded with no capacity to meet existing and future need. There are fairs within the study area that rely upon the attendance and participation of a significant number of Showpeople, the majority of whom live outside the sub region, in some cases this may be due to a lack of provision within it.

⁵¹ Showmen's guild of Great Britain Best Practice Advice on Provision of Showmen's Permanent Parking Sites Updated 4/6/2008

- 7.20 Findings from the primary fieldwork identified no need for new provision for Travelling Showpeople across the study area; however, evidence from the Local Authority in respect of the site at Burscough has identified significant overcrowding and the need for provision of a new yard with at least one plot to accommodate the family currently needing to relocate from the yard in Burscough due to overcrowding.
- 7.21 It is therefore recommended that a new yard with at least one plot is delivered within West Lancashire over the next five years (2013/14 to 2017/18). The need for plots should be subject to on-going monitoring, both to monitor current and inform future assessments of need. Current evidence would not suggest any additional need over the longer time period to 2027/28.

Table 7.1 Summary of overall permanent plot requirements (Showpeople)

| District | Plot requirement |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| | 2013/14 to 2017/18 |
| Knowsley | 0 |
| Liverpool | 0 |
| Sefton | 0 |
| St Helens | 0 |
| West Lancashire | 1 |
| Wirral | 0 |
| Total | 1 |

8. Travelling practices and experiences

- 8.1 The purpose of this chapter is to review the travelling patterns associated with respondents across Merseyside and West Lancashire. Broadly speaking, travelling patterns are seasonal, generally linked to seasonal employment, but travelling also takes place to enable visits to family and friends, and attendance at events, such as weddings and funerals. Families require safe and secure places from which to travel, and this home base is usually from where they access GPs, schools and a dentist.
- 8.2 Respondents were asked about their travelling practices in the previous year (Table 8.1). Almost a third of respondents (30.6%) had travelled in the previous year.

Table 8.1 Travelling behaviour by dwelling type

| Travelled in last year | Dwelling type (%) | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------|--------------|-------------------|-------|
| | Unauthorised development | LA Site | Private Site | Bricks and Mortar | Total |
| Yes | 23.1% | 31.7% | 32.4% | 29.4% | 30.6% |
| No | 76.9% | 68.3% | 67.6% | 70.6% | 69.4% |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Base (Valid Response) | 13 | 41 | 37 | 17 | 108 |
| Non response | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Grand Total | 13 | 43 | 38 | 17 | 111 |

- 8.3 Of respondents that have travelled in the previous year and provided information on travelling times, the vast majority (90.7%) had travelled for less than one month, a further 3.1% had travelled for between nine and 12 weeks and 6.3% between six and 10 months (Table 8.2).


Table 8.2 Length of time travelling

| Length of time travelled | Total (%) |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| No more than 13 days | 43.8% |
| 2 to 4 weeks | 46.9% |
| 9 to 12 weeks | 3.1% |
| Between 6 and 10 months | 6.3% |
| Total | 100% |
| Base (Valid responses) | 32 |
| Non Travelling/Non response | 79 |

Please note: to ensure confidentiality these data are not broken down by dwelling type.

8.4 Figure 8.1 summarises when respondents travelled. Most travelling activity is between May and August.

Figure 8.1 Month when travelling takes place



8.5 A range of reasons were given for travelling but the most frequently mentioned were for visiting family/friends (39.4%) and travelling for religious activities (18.2%), (Table 8.3).

Table 8.3 Reasons for travelling

| Reason | Number | % |
|-------------------------|--------|--------|
| Cultural | 4 | 12.1% |
| Holiday | 4 | 12.1% |
| Religious activities | 6 | 18.2% |
| Travel to fairs | 3 | 9.1% |
| Visiting family/friends | 13 | 39.4% |
| Work | 3 | 9.1% |
| Total responses | 33 | 100.0% |
| Total respondents | 29 | |
| Non-response | 78 | |
| Grand Total | 111 | |

Note more than one reason for travelling could be expressed.

8.6 A range of problems can be experienced whilst travelling and respondents were asked to identify these based on their experiences (Table 8.4). Most frequently the problems mentioned were closing of traditional stopping places (83.3%), no places to stop over (83.3%), police behaviour (79.2%) and enforcement officer behaviour (66.7%) which appears to reinforce the need for approved transit provision within the study area.

Table 8.4 Problems whilst travelling

| Problem | Responses Number | Responses % | % respondents mentioning |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| No places to stop over | 20 | 22.2% | 83.3% |
| Closing of traditional stopping places | 20 | 22.2% | 83.3% |
| Abuse, harassment or discrimination | 3 | 3.3% | 12.5% |
| Lack of toilet facilities | 4 | 4.4% | 16.7% |
| No water facilities | 4 | 4.4% | 16.7% |
| Problems with rubbish collection | 2 | 2.2% | 8.3% |
| Police behaviour | 19 | 21.1% | 79.2% |
| Enforcement officer behaviour | 16 | 17.8% | 66.7% |
| Other | 2 | 2.2% | 8.3% |
| Total responses | 90 | 100.0% | |
| Total respondents | 24 | | |
| Non-response | 21 | | |
| Grand Total | 111 | | |

Note more than one problem could be expressed.

9. Stakeholder consultation

Overview

- 9.1 Stakeholders were invited to participate in a survey aimed at identifying a range of information, including establishing the key perceived issues facing Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople within the Merseyside and West Lancashire area, and ways in which these need to be addressed. The Authorities identified a range of stakeholders, including neighbouring councils, and statutory and voluntary sector partners, all of whom were invited to participate in an on line survey. Stakeholders were asked to respond to any of the questions within the survey. A total of 35 separate responses to the stakeholder consultation were received from representatives of a range of organisations and services, including education, health and social care, fire and rescue, police, housing, and planning; responses were also received from community representatives. Data protection does not allow the views of individuals to be identified and only a summary of the views and opinions expressed is set out here. The Showmen’s Guild was also consulted and the views that they expressed are included within Chapter 7. The tables below set out the spread of respondents to the stakeholder survey in terms of organisation and geographic location.

Table 9.1 Respondents by organisation

| Organisation | % of respondents |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| Local authority undefined role | 57% |
| Local authority planning | 3% |
| Local authority housing | 3% |
| Local authority safer communities | 3% |
| Health | 9% |
| Emergency services | 11% |
| Working with Travellers | 14% |
| Total | 100% |

Table 9.2 Respondents by geographic location

| Location | % of respondents |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| Knowsley | 8% |
| Liverpool | 14% |
| Sefton | 14% |
| St Helens | 8% |
| West Lancashire | 3% |
| Wirral | 25% |
| Merseyside | 14% |
| North West (excluding Merseyside) | 14% |
| Total | 100% |

- 9.2 Irish Community Care Merseyside (ICCM) is a registered charity, which exists to identify and respond to the needs of both the Irish and Irish Traveller communities across Merseyside. ICCM was identified as a Key Stakeholder by the Authorities and as such its input to the stakeholder consultation survey was considered to be of significant value. Given its role in representing the views of Irish Travellers across Merseyside, ICCM agreed that its comments and feedback could be quoted directly within the study. ICCM played an important role in raising awareness amongst the community about the study and its purposes; it also advised and assisted the fieldwork team throughout the fieldwork process.

Provision of facilities and support

- 9.3 In terms of understanding the education, health, employment and support needs of Gypsies and Travellers the views of respondents were divided, with the majority feeling that there is not an adequate understanding of these needs. However, three respondents did feel that there was a good understanding of the overall needs of the community. A possible explanation for this could be that *'there is an understanding of the support needs of Gypsies and Travellers within pockets of the Local Authority, however there is not a 'corporate' understanding across the organisation and this can be seen when issues with Gypsies and Travellers arise i.e. there is not a clear understanding of protocols, roles and responsibilities. This is not to say that the people 'involved' in Gypsy and Traveller issues do not understand them, but rather their level of knowledge is not replicated across other relevant local authority teams'*.
- 9.4 ICCM identified that significant variations in the design and delivery of services for Gypsies and Travellers over the study area were confusing for organisations and also disempowering for community members themselves. It was felt that where an authority has in place a Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer (GTLO) then lines of communication are better rather than when, in other instances, there is no GTLO only *'central staff tasked with responsibility and granted authority'*.
- 9.5 The role of communication between organisations and with both settled and travelling communities was identified as an area in need of improvement, with clear policies, procedures and communication protocols required to tackle the issue.
- 9.6 Five respondents felt that the monitoring of support needs that already takes place is adequate, whilst fourteen considered that more could be done to monitor these support needs, including better liaison between partners – a multi-agency approach – and the employment of a Liaison Officer to maintain regular dialogue with Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Again the use of policies, procedures and protocols would assist in data gathering and information sharing. One respondent felt that, due to a lack of communication by authorities with Travelling communities, it is impossible for them to know and understand the needs of these communities. One respondent suggest that health services should play a role in monitoring needs.
- 9.7 In terms of additional support that is most needed, six respondents focused upon the provision of new sites, particularly transit sites or stop over places. Other

support that was suggested included provision of cultural training, awareness raising and 'myth busting', more resources, a formal policy for supporting Travellers, health awareness and checks, facilitating child education, especially at Key Stage 3 (11 years +) level. In fact, several stakeholders mentioned education services for Gypsies and Travellers.

- 9.8 In more general terms, it was felt that improved liaison between Gypsies and Travellers and service providers was needed to establish a network of support. One stakeholder suggested that it would be beneficial to set up a multi-agency group (MAG) of professionals from a range of statutory and voluntary sectors (including education, health, planning and housing).⁵²
- 9.9 Stakeholders were generally supportive of raising awareness of the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the Merseyside and West Lancashire area. In addition to community and cultural events, such as roadshows or drop-in sessions, it was proposed that awareness raising in local schools would be beneficial. Six respondents mentioned the need for training programmes for both decision-makers (including elected members) and professional staff in order to address pre-conceptions and stereotypes, as well as the need to identify 'cultural champions' and others with responsibility for equalities monitoring.
- 9.10 The need for authorities to respond to complaints about Travellers from the settled community in an informative and factual way was identified as important, with the emphasis being on authorities giving clear and balanced information about equalities duties and homelessness. The point was made that local authority websites need to set out clear information to all communities that is both informative and supportive, not just information on how to report an encampment. The lack of consistent information across local authority websites in respect of Gypsies and Travellers was also identified as an issue.

Provision of Accommodation

- 9.11 Seven respondents were unaware of what monitoring of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople accommodation provision is currently undertaken. Three were happy with the existing monitoring, while others proposed the improved recording of Travellers living in settled (bricks and mortar) accommodation by social housing providers.
- 9.12 However, the point was strongly made that no additional pitches have been developed since the last Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, and that the authorities are yet to comply with the 'Planning policy for traveller sites'.
- 9.13 ICCM felt that monitoring the provision of accommodation should be undertaken along with the needs of other community housing assessments, that by separating out the monitoring of Gypsy and Traveller provision from mainstream housing it allows the settled community to carry on viewing Gypsies and Travellers as separate and different and 'not like us'.

⁵² A Multi Agency Stakeholder Group does already exist and is facilitated by Irish Community Care Merseyside.

- 9.14 The point was also made that there needs to be a 'regional approach' to accommodation, and where nomadism is part of the culture it makes more sense to look at the travel needs of families and not just the need for sites. ICCM respondent felt that local authorities could improve their joint working and be more cohesive in this regard.
- 9.15 There was a view that local authority-owned sites are generally of a good standard, especially in St Helens. Problems were identified at the Council site at Broad Lane, Sefton, but it was also noted that funds have been obtained to improve the facilities on this site and provide additional pitches.
- 9.16 There is limited information available regarding the management of existing sites, but of those stakeholders who made comment on this issue there was an overall feeling of satisfaction. Sites in St Helens, Sefton and Liverpool are all considered to be well managed despite a variety of issues and challenges.
- 9.17 Huge variations in terms of standards on private sites were identified by ICCM, with little that can be done currently to ensure that facilities are improved on these poorer private sites. Given this, and the good conditions on local authority sites in the area, it is unsurprising that ICCM indicated that their service users prefer to have local authority landlords. The same service users have also identified they wish to be on small family sites that are easier for them to manage.
- 9.18 Six stakeholders were concerned about the tensions that exist within some of the Travelling communities – between families – rather than between them and the settled community.
- 9.19 ICCM stated that of the Travellers they knew living in bricks and mortar accommodation, the majority did not feel safe, and many had been subject to antisocial behaviour, prejudice and discrimination.

Need for Additional Permanent and Transit Sites

- 9.20 In terms of the existing provision of permanent sites, nine stakeholders were not familiar with current demand and supply trends. However, there was a general feeling amongst those who commented that there are currently insufficient sites, with 14 respondents identifying a lack of provision; four respondents felt that there was sufficient provision. Both lack of funding and local resistance were identified as reasons for the lack of provision. ICCM respondent advocated the development of new pitches through community consultation.
- 9.21 There was a view that there is currently inadequate provision of transit (short-term) sites across Merseyside and West Lancashire, evidenced by regular unauthorised roadside developments/encampments. The importance of Travelling communities themselves identifying the locations for new transit provision was emphasised by ICCM, this would ensure that people would not have to travel too far to access transit provision otherwise it risks being unpopulated and ineffective. Locations along access routes to Ireland and Wales were flagged as being good for new transit provision, as well as other key road networks for work access.

- 9.22 Regarding the location of new sites, stakeholders suggested needs in Wirral, Knowsley and Sefton, with one stakeholder suggesting a site along the A41 to facilitate those travelling by ferry to Ireland.
- 9.23 There appears to be a low level of awareness of Gypsies and Travellers living in bricks and mortar accommodation, although ten stakeholders noted an awareness of this scenario. Other Stakeholders had a more specific awareness through their direct role with Travellers. It was noted that there are probably a number of Gypsies and Travellers in Merseyside and West Lancashire who live in bricks and mortar accommodation because of a lack of appropriate site provision, but who would like to maintain their traditional cultural lifestyle. There was also an acknowledgement that some Gypsy and Traveller families are happy to live in permanent housing. Another stakeholder felt that there were many families living in bricks and mortar accommodation, but they do not self-identify for many reasons, including fear. It was also pointed out that ICCM is the only community organisation working with Traveller communities within Merseyside.
- 9.24 Where stakeholders who provide accommodation have been approached by Gypsies and Travellers for housing or housing-related support during the past five years, it would appear that the majority were seeking access to site accommodation. However, officers from St Helens have assisted members of Travelling communities into bricks and mortar accommodation as well.
- 9.25 When considering new provision, ICCM identified the importance of looking beyond the numbers in terms of new site provision; sometimes families do not get on, so when planning new site provision authorities must also pay regard to the opinions of Travellers; a risk assessment should be undertaken when families say that they cannot coexist. The point was made that the local Travelling communities are experts on what they need.

Unauthorised Encampments

- 9.26 Eleven respondents were aware of regular unauthorised encampments, and this appears to be well monitored by authorities in some districts.
- 9.27 Problems experienced in respect of unauthorised encampments include taking up officer time and costing money, and in some cases criminal damage, disorder and other incidents.
- 9.28 It is generally acknowledged that unauthorised encampments and developments reflect negatively on the perception of Gypsy and Traveller communities by local residents, councillors and the police/other authorities. Negative perceptions are more likely where encampments take place in residential areas, recreational areas or near beauty spots. It is therefore unfortunate that unauthorised encampments are often the only experience that the settled community has of Travellers.
- 9.29 ICCM points out that the repeated reinforcement of Gypsy and Traveller stereotypes generated by unauthorised encampments means that community cohesion can never develop whilst there are no managed sites within an area, be they permanent or transit. Also that *‘the lack of support [by local authorities] for Travellers in encampments also generates social disaffection for the Travellers*

who see the authority as unwelcoming and unsupportive so they are less likely to co-operate and engage”.

Constraints on future provision

- 9.30 Respondents identified a number of issues which they felt have hampered the provision of new sites. These include:
- Site availability;
 - Funding limitations;
 - Local opposition by the public;
 - Lack of political will;
 - Lack of positive images of Travellers and their cultures within the general community;
 - Lack of options for Travellers;
 - Travellers priced out of communities;
 - Reluctance of local authorities to compulsory purchase sites where necessary;
 - Perception that there is no demand;
 - Lack of robust evidence of need;
 - Green Belt; and
 - Planning laws and policies.
- 9.31 There was a feeling amongst stakeholders that more could be done to identify and bring forward new sites. Establishing robust evidence of need was acknowledged, as this is an integral part of the planning policy process.
- 9.32 The ‘unwillingness’ of authorities to provide pitches seemingly ‘against the will’ of the settled community was identified as a major issue by ICCM. The ability of the settled community to create pressure groups, lobby local politicians and oppose development was identified as a significant problem in delivering new sites, along with the lack of information and training available to staff to dealing with and responding to negativity and racism.
- 9.33 The majority of stakeholders recognise the importance of the planning system in the delivery of new Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites. The Government’s recent change to planning policy is considered to helpfully raise awareness of Traveller issues, acting as a reminder that plans need to consider the needs of communities, balanced with local issues and objections. Three stakeholders expressed concern, however, that the policy does not go far enough in requiring the direct involvement of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople communities themselves in assessments and the planning process.
- 9.34 ICCM advocated the need for both looking at local need and adopting a sub-regional and regional approach to meeting need. There is a need for a consistent and joined-up approach between districts, especially as Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople move across local authority boundaries.

Travelling routes and migration patterns across the region should be considered. It was suggested that links should be made to other sub-regional assessments that are being undertaken, e.g. Cheshire.

10. Conclusion and Strategic Response

- 10.1 The full extent of the Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population in Merseyside and West Lancashire is not known and is difficult to estimate. A number of sources provide information in respect of the population but none of these provide a definitive guide as to its size. In the 2011 Census a total of 465 residents in Merseyside and West Lancashire identified as having White British Gypsy and Traveller ethnicity, which may include residents living in bricks and mortar accommodation as well as on pitches on sites. Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople face considerable prejudice and discrimination so there is an understandable reluctance to 'self-identify' on the part of the Travelling population, it is therefore likely that the Census figures are an underrepresentation of the actual population.
- 10.2 Not all Travellers practise a nomadic way of life and many are settled within bricks and mortar accommodation. Government caravan count data and local authority information on existing sites (both authorised and unauthorised) are the best indicators of the local travelling population. Caravan counts indicate consistent numbers of caravans within certain Local Authority areas, including Liverpool, Sefton, St Helens, and West Lancashire. The counts indicate that Knowsley and Wirral have no recorded caravans (see 5.4 to 5.10 for more information on caravan counts). The extent of existing pitch provision is perhaps the best indicator of the number of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople living within the study area and practising a nomadic way of life; the study identified 106 occupied authorised and unauthorised pitches as at the base date of 31 May 2013.
- 10.3 A total of 111 interviews were secured with Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople resident across the study area, 17 of which were from Travellers living in bricks and mortar accommodation. There are 95 authorised pitches within the study area and a total of 94 interviews were achieved with households living on these pitches. This is a high proportion of achieved interviews with a hard to reach group and is considered to be sufficiently robust to be representative of the community.
- 10.4 There are some key challenges and issues facing the Authorities in respect of meeting the identified accommodation requirements of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in Merseyside and West Lancashire. This chapter provides:
- A brief summary of the key issue emerging from the research of meeting pitch/plot requirements, and the challenges this poses;
 - Advice on the strategic responses available to the Local Authorities to address identified issues, including examples of good practice; and
 - Recommendations and next steps.
- 10.5 Whilst many of the suggested measures for tackling the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople listed here constitute best practice, it must be recognised that implementing many of these recommendations may be beyond the capacity of local authorities in the current financial climate, where resources may be extremely limited.

Meeting pitch/plot requirements

- 10.6 This section of the report focuses on the key priority identified by the research of meeting pitch/plot requirements.
- 10.7 The research has evidenced:
- An overall five year requirement (2013/14 to 2017/18) of 30 permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches and a further 17 pitches to 2027/28 (excluding the oversupply identified for Liverpool) or a further requirement for 9 pitches if the oversupply identified in Liverpool is included;
 - A minimum of one Showperson yard to be provided in West Lancashire in the first five years (2013/14 to 2017/18) with continued engagement with the Showperson community to establish any further needs over the period 2018/19 to 2027/28' and
 - A recommendation for 22 transit pitches for Gypsy and Travellers across the study area based on past trends of unauthorised encampment activity.
- 10.8 Longer-term requirements are based on demographic analysis of the profile of existing households. It is recommended that a similar study is carried out in 2018/19 to accurately identify future requirements at that point in time.
- 10.9 This study complies with the 2007 CLG Guidance, and the needs identified by it are on the basis of 'need where need arises'; the needs identified by the research are from households residing within the study area and not outside it. Needs have been identified on the basis of Authority areas.
- 10.10 With a view to facilitating discussions under the Duty to Co-operate, neighbouring local planning authorities were invited to participate in the stakeholder consultation survey and their views are summarised, along with those of other stakeholders, in Chapter 9 of this report. Responses from neighbouring authorities indicate that there is a desire to engage at cross boundary level in respect of addressing the accommodation requirements of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
- 10.11 In order to meet future requirements the Authorities need to firstly review the potential to increase the number of pitches on available sites⁵³, and secondly to ensure they have an adequate supply of additional sites identified in their respective Local Plans to address immediate and longer-term need. The Authorities will need to work closely with both settled and Travelling communities to do this.
- 10.12 This is especially important in the case of new provision for Travelling Showpeople, where the current absence of yards in the study area means that, in the opinion of the Showmen's Guild, the needs of Showpeople are underrepresented and it has not been possible to comprehensively identify the accommodation requirements of Showpeople working across the study area due to their residing outside it.

⁵³ It may not be viable or sustainable to increase the number of pitches on existing sites.

- 10.13 The Authorities, in partnership with Travelling communities, need to consider the options available to help meet identified need, including the expansion of existing sites, re-designation of unauthorised sites, use of Community Land Trusts and exceptions site policies. Each of these areas is now looked at in more detail, alongside good practice in planning for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision.
- 10.14 Local planning authorities are required to identify land for future residential development to meet identified housing needs, including the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Planning authorities are best placed to identify potential future sites, as they are most likely to know the current status of the land and the probability of securing planning permission, and to robustly assess site suitability through the Local Plan process.
- 10.15 Evidence from the household survey indicates that in terms of new provision (both permanent and transit) the majority of Travellers favour privately managed sites (permanent 67% see 6.37; transit 96.3% see 6.70). However, stakeholder information (see 9.17) indicates that local authority owned and managed sites are preferable. National policy emphasises the use of private provision where possible.

New site identification

- 10.16 Authorities should consider the role of 'call for sites' exercises, the analysis of which would enable the suitability and deliverability of land in different ownerships to be considered fully. Authorities could look to their own land holdings for suitable and appropriate land for development. Land that is not in need of remediation should be considered first, as remediation may well incur more financial investment than site provision itself. Acquisition of private land could also be considered but given the current economic climate, 'going rates' may negate the viability of development.
- 10.17 The Homes and Communities Agency also have land holdings, which should also be explored. Local land owners could also be approached for sites that could be suitable.
- 10.18 The idea of local community members 'knowing' what land is available or suitable is a misnomer identified by research carried out by HSSA - this showed that Travellers are usually unaware of planning restrictions and current/past land use. However, where land is already owned by Travellers, support could be offered to bring these sites forward for planning permission as permanent sites where this is appropriate.


Community Land Trusts

- 10.19 The Housing and Regeneration Act 2008 established Community Land Trusts as an option for local communities to acquire and manage land to address a social, environmental or economic interest.
- 10.20 Community Land Trusts (CLTs) are now emerging as an option to help meet the need for more sites for Gypsies and Travellers (Figure 10.1). This approach has successfully been adopted by Mendip District Council in Somerset, which has

committed funding to developing a CLT locally, despite Government cuts in funding⁵⁴.

10.21 In the Mendip model, the Council has worked with Travellers and community groups to develop a CLT which facilitates Gypsies and Travellers purchasing land at low cost with a loan made available through a specific funding vehicle (SFV). Travellers develop a business plan for their proposal. Land owners are needed to sell small parcels of land for sites; this land cannot be sold for profit but is retained in perpetuity for provision of Traveller site accommodation. To incentivise landowners an upfront deposit is provided. The following diagram illustrates how the model works. A fundamental challenge with this approach is resourcing the model in the absence of Government subsidy; in Mendip the local authority has provided £100,000 to get their scheme off the ground.

Figure 10.1 How does CLT model work?



Planning gain

10.22 Use of planning obligations to deliver sites for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople could be explored further by the Authorities. The approach has been used successfully elsewhere (South Cambridgeshire)⁵⁵. Planning obligations to address Traveller requirements on sites other than trailer parks could also be considered. However, it is important that, where this

⁵⁴ <http://www.gypsy-traveller.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/MDC-CLT-Scheme-LeafletTRIFOLD.pdf>

⁵⁵ Planning Advisory Service Spaces and Places for Gypsies and Travellers November 2006 page 10

approach is adopted, regular monitoring takes place to ensure that the requisite pitches are being made available to, and are being used by, Travellers; enforcement action will be necessary where this is not the case.

Good practice in planning for Gypsy and Traveller provision

- 10.23 There are a number of resources available to local planning authorities to assist them in planning for Gypsy and Traveller provision, including resources from the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) and the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI), which are presented in Appendix B. In addition, the Local Government Agency and Local Government Association have resources available for local authorities working with Traveller communities to identify sites for new provision, these include dedicated learning aids for elected members⁵⁶.
- 10.24 Work undertaken by PAS⁵⁷ identified ways in which the planning process can increase the supply of authorised Gypsy and Traveller pitches. The RTPI has developed a series of Good Practice notes for local planning authorities. Both are summarised at Appendix B.
- 10.25 Research undertaken by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation⁵⁸ in 2007 identified the importance of leadership in successfully delivering new provision for Travellers. The study found that demonstrating the case for new provision is essential in terms of successfully engaging local communities and countering opposition to new provision. The research points to three cases for new provision:
1. The Business case: the costs associated with unauthorised encampment and developments;
 2. The Social case: that accommodation is key to equality in terms of health and education outcomes; and
 3. The Legal case: requirements and obligations under the Housing Act, Localism Act, the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning policy for traveller sites, and decisions made by the Planning Inspectorate.

⁵⁶ landDeA (now Local Government Agency) local leadership academy providing Gypsy and Traveller sites

⁵⁷ PAS: Spaces and Places for Gypsies and Travellers: How Planning Can Help (2007)

⁵⁸ Joanna Richardson Providing Gypsy and Traveller Sites: Contentious Spaces (JRF 2007)

Recommendations for meeting pitch requirements

To enable the Authorities to meet the identified pitch requirements it is recommended that consideration is given to the following:

- That Authorities work collaboratively with neighbouring local planning authorities to meet identified need;
- That mechanisms are established to enable effective engagement with both settled and Traveller communities about identifying future sites;
- That appropriate sites are identified to meet requirements;
- That identified transit provision is delivered;
- That links are made with the Showmen's Guild to ensure that the needs of Travelling Showpeople are fully considered and addressed; and
- That needs are monitored on an on-going basis.

Other issues to be considered as best practice

This best practice guidance comes from our experience of working elsewhere and selective feedback from stakeholders within the study area. It is for the Authorities to consider how to take these best practice recommendations forward:

- That existing sites are reviewed to ascertain the scope for extension and increasing the number of pitches available;
- That options to secure provision of pitches through planning gain and exception sites are pursued;
- That the use of CLTs to meet needs is explored;
- That consideration is given to the disposal of publicly owned land to meet pitch requirements;
- That consideration is given as to the ways in which Travellers can be supported through the planning application process;
- That a key point of contact is identified for the Authorities to deal with all matters relating to Travellers;
- That stakeholders, who have indicated a desire to be kept informed on the results of the study, are kept up-to-date and fully briefed on progress;
- That resources are identified to develop a proactive communications strategy, starting with dissemination of these research findings, to enable positive media coverage of Traveller issues; and
- That, where necessary, training is provided for staff and elected members to promote better cultural understanding, counter prejudice and aid communication.

Concluding comments

10.26 The overarching purpose of this study has been to identify the accommodation requirements of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople across Merseyside and West Lancashire. Overall shortfalls of both pitches and plots have been identified, and these need to be addressed (Tables 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3). It is also recommended that this evidence base is refreshed on a regular basis to ensure that the level of pitch and plot provision remains appropriate for the Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople population across the study area.

Table 10.1 Summary of overall pitch and plot requirements over five years and up to 2027/28

| District/Local Planning Authority | | Gypsy and Traveller Pitch requirements | Showperson Plot requirements |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|
| Liverpool | 5 yr shortfall 2013/14 to 2017/18 | 0 | 0 |
| | 2018/19 to 2027/28 | -8 | 0 |
| Knowsley | 5 yr shortfall 2013/14 to 2017/18 | 0 | 0 |
| | 2018/19 to 2027/28 | 0 | 0 |
| Sefton | 5 yr shortfall 2013/14 to 2017/18 | 4 | 0 |
| | 2018/19 to 2027/28 | 10 | 0 |
| St Helens | 5 yr shortfall 2013/14 to 2017/18 | 6 | 0 |
| | 2018/19 to 2027/28 | 0 | 0 |
| West Lancashire | 5 yr shortfall 2013/14 to 2017/18 | 14 | 1 |
| | 2018/19 to 2027/28 | 6 | 0 |
| Wirral | 5 yr shortfall 2013/14 to 2017/18 | 6 | 0 |
| | 2018/19 to 2027/28 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 5 yr shortfall 2013/14 to 2017/18 | 30 | 1 |
| | 2018/19 to 2027/28 | 9⁵⁹ | 0 |

Table 10.2 Summary of Gypsy and Traveller pitch requirements 2028/29 to 2032/33

| Authority | Gypsy and Traveller Pitch requirements 2028/9 to 2032/33 |
|-----------------|--|
| Liverpool | -3 |
| Knowsley | 0 |
| Sefton | 1 |
| St Helens | 2 |
| West Lancashire | 2 |
| Wirral | 1 |
| Total | 3⁶⁰ |

⁵⁹ The need is 17 if Liverpool's oversupply is excluded.

⁶⁰ The need is 6 if Liverpool's oversupply is excluded

Table 10.3 Summary of transit requirements [2013/14 - 2017/2018]

| Authority | Five year requirement (single van use) | Total maximum caravans that could be accommodated |
|------------------|---|--|
| Liverpool | 4 | 8 |
| Knowsley | 3 | 6 |
| Sefton | 4 | 8 |
| St Helens | 3 | 6 |
| West Lancashire | 4 | 8 |
| Wirral | 4 | 8 |
| Total | 22 | 44 |

Appendix A: Legislative Background

Overall approach

- A.1 Between 1960 and 2003, three Acts of Parliament had a major impact upon the lives of Gypsies and Travellers. The main elements of these are summarised below.
- A.2 The **1960 Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act** enabled councils to ban the siting of caravans for human occupation on common land, and led to the closure of many sites.
- A.3 The **Caravan Sites Act 1968 (Part II)** required local authorities 'so far as may be necessary to provide adequate accommodation for Gypsies residing in or resorting to their area'. It empowered the Secretary of State to make designation orders for areas where he (sic) was satisfied that there was adequate accommodation, or on grounds of expediency. Following the recommendations of the Cripps Commission in 1980, provision began to grow rapidly only after the allocation of 100% grants from Central Government. By 1994 a third of local authorities had achieved designation, which meant that they were not required to make further provision and were given additional powers to act against unauthorised encampments. The repeal of most of the Caravan Sites Act under the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act in 1994 led to a reduction in provision, with some sites being closed over a period in which the Gypsy and Traveller population was increasing.
- A.4 The **1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act (CJandPOA)**:
- Repealed most of the 1968 Caravan Sites Act;
 - Abolished all statutory obligation to provide accommodation;
 - Discontinued government grants for sites; and
 - Under Section 61 made it a criminal offence to camp on land without the owner's consent.
- A.5 Since the CJandPOA the only places where Gypsies and Travellers can legally park their trailers and vehicles are:
- Council Gypsy caravan sites; by 2000 nearly half of Gypsy caravans were accommodated on council sites, despite the fact that new council site provision stopped following the end of the statutory duty;
 - Privately owned land with appropriate planning permission; usually owned by Gypsies or Travellers. Such provision now accommodates approximately a third of Gypsy caravans in England; and
 - Land with established rights of use, other caravan sites or mobile home parks by agreement or licence, and land required for seasonal farm workers (under site licensing exemptions).
- A.6 By the late 1990s the impact of the 1994 Act was generating pressure for change on both local and national government. There was a major review of law and policy, which included:

- A Parliamentary Committee report (House of Commons 2004).
 - The replacement of Circular 1/94 by Circular 1/2006 (which has since been cancelled and replaced by the Planning policy for traveler sites 2012).
 - Guidance on accommodation assessments (ODPM 2006).
 - The Housing Act 2004 which placed a requirement (s.225) on local authorities to assess Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs.
- A.7 More recent legislation with a direct impact on the lives of Gypsies and Travellers includes the Housing Act 2004 and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
- A.8 **Section 225: Housing Act 2004** imposes duties on local authorities in relation to the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers:
- Every local housing authority must, as part of the general review of housing needs in their areas under section 8 of the Housing Act 1985, assess the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers residing in or resorting to their district;
 - Where a local housing authority are required under section 87 of the Local Government Act 2003 to prepare a strategy to meet such accommodation needs, they must take the strategy into account in exercising their functions;
 - A local housing authority must have regard to section 226 ('Guidance in relation to section 225') in:
 - carrying out such an assessment, and
 - preparing any strategy that they are required to prepare.
- A.9 **The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004** set out to introduce a simpler and more flexible planning system at regional and local levels. It also introduced new provisions which change the duration of planning permissions and consents, and allow local planning authorities to introduce local permitted development rights using 'local development orders'. It made the compulsory purchase regime simpler, fairer and quicker, to support major infrastructure and regeneration initiatives.
- A.10 The Act introduced major changes to the way in which the planning system operates. Local planning authorities are required to prepare a Local Development Framework, which was subsequently amended to a Local Plan document with the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework in March 2012.
- A.11 Part 8 of the Act contains a series of measures to reform the compulsory purchase regime and make it easier for local planning authorities to make a case for compulsory purchase orders where it will be of economic, social or environmental benefit to the area. This section also brings in amended procedures for carrying out compulsory purchase orders, including a widening of the category of person with an interest in the land who can object, and deals with ownership issues and compensation.
- A.12 **The Localism Act 2011** introduced a number of reforms, including changes to planning enforcement rules, which strengthen the power of local planning authorities to tackle abuses of the planning system. The changes give local

planning authorities the ability to take actions against people who deliberately conceal unauthorised development, and tackle abuses of retrospective planning applications. The Act also introduced the Duty to Co-operate which applies to the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites; the Duty aims to ensure that neighbouring authorities work together to address issues such as provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers in a planned and strategic way.

- A.13 **Statutory Instrument 2013 No 830 Town and Country planning Act, England (Temporary Stop Notice) (England) (Revocation) Regulations 2013** came into force on 4th May 2013. This Instrument revoked the regulations governing Temporary Stop Notices, which were in place to mitigate against the disproportionate impact of Temporary Stop Notices on Gypsies and Travellers in areas where there was a lack of sufficient pitches to meet the needs of the Travelling community.

Appendix B: Policy and Guidance

Introduction

B.1 As part of this research, we have carried out a review of literature, which is presented in this Appendix. A considerable range of guidance documents has been prepared by Central Government to assist local authorities discharge their strategic housing and planning functions. In addition there is considerable independent and academic research and guidance on these issues; some of the key documents are summarised here. The documents are reviewed in order of publication date.

B.2 **A Decent Home: Definition and Guidance for Implementation Update, DCLG, June 2006**

Although not primarily about the provision of caravan sites, facilities or pitches, the June 2006 updated CLG guidance for social landlords provides a standard for such provision. The guidance is set out under a number of key headings:

- Community-based and tenant-led ownership and management;
- Delivering Decent Homes Beyond 2010;
- Delivering mixed communities;
- Procurement value for money; and
- Housing Health and Safety.

The guidance defines four criteria against which to measure the standard of a home:

- It meets the current statutory minimum standard for housing;
- It is in a reasonable state of repair;
- It has reasonably modern facilities and services; and
- It provides a reasonable degree of thermal comfort.

B.3 **Guide to Effective Use of Enforcement Powers - Part 1: Unauthorised Encampments, ODPM, 2006**

The Guide is the Government's response to unauthorised encampments which cause local disruption and conflict. Strong powers are available to the police, local authorities and other landowners to deal with unauthorised encampments. It provides detailed step-by-step practical guidance to the use of these powers, and sets out advice on:

- Choosing the most appropriate power;
- Speeding up the process;
- Keeping costs down;
- The eviction process; and
- Preventing further unauthorised camping.

B.4 **Common Ground: Equality, good race relations and sites for Gypsies and Irish Travellers, Commission for Racial Equality, May 2006**

This report was written four years after the introduction of the statutory duty on public authorities under the Race Relations (Amendment) Act to promote equality of opportunity and good race relations and to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination. The CRE expressed concerns about relations between Gypsies and Irish Travellers and other members of the public, with widespread public hostility and, in many places, Gypsies and Irish Travellers leading separate, parallel lives. A dual concern about race relations and inequality led the Commission in October 2004 to launch the inquiry on which this report was based.

The Report's recommendations include measures relating to Central Government, local authorities, police forces and the voluntary sector. Among those relating to Central Government are:

- developing a realistic but ambitious timetable to identify land for sites, where necessary establishing them, and making sure it is met;
- developing key performance indicators for public sites which set standards for quality and management that are comparable to those for conventional accommodation;
- requiring local authorities to monitor and provide data on planning applications, outcomes and enforcement, and on housing and homelessness by racial group, using two separate categories for Gypsies and Irish Travellers; and
- requiring police forces to collect information on Gypsies and Irish Travellers as two separate ethnic categories.

Strategic recommendations affecting local authorities include:

- developing a holistic corporate vision for all work on Gypsies and Irish Travellers,
- reviewing all policies on accommodation for Gypsies and Irish Travellers,
- designating a councillor at cabinet (or equivalent) level, and an officer at no less than assistant director level, to coordinate the authority's work on all sites;
- emphasising that the code of conduct for councillors applies to their work in relation to all racial groups, including Gypsies and Irish Travellers;
- giving specific advice to Gypsies and Irish Travellers on the most suitable land for residential use, how to prepare applications, and help them to find the information they need to support their application;
- identifying and reporting on actions by local groups or individuals in response to plans for Gypsy sites that may constitute unlawful pressure on the authority to discriminate against Gypsies and Irish Travellers; and
- monitoring all planning applications and instances of enforcement action at every stage, by type and racial group, including Gypsies and Irish Travellers, in order to assess the effects of policies and practices on different racial

groups.

Among other recommendations, the Report states that police forces should:

- include Gypsies and Irish Travellers in mainstream neighbourhood policing strategies, to promote race equality and good race relations;
- target individual Gypsies and Irish Travellers suspected of anti-social behaviour and crime on public, private and unauthorised sites, and not whole communities;
- treat Gypsies and Irish Travellers as members of the local community, and in ways that strengthen their trust and confidence in the police;
- provide training for all relevant officers on Gypsies' and Irish Travellers' service needs, so that officers are able to do their jobs more effectively;
- review formal and informal procedures for policing unauthorised encampments, to identify and eliminate potentially discriminatory practices, and ensure that the procedures promote race equality and good race relations; and
- review the way policy is put into practice, to make sure organisations and individuals take a consistent approach, resources are used effectively and strategically, all procedures are formalised, and training needs are identified.

Other recommendations relate to Parish and Community councils the Local Government Association, the Association of Chief Police Officers and the voluntary sector.

B.5 Guidance on Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessments, DCLG, October 2007

This Guidance sets out a detailed framework for designing, planning and carrying out Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs assessments. It includes the needs of Showpeople. It acknowledges that the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers are likely to differ from those of the settled community, and that they have hitherto been excluded from accommodation needs assessments.

The guidance stresses the importance of understanding accommodation needs of the whole Gypsy and Traveller population; and that studies obtain robust data. It recognises the difficulty of surveying this population and recommends the use of:

- Qualitative methods such as focus groups and group interviews;
- Specialist surveys of those living on authorised sites that are willing to respond; and
- Existing information, including local authority site records and the twice yearly caravan counts.
- The guidance recognises that there are challenges in carrying out these assessments, and accepts that while the approach should be as robust as possible it is very difficult to exactly quantify unmet need.

B.6 RTPI Planning for Gypsies and Travellers, 2007

The RTPI has developed a series of Good Practice notes for local planning authorities, 'Planning for Gypsies and Travellers'; the notes cover four key areas:

- Communication, consultation and participation;
- Needs assessment;
- Accommodation and site delivery; and
- Enforcement.

Whilst the notes were developed prior to the NPPF and the introduction of the new Planning policy for traveller sites, they remain relevant, and it is worth considering some of the papers' key recommendations.

In terms of **communication, consultation and participation** the RTPI highlight the following good practice:

- **Define potentially confusing terminology** used by professionals working in the area;
- **Use appropriate methods of consultation:** oral exchanges and face-to-face dealings are essential to effectively engage with Gypsy and Traveller communities, whilst service providers tend to use written exchanges;
- **Consultees and participants need to be involved in the entire plan making process;** this includes in-house participants, external organisations, Gypsy and Traveller communities, and settled communities. The RTPI concludes that:
 - 'Local authorities should encourage Gypsy and Traveller communities to engage with the planning system at an early stage. However, they may request other agencies that have well-established relationships with members of Gypsy and Traveller communities to undertake this role.' and
 - 'In the past, settled communities have often only become aware of the intention to develop Gypsy and Traveller accommodation when the local authority issues a notice or consultation. ... cultivating the support of the settled community for the development of sites should start as soon as possible. ... There is a sound case for front-loading and sharing information with small groups in the [settled] community, rather than trying to manage large public gatherings at the start of the process. Again, it may be beneficial for the local authority to work in partnership with organisations with established links in the community. The settled community is not a homogeneous whole. There will be separate groups with different perceptions and concerns, which the local authority must take account of.'⁶¹
- **Dialogue methods:** the RTPI correctly identify that the experience of many Gypsies and Travellers of liaising with both public sector agencies and the settled community is both frightening and negative. As a result 'there should be no expectation that Gypsies and Travellers will participate in open meetings. Stakeholders should investigate suitable methods of bringing

⁶¹ RTPI Planning for Gypsies and Travellers Good Practice Note 4 Part A (2007) page 8

together individuals from the respective communities in an environment that will facilitate a constructive exchange of information and smooth the process of breaking down animosity and hostility.⁶² The use of public meetings is discouraged, and the use of organisations with experience of working within both Gypsy and Traveller, and settled communities encouraged – advice and support groups, assisted by the latter, holding regular local meetings can be an effective means of engaging constructively with both communities. Representatives from these groups can also be included on appropriate forums and advisory groups. The location and timing of meetings needs to be carefully considered to maximise participation, with a neutral venue being preferable.

- **The media** has an important role to play in facilitating the delivery of sites locally, with past reporting being extremely damaging. Positive media liaison is important and requires:
 - A single point of contact with the local authority;
 - A liaison officer responsible for compilation and release of briefings, and for building positive relationships with editors, journalists, radio and television presenters;
 - All stakeholders to provide accurate and timely briefings for the liaison officer;
 - Provision of media briefings on future activities;
 - Officers to anticipate when and where the most sensitive and contentious issues will arise and use of a risk assessment to mitigate any negative impact;
 - Use of the media to facilitate engagement with both settled and Gypsy and Traveller communities; and
 - Stakeholders to provide politicians with clear, accurate and comprehensive briefings.
- **On-going communication, participation and consultation** are important. The continued use of the most effective methods of engagement once an initiative is completed ensures the maximum use of resources:
 - ‘The delivery of some services, such as the identification of sites in development plan documents, is the end of one process and the start of another. The various committees and advisory groups established to participate in the process of site identification and the accommodation needs assessment will have considerable background information and expertise embedded in their membership. This will prove useful in the management and monitoring of subsequent work. ... Whilst on-going engagement with all service users is important, it is especially important with regard to Gypsies and Travellers, given their long history of marginalisation.’⁶³

⁶² RTPI Planning for Gypsies and Travellers Good Practice Note 4 Part A (2007) page 13

⁶³ RTPI Planning for Gypsies and Travellers Good Practice Note 4 (2007) Part A, page 18

Whilst the RTPI's Good Practice Note Planning for Gypsies and Travellers predates the NPPF, the principles that it establishes at Part C remain largely relevant in terms of the role of local plan making. The Note advises that whilst the use of the site specific DPDs to identify sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation may seem less divisive, subsequent to identification of sufficient sites to meet identified need, local planning authorities should seek to integrate provision for Gypsies and Travellers within their general housing strategies and policies. Early involvement of stakeholders, the community and special interest groups will help achieve a consensus.

However, the RTPI point out that, due to the contentious nature of Gypsy and Traveller provision, the use of a criteria based approach to the selection of development sites is unlikely to be successful 'in instances where considerable public opposition to the development might be anticipated.' The paper concludes that it is not appropriate to rely solely on criteria as an alternative to site allocations where there is an identified need for the development.⁶⁴

The RTPI advocate adopting a pragmatic approach, whereby local planning authorities work with the Gypsy and Traveller communities within their areas to identify a range of potentially suitable sites:

- 'The local authority and Gypsy and Traveller communities are both able to bring forward their suggested sites during this process, and the distribution and location of transit as well as permanent sites can be covered. The practicable options would then go forward for discussion with the local community, interest groups, and other stakeholders before the selection of preferred sites is finalised. The advantages of this approach are its transparency and the certainty it provides both for Gypsies and Travellers and for settled communities.'⁶⁵

The RTPI also advocates the use of supplementary planning guidance to provide additional detail on policies contained within a Local Plan; in terms of Gypsies and Travellers this could include:

- Needs assessment evidence base;
- Design principles; and
- A design brief for the layout of sites.

B.7 CLG Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide, May 2008

The Guide attempts to establish and summarise the key elements needed to design a successful site. In particular, the guidance intends to assist:

- Local authorities or Registered Providers looking to develop new sites or refurbish existing sites;
- Architects or developers looking to develop sites or refurbish existing sites; and
- Site residents looking to participate in the design/refurbishment process.

⁶⁴ RTPI Planning for Gypsies and Travellers Good Practice Note 4 (2007) Part C page 11

⁶⁵ RTPI Planning for Gypsies and Travellers Good Practice Note 4 (2007) Part C page 11

B.8 The National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into effect in March 2012 and sets out the Government's planning policies for England. It condenses previous guidance and places a strong emphasis on 'sustainable development'. It provides more focussed guidance on plan-making and refers to 'Local Plans' rather than Local Development Frameworks or Development Plan Documents. Despite the difference in terminology, it does not affect the provisions of the 2004 Act which remains the legal basis for plan-making.

B.9 Planning policy for traveller sites, March 2012

In March 2012 the Government also published Planning policy for traveller sites, which together with the NPPF replaces all previous planning policy guidance in respect of Gypsies and Travellers. The policy approach encourages provision of sites for Gypsies and Travellers where there is an identified need, to help maintain an appropriate level of supply. The policy also encourages the use of plan making and decision taking to reduce unauthorised developments and encampments.

B.10 Progress report by the ministerial working group on tackling inequalities experienced by Gypsies and Travellers, April 2012

In April 2012 the Government published a Progress Report by the ministerial working group on tackling inequalities experienced by Gypsies and Travellers, which summarised progress in terms of meeting 'Government commitments to tackle inequalities and promote fairness for Gypsy and Traveller communities.'⁶⁶ The report covers 28 measures from across Government aimed at tackling inequalities, these cover:

- Improving education outcomes;
- Improving health outcomes;
- Providing appropriate accommodation;
- Tackling hate crime;
- Improving interaction with the National Offender Management Service;
- Improving access to employment and financial services; and
- Improving engagement with service providers.

B.11 Dealing with illegal and unauthorised encampments: a summary of available powers, CLG August 2012

This guidance note summarises the powers available to local authorities and landowners to remove encampments from both public and private land. Powers available to local authorities being:

- Injunctions to protect land from unauthorised encampments;
- Licensing of caravan sites;
- Tent site licences;

⁶⁶ www.communities.gov.uk/news/corporate/2124322

- Possession orders;
- Interim possession orders;
- Local byelaws;
- Power of local authorities to direct unauthorised campers to leave land;
- Addressing obstructions to the public highway;
- Planning contravention notice;
- Temporary stop notice;
- Enforcement notice and retrospective planning;
- Stop notice;
- Breach of condition notice; and
- Powers of entry onto land.

B.12 Statutory Instrument 2013 No.830 Town and Country Planning (Temporary Stop Notice) (England) (Revocation) Regulations 2013: Made on 11th April 2013 and laid before Parliament on 12th April 2013 this Instrument revoking the regulations applying to Temporary Stop Notices (TSNs) in England came into force on 4th May 2013. The regulations were originally introduced to mitigate against the likely disproportionate impact of TSNs on Gypsies and Travellers in areas where there is a lack of sites to meet the needs of the Travelling community. Under the regulations, TSNs were prohibited where a caravan was a person's main residence, unless there was a risk of harm to a serious public interest significant enough to outweigh any benefit to the occupier of the caravan. Under the new arrangements local planning authorities are to determine whether the use of a TSN is a proportionate and necessary response.

B.13 Ministerial Statement 1st July 2013 by Brandon Lewis⁶⁷ highlighted the issue of inappropriate development in the green belt and revised the appeals recovery criteria issued on 30th June 2008 to enable an initial six month period of scrutiny of Traveller site appeals in the green belt. This is so that the Secretary of State can assess the extent to which the National policy 'Planning policy for traveller sites' is meeting the Government's stated policy intentions. A number of appeals have subsequently been recovered. The Statement also revoked the practice guidance on 'Diversity and equality in planning'⁶⁸, deeming it to be outdated; the Government does not intend to replace this guidance.

B.14 Dealing with illegal and unauthorised encampments: a summary of available powers 9th Aug 2013. This Guidance replaces that published in Aug 2012, and updates it in respect of recent changes to Temporary Stop Notices. The Guidance lists powers available to local authorities, including:

- More powerful temporary stop notices to stop and remove unauthorised caravans;

⁶⁷ <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/planning-and-travellers>

⁶⁸ ODPM Diversity and Equality in Planning: A good practice guide (2005)

- Pre-emptive injunctions that protect vulnerable land in advance from unauthorised encampments;
- Possession orders to remove trespassers from land;
- Police powers to order unauthorised campers to leave land;
- Powers of entry onto land so authorised officers can obtain information for enforcement purposes;
- Demand further information on planning works to determine whether any breach of the rules has taken place;
- Enforcement notices to remedy any planning breaches; and
- Ensuring sites have valid caravan or tent site licences.

It sets out that councils should work closely with the police and other agencies to stop camps being set up when council offices are closed.

B.15 **PAS spaces and places for Gypsies and Travellers: how planning can help**

PAS list the following as key to successful delivery of new provision:

- **Involve Gypsy and Traveller communities:** this needs to happen at an early stage, innovative methods of consultation need to be adopted due to low levels of literacy and high levels of social exclusion within Gypsy and Traveller communities and members of the Gypsy and Traveller community should be trained as interviewers on Accommodation Assessments (Cambridgeshire, Surrey, Dorset and Leicestershire). Other good practice examples include distribution of material via CD, so that information can be 'listened to' as opposed to read. The development of a dedicated Gypsy and Traveller Strategy is also seen to be good practice, helping agencies develop a co-ordinated approach and so prioritise the issue. The report also recommends the use of existing Gypsy and Traveller resources such as the planning guide published in Traveller's Times, which aims to explain the planning process in an accessible way to members of the Gypsy and Traveller community. As well as consulting early, PAS also flags the need to consult often with communities;
- **Work collaboratively** with neighbouring authorities to address the issues and avoid just 'moving it on' to a neighbouring local authority area. With the new Duty to Co-operate established within the NPPF, working collaboratively with neighbouring local authorities has never been more important. Adopting a collaborative approach recognises that local authorities cannot work in isolation to tackle this issue;
- **Be transparent:** trust is highly valued within Gypsy and Traveller communities, and can take a long time to develop. The planning system needs to be transparent, so that members of the Gypsy and Traveller community can understand the decisions that have been taken and the reasoning behind them. PAS states that *'ideally council work in this area should be led by an officer who is respected both within the Council and also within Gypsy and*

*Traveller communities: trust is vital and can be broken easily.*⁶⁹ Local planning authorities also need to revisit their approach to development management criteria for applications for Gypsy and Traveller sites *‘to ensure that criteria make it clear what applications are likely to be accepted by the council. Authorities need to ensure that these are reasonable and realistic. Transparent and criteria-based policies help everyone to understand what decisions have been made and why.’*⁷⁰ Kent and Hertsmere councils are listed as examples of good practice in this regard.

- **Integration:** accommodation needs assessments need to be integrated into the Local Plan evidence base, with site locations and requirements set out within specific Development Plan Documents (DPDs); dedicated Gypsy and Traveller DPDs are advocated as a means of ensuring that the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers are fully considered and addressed within the local planning process; and
- **Educate and work with councillors:** members need to be aware of their responsibilities in terms of equality and diversity and ‘understand that there must be sound planning reasons for rejecting applications for Gypsy and Traveller sites’⁷¹. It is helpful for members to understand the wider benefits of providing suitable accommodation to meet the requirements of the Gypsy and Traveller community, such as:
 - An increase in site provision;
 - Reduced costs of enforcement; and
 - Greater community engagement and understanding of community need.

⁶⁹ PAS Spaces and Places for Gypsies and Travellers: How Planning Can Help (2007) page 8

⁷⁰ PAS Spaces and Places for Gypsies and Travellers: How Planning Can Help (2007) page 8

⁷¹ PAS Spaces and Places for Gypsies and Travellers: How Planning Can Help (2007) page 8

Appendix C: Fieldwork Questionnaire

Liverpool City Region Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Survey

Introduction

I am an independent researcher doing a study on the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. This work is being conducted on behalf of the Liverpool City Region Councils. I don't work for the Council but they have asked me to do this study.

We want to find out:

- What sort of homes – sites, yards and houses – Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople need.
- What you think of existing sites, yards and homes
- Whether you think new permanent and temporary sites and yards are needed
- Whether you travel and if so whether you've had problems while travelling
- What you think about the costs of your homes – houses, yards and sites
- What other services you feel you need to support you

Interviewed before?

1. Have you been interviewed for this survey before?
 - ***If 'Yes' and in same location as previous interview, politely decline interview and find new respondent.***
 - ***If 'Yes' on roadside and in different location from previous interview carry on with introduction***
 - ***If 'No' carry on with introduction***

Do you have time to talk with me about these things – it will take about 40 minutes?

Your answers are completely confidential – I won't use your name in any report that I write and no one will be able to trace any answer back to you. You don't have to answer everything - if you don't want to answer any particular questions, just tell me to skip them.

[For most answers, check the boxes most applicable or fill in the blanks.]

Interview details

Attach label with interviewer details and URN

Date and time _____

Location (site name and address)

Type: Unauthorised Encampment / Unauthorised Development / Caravan in Garden / Local Authority Site / Private Site / House

No. of separate **respondent** self identified households living on pitch [this is to be added to site census sheets after all interviews completed]

1. 1
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5 or more

Home base

1a. Do you usually live here? Is this your primary home base?

1. Yes
2. No

1b. Do you have any other home bases?

1. Yes Go to Q1c
2. No Go to Q2

1c. Please tell us about your other home base (record details of next most used home base). What type of home is it? (Select only one.)

1. Trailer or wagon
2. Chalet/mobile home (or similar)
3. House
4. Bungalow
5. Flat
6. Sheltered/Extra care housing
7. Other **[please state]:**

1d. How much time do you spend there (other home base)? (Select only one.)

1. up to 1 month a year
2. Over 1 and up to 2 months a year
3. Over 2 and up to 3 months a year
4. Over 3 and up to 4 months a year
5. Over 4 and up to 5 months a year
6. 5 months or over a year

1e. Do you have any other home bases?

1. Yes Go to Q1f
2. No Go to Q2

1f. Please tell us about your other home base (record details of next most used home base). What type of home is it? (Select only one.)

1. Trailer or wagon
2. Chalet/mobile home (or similar)
3. House
4. Bungalow

5. Flat
6. Sheltered/Extra care housing
7. Other ***[please state]:***

1g. How much time do you spend there (other home base)? (Select only one.)

1. up to 1 month a year
2. Over 1 and up to 2 months a year
3. Over 2 and up to 3 months a year
4. Over 3 and up to 4 months a year
5. Over 4 and up to 5 months a year
6. 5 months or over a year

2. Why do you live here (at the location of interview)?
(Select all that apply.)

1. Close to family and friends
2. Near to place of work
3. Nowhere else that is suitable
4. Choose to travel
5. Simply chose this place/No particular reason
6. Other **[please state]**
: _____

3. How long have you lived here (at the location of interview)? (Select only one.)

1. up to 1 year
2. Over 1 and up to 2 years
3. Over 2 and up to 3 years
4. Over 3 and up to 4 years
5. Over 4 and up to 5 years
6. 5 years or over

4. What do you normally live in (at the location of interview)? (Select only one.)

1. Trailer or wagon
2. Chalet/mobile home (or similar)
3. House
4. Bungalow
5. Flat
6. Sheltered/Extra Care housing
7. House and yard with or without trailers
8. Other **[please state]:**

5. Are you happy with your main home base or would you prefer to live in a different type of home? (Select only one.)

1. Happy with house/bungalow/flat/sheltered Go to Q7
 2. Happy with trailer/wagon/chalet/mobile home Go to Q7
 3. Prefer trailer Go to Q6
 4. Prefer caravan Go to Q6
 5. Prefer wagon Go to Q6
 6. Prefer chalet Go to Q6
 7. Prefer house/bungalow/flat/sheltered Go to Q6
 8. Other **[please state]:** Go to Q6
-

6. If you would prefer to live in a different type of home please tell us about your reasons for this? (Select all that apply.)

1. Health/Old age/Illness
 2. Lifestyle/Belief
 3. Prefer bricks and mortar
 4. Prefer Caravan/trailer/wagon/pitch
 5. Want to travel
 6. Want to settle down
 7. Other **[please state]:**
-

7. If you are living in bricks and mortar accommodation, would you like to move to a site if this was an option?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not applicable

8. Do you rent or own the home where you normally live?
(Select only one.)

1. Rent from Council
2. Rent privately
3. Rent from Housing Association/Registered Provider/RSL
4. Own home
5. Not applicable
6. Other **[please state]**: _____

9. Do you own or rent the land you live on? (Select only one.)

1. Own land where trailer/wagon is normally located (with planning permission)
2. Own land where trailer/caravan is normally located (no planning permission)
3. Own land where trailer/wagon is normally located seeking planning permission
4. Rent pitch from Council

5. Rent pitch from Housing Association/Registered Provider/Registered Social Landlord
6. Rent pitch privately (with planning permission)
7. Rent pitch privately (no planning permission)
8. Neither own or rent the land (unauthorised)
9. Tolerated site
10. Not applicable
11. Other **[please state]** _____

10a. How satisfied are you with your home? (Select only one.)

- 1. Very Satisfied
- 2. Satisfied
- 3. Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
- 4. Dissatisfied
- 5. Very Dissatisfied

10b. Please tell us about your reasons for saying this?

11. **[ONLY FOR PEOPLE LIVING ON SITES/YARDS]**

What is provided on your pitch? (Select all that apply.)

- 1. slab
- 2. shed
- 3. kitchen
- 4. laundry
- 5. laundry drying area
- 6. bath
- 7. shower
- 8. toilet
- 9. living room
- 10. mains water
- 11. mains sewerage
- 12. mains electric
- 13. gas supply
- 14. Other **[please state]:** _____

12. [ONLY FOR PEOPLE LIVING ON SITES/YARDS]

What is provided for your use elsewhere on the site/yard?

(Select all that apply.)

- 1. amenity block
- 2. toilets
- 3. showers
- 4. laundry
- 5. car parking
- 6. space for storing loads
- 7. play area
- 8. communal meeting area
- 9. Other **[please state]:**

[ONLY FOR PEOPLE LIVING ON SITES/YARDS]

13. How many pitches/plots are there currently on the site/yard where you are living?

.....

14. Are these all occupied?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

15a. If no, how many pitches/plots are vacant?

15b. How long have these been empty? If more than one vacant pitch/plot please comment on the one that has been vacant for the longest time.

- 1. up to 1 year
- 2. 1 to 2 years
- 3. 2 to 3 years
- 4. 3 to 4 years
- 5. 4 to 5 years
- 6. over 5 years

16. In your opinion, is there capacity for further development in the site/yard on which you live to incorporate new pitches/plots?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

17. If yes, how many new pitches/plots?

18a. Do you have development option(s) for land surrounding the site? (select one only)

- 1. Yes, including ownership or lease for the land. If 'Yes' please go to Q18b
- 2. Yes, with no ownership or lease for the land. If 'Yes' please go to Q18b
- 3. No. If 'No' please go to Q18c

18b. If you do have options for land around the site where are these and how much space is there to potentially develop? _____

18c. Do you have an option(s) for a new site? (i.e. on land that would not be an extension to your existing site)

- 1. Yes Go to Q18d
- 2. No Go to Q18e

18d. If you do have option(s) for a new site where are these and how much space is there to potentially develop?

18e. Do you have any other comments about the capacity of the site/yards you are currently living on?

ALL RESPONDENTS

19. Do you think your home/trailer/pitch is overcrowded?
(Select only one.)

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

20. If yes, please tell us in what way the home is overcrowded (i.e. number of caravans/households living on pitch)

21. What repairs or improvements, if any, are needed to your home? (Select all that apply.)

- 1. none
- 2. more space on pitch
- 3. slab/drive
- 4. roof
- 5. doors/windows
- 6. kitchen facilities

7. bathroom facilities

8. Other **[please state]:**

22. How would you describe the state of repair of your home? (Select only one.)

- 1. Very Good
- 2. Good
- 3. Neither Good nor Poor
- 4. Poor
- 5. Very Poor

23. Do you feel you have enough space:

a) for your trailers, wagons, horse boxes, vehicles and loads?

Yes 1. No 2.

b) in your own amenity block (shed) - if relevant?

Yes 1. No 2. Not relevant 3.

c) on your pitch - if relevant?

Yes 1. No 2. Not relevant 3.

d) for travelling show people only, room to repair equipment - if relevant?

Yes 1. No 2. Not relevant 3.

24. Do you have to share any of the following facilities with another household (this could be a family in another trailer/pitch)? (Select all that apply.)

1. Bathroom

2. Toilet

3. Kitchen

4. Laundry

25. How many bedrooms/sleeping trailers or wagons do you have?

Number: _____

26. How much does your home cost per week (excluding water, heating and lighting; including rent, mortgage, and ground rent)?

Please state amount

£ _____

27. How much of your housing costs, if any, are covered by housing benefit? (Select only one.)

1. None

2. Part

3. All

28. How do you find the cost of :

| | | OK | | Not OK |
|----------------|---|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| a. Electricity | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Gas | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Oil | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Water | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

29. Is there anything else you would like to add about your home base? [*Prompt: safety, views about wardens on sites, management, maintenance issues, living conditions*]

Neighbourhood and local services

30. How satisfied are you with the location of your home? (By home we mean the location where the interview is taking place and this covers questions 30-34) (Select only one.)

1. Very Satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
4. Dissatisfied
5. Very Dissatisfied

31. How happy are you with the neighbourhood? (Select only one.)

1. Very Happy

2. Happy
3. Neither happy nor unhappy
4. Unhappy
5. Very unhappy

32. Do you feel safe in this neighbourhood? (Select only one.)

1. Yes
2. No

33. Please say if being near to the following is important, slightly important or not important to you?

| | Important | Slightly Important | Not important |
|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------|
| a) Primary schools | 1 [] | 2 [] | 3 [] |
| b) Secondary schools | 1 [] | 2 [] | 3 [] |
| c) Doctors | 1 [] | 2 [] | 3 [] |
| d) Shops | 1 [] | 2 [] | 3 [] |
| e) Pubs | 1 [] | 2 [] | 3 [] |
| f) Public Transport | 1 [] | 2 [] | 3 [] |
| g) Main roads | 1 [] | 2 [] | 3 [] |
| h) Access to open space | 1 [] | 2 [] | 3 [] |
| i) Access to place of work | 1 [] | 2 [] | 3 [] |
| j) Access to place of worship | 1 [] | 2 [] | 3 [] |
| k) Other (specify) | 1 [] | 2 [] | 3 [] |

34. Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about your neighbourhood? **[Prompt - how do you find local people, shops, problems with the environment etc. ?]**

Housing History

35. Where did you live before you came here (or moved to your existing home)?
1. [] Please state town/district _____
 2. [] Travelling all the time (no permanent home) - **go to Q40**
 3. [] Homeless - **go to Q 40**

36. How long did you live there?
(Select only one.)

1. up to 1 year
2. 1 to 2 years
3. 2 to 3 years
4. 3 to 4 years
5. 4 to 5 years
6. over 5 years

37. What kind of home did you have there?
(Select only one.)

1. Trailer or wagon
2. Chalet/mobile home (or similar)
3. House
4. Bungalow
5. Flat
6. Sheltered
7. Other **[please**

state] _____ :

38. Why did you leave that place?

39. How many times have you moved in the last 2 years

Number: _____

Or b. Travelled for the whole time

Or c. None/Have not moved

Travelling

40. In the last year, have you travelled?
(Select only one.)

1. Yes

2. No - **go to Q44**

41. How many days or weeks do you normally travel every year?
(Select only one.)
1. No more than thirteen days
 2. 2 to 4 weeks (or one month)
 3. 5 to 8 weeks (or 2 months)
 4. 9 to 12 weeks (or 3 months)
 5. 13 to 26 weeks (or 6 months)
 6. Over 6 months but less than 10 months
 7. Over 10 months but less than 12 months
 8. All year

42. Where would you normally go when you are travelling, when and why? And what is the main route you would take to get there (please specify main roads taken/towns passed through)

| Location | Month | Reason | Route |
|----------|-------|--------|-------|
| a. | | | |
| b. | | | |
| c. | | | |
| d. | | | |

43. What problems do you have while travelling?
(Select all that apply.)

1. No places to stop over
2. Closing of traditional stopping places
3. Abuse, harassment or discrimination
4. Lack of toilet facilities
5. No water facilities
6. Problems with rubbish collection
7. Police behaviour
8. Enforcement officer behaviour
9. Behaviour of other Travellers
10. Other ***[please state]:***

(Tick all that apply)

44. Transit sites are intended for short-term use while in transit. Sites are usually permanent and authorised, but there is a limit on the length of time residents can stay. Is there a need for transit sites in the Liverpool City Region?

1. Yes
 2. No

45. If yes, where should the transit site(s) be located? (Select all that apply.)

| Where are transit sites needed? | How big does the site need to be? (no pitches) | Who needs this transit site? | When is this transit site needed? (all the time/certain times of year – please specify) | |
|---|--|------------------------------|---|----|
| Liverpool Council area | | | | 1 |
| Knowsley: Kirkby | | | | 2 |
| Knowsley: Preston/Whinston/Cronton/Knowsley Village | | | | 3 |
| Knowsley: Huyton | | | | 4 |
| Knowsley: Halewood | | | | 5 |
| Wirral: East of M53 | | | | 6 |
| Wirral: West of M53 | | | | 7 |
| West Lancashire: Skelmersdale and M58 corridor | | | | 8 |
| West Lancashire: Ormskirk and Aughton | | | | 9 |
| West Lancashire: Burscough | | | | 10 |
| West Lancashire: Northern parishes | | | | 11 |
| West Lancashire: Western Parishes | | | | 12 |
| West Lancashire: Eastern Parishes | | | | 13 |
| Sefton: Southport | | | | 14 |
| Sefton: Formby | | | | 15 |
| Sefton: Crosby | | | | 16 |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----|
| Sefton: Bootle and Netherton | | | | 17 |
| Sefton: Maghull | | | | 18 |
| St. Helens: Town Centre and Moss bank, Haresfinch, Windle, Eccleston, West Park, Thatto Heath, Marshalls Cross, Sutton Park) | | | | 19 |
| St. Helens: Haydock and Blackbrook | | | | 20 |
| St. Helens: Newton Le Willows and Earlston | | | | 21 |
| St. Helens: Rural North St. Helens including Garswood, Rainford, Billinge) | | | | 22 |
| Area outside study areas above (please specify) | | | | 23 |

46. Who should manage transit sites? (Select all that apply.)

1. Councils
2. Registered Social Landlords/Housing Associations
3. Private (Gypsy/Traveller/Showman)
4. Private (non-Gypsy or Traveller/Showman)
5. Other **[please state]:**
6. _____

1. Cultural heritage
 2. Personal preference
 3. Work related
 4. Visit family/friends
 5. Only way of life I know
 6. Limited opportunity to settle/no pitch on which to live/lack of site provision
 7. Other **[please state]**
-

47. Why do you travel?
(Select all that apply.)

48. Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about your travelling experience, transit sites and/or stopping places?

12. Other **[please state]**: _____

Advice, support, health and other services

49. Have you used any of the following services in the last year?
(Select all that apply.)

- 1. Traveller liaison
- 2. Traveller Education
- 3. Adult education
- 4. Law Centre
- 5. Citizens Advice Bureau
- 6. Other welfare rights advice
- 7. Doctor (G.P.)
- 8. Dentist
- 9. Accident and emergency
- 10. Health visitors
- 11. Social services

50. Are you registered with the following
(Select all that apply.)

- 1. Doctor
- 2. Dentist

51. Does your home need adapting in any way, for instance to help with mobility around the home?

- 1. Yes Go to Q52
- 2. No Go to Q53

52. In your opinion, what assistance/adaptations are required to help? e.g. Handrails, re-positioned sockets etc

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Adaptation 1 | |
| Adaptation 2 | |
| Adaptation 3 | |

53. What type of services (other than those you currently receive) would help you with your health care needs?

54. Is there anything else that you would like to tell us about your health or health services?

3. Onto another site/yard (if so, where) _____ go to Q58

4. Into bricks and mortar accommodation go to Q57

5. From bricks and mortar accommodation onto a site/yard (if so, where?) go to Q58

6. Other [please specify]: _____ go to Q58

The future

55. ***In the next five years, is your household:***

1. Planning to stay where you are based now
– ***go to Q58***

2. Plan to move elsewhere - ***go to Q56***

56. If you are planning to move elsewhere, are you planning to move to (select one):

1. Another pitch/plot on the same site/yard in a trailer/wagon go to Q58

2. Another pitch/plot on the same site/yard in a chalet/mobile home go to Q58

57. If you are planning to move to bricks and mortar accommodation

a. Where would it be ? _____

b. What type of accommodation?

1. House
2. Bungalow
3. Flat
4. Sheltered/extra care housing

c. Would you be renting or buying?

1. Rent from Council
2. Rent privately
3. Rent from Housing Association/RP/RSL
4. Buy
5. Other
6. **[please state]:** _____

58. How do you think sites should be managed?
(tick all that apply)

1. Councils
2. Private (Gypsy/Traveller/Showman)
3. Private (non-Gypsy/Traveller/Showman)
4. Registered Social Landlords/Housing Associations
5. Other **[please state]:** _____

59. Is there a need for new permanent site(s) in the Liverpool City Region?

1. Yes
2. No

60. If yes, in which of the following locations? (Tick all that apply)

| Where are permanent sites needed? | Why this location? | How big does the site need to be? (no pitches) | |
|--|--------------------|--|-----------|
| Liverpool Council area | | | 1 |
| Knowsley: Kirkby | | | 2 |
| Knowsley: Preston/Whinston/Cronton/Knowsley Village | | | 3 |
| Knowsley: Huyton | | | 4 |
| Knowsley: Halewood | | | 5 |
| Wirral: East of M53 | | | 6 |
| Wirral: West of M53 | | | 7 |
| West Lancashire: Skelmersdale and M58 corridor | | | 8 |
| West Lancashire: Ormskirk and Aughton | | | 9 |
| West Lancashire: Burscough | | | 10 |
| West Lancashire: Northern parishes | | | 11 |
| West Lancashire: Western Parishes | | | 12 |
| West Lancashire: Eastern Parishes | | | 13 |
| Sefton: Southport | | | 14 |
| Sefton: Formby | | | 15 |
| Sefton: Crosby | | | 16 |
| Sefton: Bootle and Netherton | | | 17 |
| Sefton: Maghull | | | 18 |
| St. Helens: Town Centre and Moss bank, Haresfinch, Windle, Eccleston, West Park, Thatto Heath, Marshalls Cross, Sutton Park) | | | 19 |
| St. Helens: Haydock and Blackbrook | | | 20 |
| St. Helens: Newton Le Willows and Earlston | | | 21 |
| St. Helens: Rural North St. Helens including Garswood, Rainford, Billinge) | | | 22 |
| Area outside study areas above (please specify) | | | 23 |

62. How many new pitches/plots in the Liverpool City Region do you think are needed now and in the next 5 years?

(a) Number now: _____

(b) Number next 5 years: _____

63. Is there anything else that you want to tell us about the future need for homes and sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?

64. Do you have children or grandchildren who want to live in a similar way to you (e.g. Travelling lifestyle)?

(Select only one.)

Yes

No

Emerging Families

65. How many members of your family who are living with you now, if any, are likely or need to move on and set up by themselves in the next five years?

[IF POSSIBLE, ASK THOSE WHO ARE LIKELY TO MOVE ON THE 'EMERGING FAMILIES' QUESTIONS DIRECTLY - PLEASE TICK THE APPROPRIATE BOX]

(Select only one.)

1. 1

2. 2

3. 3

4. 4

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Q66 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 1. Respondent is part of emerging household | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Respondent is not part of emerging household | <input type="checkbox"/> |

67. What type of household (HH) are you (or they) likely to form?
 (Select only one for each household.)

| | HH1 (a) | HH2 (b) | HH3 (c) | HH4 (d) |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Single person (under 60 years) | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] |
| Single person (60 years and over) | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] |
| Lone parent | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] |
| Young couple (under 30) with no children | 4 [] | 4 [] | 4 [] | 4 [] |
| Young couple (under 30) with child(ren) | 5 [] | 5 [] | 5 [] | 5 [] |
| Couple (aged 30-under 60) with no children | 6 [] | 6 [] | 6 [] | 6 [] |
| Couple (aged 30-under 60) with children. | 7 [] | 7 [] | 7 [] | 7 [] |
| Older Couple (at least one over 60 years) | 8 [] | 8 [] | 8 [] | 8 [] |
| Other <i>[please state]:</i> | 9 [] | 9 [] | 9 [] | 9 [] |

68. What would you (or they) want as a permanent base?

| | | HH1 (a) | | HH2 (b) | | HH3 (c) | | HH4 (d) |
|---|---|---------|---|---------|---|---------|---|---------|
| Continue to live on current site/yard | 1 | [] | 1 | [] | 1 | [] | 1 | [] |
| Move to another site/yard | 2 | [] | 2 | [] | 2 | [] | 2 | [] |
| Move to bricks and mortar accommodation | 3 | [] | 3 | [] | 3 | [] | 3 | [] |
| Other (please specify) | 4 | [] | 4 | [] | 4 | [] | 4 | [] |
| _____ | | | | | | | | |

69a. If planning to move to another location, where would you (they) prefer to live? Please state town/district. This can be an area out with the study area.

HH1 _____

HH2 _____

HH3 _____

HH4 _____

69b. If planning to move to another location, what is the main reasons for this?

HH1 _____

HH2 _____

HH3 _____

HH4 _____

70. What type of home do you (or do you think they would) want as a permanent base?
(Select only one for each household.)

| | HH1 (a) | HH2 (b) | HH3 (c) | HH4 (d) |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Trailer or wagon go to Q71 | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] |
| Chalet/mobile home or similar go to Q71 | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] |
| House - go to Q72 | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] |
| Bungalow - go to Q72 | 4 [] | 4 [] | 4 [] | 4 [] |
| Flat - go to Q72 | 5 [] | 5 [] | 5 [] | 5 [] |
| Sheltered housing go to Q72 | 6 [] | 6 [] | 6 [] | 6 [] |
| Extra Care Housing – go to Q72 | 7 [] | 7 [] | 7 [] | 7 [] |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|
| No permanent base required | 8 | [] | 8 | [] | 8 | [] | 8 | [] |
| Other (please specify) | 9 | [] | 9 | [] | 9 | [] | 9 | [] |

Interviewer note:

Sheltered housing is usually a group of bungalows or flats and you have your own front door. Schemes usually have a manager/warden to arrange services and are linked to a careline/alarm service

Extra Care housing is designed with the needs of frailer older people in mind. It includes flats, bungalows and retirements villages. You have your own front door. Domestic support and personal care are available.)

71. Which of the following options would you (or do you think they would) prefer? (Select only one.)

| | | HH1 (a) | | HH2 (b) | | HH3 (c) | | HH4 (d) |
|---|---|---------|---|---------|---|---------|---|---------|
| Rent pitch/plot from Council | 1 | [] | 1 | [] | 1 | [] | 1 | [] |
| Rent pitch/plot from Registered Provider/Housing Association/RSL2 | 2 | [] | 2 | [] | 2 | [] | 2 | [] |
| Rent pitch/plot privately | 3 | [] | 3 | [] | 3 | [] | 3 | [] |
| Own land where trailer/ caravan is normally located | 4 | [] | 4 | [] | 4 | [] | 4 | [] |
| To travel/Use multiple/various sites | 5 | [] | 5 | [] | 5 | [] | 5 | [] |
| Other [please state]: | 6 | [] | 6 | [] | 6 | [] | 6 | [] |

72. If in a house, which of the following options would you (or do you think they would) prefer?
(Select only one.)

| | | HH1 (a) | | HH2 (b) | | HH3 (c) | | HH4 (d) |
|--|---|---------|---|---------|---|---------|---|---------|
| Rent house/flat from Council | 1 | [] | 1 | [] | 1 | [] | 1 | [] |
| Rent house/flat privately | 2 | [] | 2 | [] | 2 | [] | 2 | [] |
| Rent house/flat from Registered Provider/Housing Association/RSL | 3 | [] | 3 | [] | 3 | [] | 3 | [] |
| Own house | 4 | [] | 4 | [] | 4 | [] | 4 | [] |
| Other <i>[please state]:</i> | 5 | [] | 5 | [] | 5 | [] | 5 | [] |

73. Do you (or do you think they will) want to travel for some time of the year? (Select only one.)

| | | HH1 (a) | | HH2 (b) | | HH3 (c) | | HH4 (d) |
|-----|---|---------|---|---------|---|---------|---|---------|
| Yes | 1 | [] | 1 | [] | 1 | [] | 1 | [] |
| No | 2 | [] | 2 | [] | 2 | [] | 2 | [] |

Your Household (Respondent)

74. Family type (Select only one.)

1. Single person (under 60 years)
2. Single person (60 years and over)
3. Lone parent
4. Young couple (aged under 30) – no children
5. Young Couple (aged under 30 years) - with children
6. Couple (aged 30 to under 60) - no children
7. Couple (aged 40 to under 60) - with children
8. Older Couple (at least one of 60 years or over)
9. Other [please state]: _____

Number of Households sharing a pitch

75a. How many other households are **currently** living on your pitch/plot with you? (i.e. grandparents, parents, children and their respective spouses)

Number of households:

1. 0
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3
5. 4
6. Other (please specify): _____

75b. Of these households, how many want to live on their own pitch/plot on a site/yard?

1. 0
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3
5. 4
6. Other (please specify): _____

76a. Over the next 15 years do you have dependents who would want to live on a pitch on a site and who will need additional pitches? Number of dependent households needing pitches or a pitch in the next 15 years:

1. Not applicable/No pitch on a site requirement
2. Dependents would prefer another type of home
3. 1
4. 2
5. 3
6. 4
7. Other (please specify):

76b. If you do have dependents who will need additional pitches could you tell us their age?

| | Dependent (a) | Dependent (b) | Dependent (c) | Dependent (d) | Dependent (e) | Dependent (f) | Dependent (g) |
|-----|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Age | | | | | | | |

IF RESPONDENT HAS A SPOUSE OR PARTNER THEN RECORD INFORMATION ABOUT THIS PERSON IN THE SECOND COLUMN.

77. For each person in your household, starting with yourself and then your spouse (partner, husband or wife) please could you tell us their sex and age? (Select only one for each person.)

| | R (a) | P2 (b) | P3 (c) | P4 (d) | P5 (e) | P6 (f) | P7 (g) |
|--------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Male | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Female | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> |

78. Age

R (a) P2 (b) P3 (c) P4 (d) P5 (e) P6 (f) P7 (g)

Age

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Part-time employee

2 [] 2 [] 2 [] 2 [] 2 [] 2 [] 2 []

Self-employed

3 [] 3 [] 3 [] 3 [] 3 [] 3 [] 3 []

Retired

4 [] 4 [] 4 [] 4 [] 4 [] 4 [] 4 []

No paid work

5 [] 5 [] 5 [] 5 [] 5 [] 5 [] 5 []

Disability benefit

6 [] 6 [] 6 [] 6 [] 6 [] 6 [] 6 []

In education

7 [] 7 [] 7 [] 7 [] 7 [] 7 [] 7 []

Other **[please state]:**

8 [] 8 [] 8 [] 8 [] 8 [] 8 [] 8 []

IF NO SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN GO TO Q 80

79. What type of education are your children receiving? (Select all that apply.)

1. Nursery education
2. State school
3. Private school
4. Home schooled
5. College or university
6. Other **[please state]:** _____

80. Employment status (Select only one for each person.)

R P2 P3 P4 P5 P6 P7
(a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) (g)

Full-time employee

1 [] 1 [] 1 [] 1 [] 1 [] 1 [] 1 []

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 81. How would you describe yourself (ethnic or cultural identity)?(Select all that apply) | Circus Traveller | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| | | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | | | | | |
| | R (a) | P2 (b) | P3 (c) | P4 (d) | P5 (e) | P6 (f) | P7 (g) | DK/No answer | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | | | | | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] |
| Romany Gypsy | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | 1 [] | Other [please state]: | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | | | | | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] |
| English Gypsy | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] | 2 [] | | | | | | | | | |
| English Traveller | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] | 3 [] | | | | | | | | | |
| Irish Traveller | 4 [] | 4 [] | 4 [] | 4 [] | 4 [] | 4 [] | 4 [] | | | | | | | | | |
| Welsh Gypsy | 5 [] | 5 [] | 5 [] | 5 [] | 5 [] | 5 [] | 5 [] | | | | | | | | | |
| Welsh Traveller | 6 [] | 6 [] | 6 [] | 6 [] | 6 [] | 6 [] | 6 [] | | | | | | | | | |
| Scottish Gypsy | 7 [] | 7 [] | 7 [] | 7 [] | 7 [] | 7 [] | 7 [] | | | | | | | | | |
| Scottish Traveller | 8 [] | 8 [] | 8 [] | 8 [] | 8 [] | 8 [] | 8 [] | | | | | | | | | |
| New Traveller | 9 [] | 9 [] | 9 [] | 9 [] | 9 [] | 9 [] | 9 [] | | | | | | | | | |
| Showman | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 0 [] | 0 [] | 0 [] | 0 [] | 0 [] | 0 [] | 0 [] | 0 [] |

82. Do you know of a household in bricks and mortar accommodation who'd like to move onto a site/yard, could you provide some contact details and/or a telephone number and/or an email address?

83. Anything else you would like to tell us?

84a. Would you be happy to be contacted again?

Yes [] No []

If yes, record contact details on SEPARATE SHEET and **please now take a note of the respondents FULL TELEPHONE number for quality assurance purposes.** We may use the number provided to check the response to a small number of questions as part of our internal quality processes. FULL TELEPHONE NUMBER:-

84b. If you would like us/the Council to contact you with the results of this research please provide either an email or postal address for us to advise you of the results.

Yes [] No []

If yes, record contact details on SEPARATE SHEET TO THE ONE ABOVE

Appendix D: Stakeholder Consultation

Approach

- D.1 Stakeholders were invited to participate in a survey aimed at identifying a range of information, including establishing the key perceived issues facing Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople within the Merseyside and West Lancashire area, and ways in which these need to be addressed. Stakeholders were asked to respond to any of the questions within the survey.
- D.2 A total of 35 separate responses to the Stakeholder consultation were obtained, including a response from Irish Community Care Merseyside (ICCM). ICCM are a key local stakeholder and represent a significant proportion of the Travelling communities⁷² within Merseyside and West Lancashire, as such, with their consent, their responses to the survey questions are detailed in full in this summary. ICCM responses are listed in italics.
- D.3 The questions and a summary of Stakeholders' responses are set out below. As a general observation, it is useful to note that there was not a comprehensive response to every question. The responses to each question therefore do not represent a proportional representation of the 35 Stakeholders who took part. The comments received represent only an expression of the views of those who participated in that specific question, or had a specific point to make.

Stakeholder questions and responses

General

- D.4 *Which Local Authority areas do you work in? Please tick all that apply*
- Below is a summary of the responses received. Note that some Stakeholders identified multiple areas; hence there are more than 35 counts:

| Area | Number who operate in that area |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Knowsley | 3 |
| Liverpool | 5 |
| St Helens | 6 |
| Sefton | 6 |
| West Lancashire | 1 |
| Wirral | 10 |
| Merseyside and West Lancashire | 2 |
| Other: Wigan; Cheshire West and Chester; Cheshire sub region; Halton; South Ribble; Chorley | 6 |

⁷² ICCM do not work with Travelling Showpeople, their responses reflect issues concerning the groups with which they work, namely Irish and Irish Traveller communities, Traveller communities who are married into Irish Traveller families, including Scottish and Welsh travellers and Gypsies.

D.5 *Do you think that there is sufficient understanding of the education, employment, health and support needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople within the area(s) in which you work? What could be done to improve the current position?*

- There was a diversity of responses received.
- A narrow majority of Stakeholders felt that there is an adequate understanding of the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, although some respondents qualified this by stating that there is a good understanding within certain organisations but not amongst others.
- There was a significant number of Stakeholders who did not believe that there is sufficient understanding of needs. Several respondents noted this in relation to the wider community/the general public, rather than necessarily in respect of authorities/providers.
- Proposals to improve the current position included educating the wider community, and training professionals and Councillors. It was also suggested that services need to be made more accessible, and communication between Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople communities and decision-makers should be improved. The benefit of local authorities having their own Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer was noted by one respondent.
- *No: There are huge variations in service design and delivery over the areas that we work, this is confusing enough for organisations but incredibly disempowering for community members, particularly those with few or no literacy skills, and those new to the area. I believe that there are training needs within all agencies working with the communities, from our Service Users experiences. There needs to be recognition of specialist community, faith, voluntary sector agencies and they need to be linked into communication protocols as this is a huge barrier to communication sharing. All local authorities need to have clear policy and procedure guidelines and there needs to be a clear line of guidance for settled communities also - in the interests of community safety and cohesion. Where the Local Authority has a GTLO there are lines of communication and this works better than where there is no GTLO or other central staff tasked with responsibility and granted authority.*

D.6 *Do you think that more could be done to appropriately monitor the health, education and support needs of Gypsies and Travellers? If so, what?*

- Many respondents were unsure and did not know what monitoring was undertaken, so did not make suggestions regarding what more could be done in this respect.
- Several Stakeholders were confident that the monitoring that already takes place is adequate to the needs. On the other hand, other respondents believed that more could be done to monitor needs, including:
 - Employing a Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer;
 - Use of the common welfare form;
 - Education regarding health awareness; and
 - Better liaison between partners (a multi-agency approach).

- Challenges to monitoring were acknowledged because of the unwillingness of some housed (bricks and mortar) Travellers to self-identify, and the nomadic lifestyles of others especially when in unauthorised encampments. *In order to identify the needs of a community, one needs to know the population/demographics of that community, where they are, who they are and have a line of communication with them - very little of this exists. There is knowledge in authorities of where there are sites, but there an unknown number of Gypsies and Travellers in bricks and mortar who do not identify due to real or anecdotal experiences of inequality and so monitoring systems cannot be put into place until there is a positive environment created where community members feel safe in identifying their ethnicity and know they will be supported appropriately once they have.*

D.7 *In your opinion, what additional support is most needed to help Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople families living within the area(s) in which you work? What could be done to improve the current position?*

- Many Stakeholders were unsure.
- Several commented on the need for more sites, particularly additional transit sites or stopping-off points.
- In terms of additional support, it was proposed that a formal council policy for supporting Travellers should be adopted; that Information Sharing Protocols be developed; that cultural training be undertaken by both agency staff and elected members; that a social marketing campaign be undertaken to change public perception; and that more funding be made available.

D.8 *Appropriate cultural training (with LOCAL community input wherever this is possible), is key for both front-line agency staff and for elected members, leads within CCG groups, as well as for cultural champions and others with responsibility for equality monitoring. This alone will ensure that there is a better inclusion and awareness of need - including the need to consult properly from the development process into delivery. There needs to be an awareness of community development as a process of inclusion and empowerment for both the community and the local agencies they can then work with. Do you think that more could be done to monitor the provision of accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the Liverpool City Region? If so, what?*

- Many respondents were unaware of what monitoring is currently undertaken, so could not provide further comment. Some were happy with the existing monitoring.
- In terms of further monitoring, suggestions included the improved recording of Travellers who live in bricks and mortar accommodation by social housing providers.
- *Monitoring the provision of accommodation should be undertaken along with the needs of other community housing assessments- to keep setting the community apart is to say that they have different needs - they don't and it allows settled communities to go on seeing the Traveller communities as separate different and "not like us"- accommodation is the key issue - and whilst the needs are perceived by the settled community as different then there will never be parity for the Travelling communities. There also needs to*

be a regional approach to accommodation for all people but where nomadism is part of the culture, it makes more sense to look at the travel needs as well as just the needs for sites. Local authorities could still work better together, in a more cohesive way - this would support the nomadic habit of life and allow for the sharing of information to support any vulnerable members of the community who often slip through the net.

D.9 *In your opinion, what additional support is most needed to help Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople families living within the area(s) in which you work?*

- *Multi Agency work is the best way forward, no one agency can provide for all needs of such excluded communities – support needs to be SMART and co-ordinated through a multi-agency approach. There needs to be joined up and planned inclusion work, appropriately funded, to develop real relationships, without which trust will not exist, and nor will any real positive change for Traveller and Gypsy communities. Outcomes need to be realistic and achievable for agencies undertaking such work, with long term funding written into strategies, and the key support for positive outcomes and all the resources that are required has to be enough suitable accommodation options, with proper on-going consultation with the local Traveller communities, so that local options AND regional need are all taken into consideration in site planning and development.*
- *Many Stakeholders were unable to comment. Issues identified were wide-ranging, including the following:*
 - *Developing more sites, including transit sites;*
 - *Facilitating child education (specifically Key Stage 3 level);*
 - *Employing health liaison workers;*
 - *Providing horse grazing land;*
 - *Reporting hate crime; and*
 - *Using a multi-agency approach.*

D.10 *Do you think that more could be done to raise awareness of the cultural, support and accommodation needs and requirements of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the Liverpool City Region? If so, what?*

- *Yes: Training for staff, particularly those elected members and others who are strategically planning and developing policies and procedures, community engagement, data collections/analysis, planning and environment, health and social care, health and wellbeing, clinical commissioning groups and staff who are front-line as well as community information, Gypsy Traveller Roma History Month activities, work with Residents groups and other community information made available, educational support for Traveller books in all schools - not only the schools that have Traveller children attending. Local authority websites need to set out clear information that is informative and supportive of ALL communities – not just information on how to report an encampment! Telephone complaints about Travellers from settled residents need to be informative and factual not emotive, and give clear and balanced information about equalities duties and homelessness. ICCM have worked on residents' group training and Elected members training in East and West Cheshire which has had very positive outcomes there with Local Authority Gypsy and Traveller staff. ICCM has chaired the Greater Merseyside Multi-*

Agency Gypsy and Traveller Network (GMMAGTN) for many years – this is a group of local authority and other statutory agencies i.e. health, police, fire and rescue service representatives, who's roles mean that they are working with Traveller communities across Merseyside and including Halton, which serves to provide information through speakers, and share space for information sharing across the sub-region. There are no resources other than those of ICCM which facilitate this group, the Chair is the Deputy Director/Irish Traveller Service manager, Administration is ICCM administrator. It would be a great resource to be able to undertake on-going work with this group in a more strategic, planned way which would require resources for developing that.

- Some respondents were unsure or unable to comment. Others considered that more could be done, including the following comments:
 - Community and cultural events, as roadshows or drop-in sessions;
 - Awareness as part of school education;
 - Training programmes for both decision-makers and agency staff, to address pre-conceptions and stereotypes.

D.11 *What action has your organisation undertaken to raise awareness of the cultural, support and accommodation requirements of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople locally?*

- *ICCM is an organisation which exists to identify and support the needs of Irish and Irish Traveller communities across Merseyside and the surrounding areas. We also work with other cultural Travellers, and provide support to Traveller communities with a number of services. We have Drop In times in Wirral Liverpool and Wigan (and there was a Tuesday Drop In at the Civic Centre, Ellesmere Port up until the end of April 2013), within which we offer a Care of Address policy/procedure for holding mail so that highly mobile and vulnerably accommodated people can sign up to access their communications – to support our Service Users with their Article 8 rights. We have a Service User Forum which usually has 50% Traveller representation and who look at our services and policies/procedures to ensure fit for purpose. We offer services via Prison in-reach and outreach work, employ staff who work with mental health, drugs/alcohol and homelessness issues, Irish and UK Benefits workers, hospital and other outreach visits. We sit on Mental Health Fora, and support the inclusion of our communities into all engagement processes. ICCM has contracts with Supporting People in Liverpool and Wirral – in Wirral it includes providing floating support to housed Travellers and work with Wirral Borough Council staff for encampment welfare needs assessments, on LA land and are working alone to identify need on private site encampments. We work with housed, sited and unauthorised encamped families/communities/individuals, and those estranged from the community too. ICCM sits on the Wirral Task Group for Gypsies and Travellers working to support the development of policies and Procedures for Gypsies and Travellers in Wirral. We Chair and administrate the GMMAGTN, deliver training to agencies and across local Universities, having Social Worker students on placement from JMU, Hope University and Chester University, providing them with experience across all areas of community engagement. We were key to developing a piece of work within*

the Safe Network research of 2011, with a number of Gypsies and Travellers who designed a cultural competency wheel in the vein of the Tilki/Popodopoulous wheel, which is shared through training delivery to professionals and students who will engage with Traveller communities. We have worked with Cheshire staff to deliver Gypsy and Traveller awareness training with residents groups in Ellesmere Port, and with various elected members training groups. ICCM sits on Welfare Organisations Committee (WOC), Wirral Equalities Health Action Group(WEHAG), Supporting People in Liverpool (SPiL) groups, and have just completed a training contract with partner agencies to deliver cultural awareness training to health staff in Wirral, offering 10 training events and have been a key deliverer for a Women's health event in Ellesmere Port, linking 12 local Traveller women in that area into health agencies, education agencies, police and community activities going forward (on a freezing cold and snowy day). We are speaking soon at the newly created Crime Reduction Forum in Liverpool about the work we do around hate crime and community support, also a group we sit on, ICCM also sits on the Independent Advisors Group to Merseyside Police, and we accessed funding for one Hate Crime on Trial event and supported Gypsy and Traveller engagement at another event in 2011. We also are signed up to and attend the MARAC protocols in Wirral. I was a rep for ICCM on the last NW RSS partial review /GTAA regional steering group, and we supported community engagement into the processes across all local authority areas we work in. ICCM promoted the inclusion in local media and at community events of both Irish and our Traveller community Service Users into the 2011 Census, across all areas of our work, and all our Traveller service users at that time were represented within the Census. ICCM works locally regionally and nationally at grass roots and strategic levels to ensure that the voices of our communities are heard within policy development, ICCM sits on the Federation Of Irish Societies Policy Action Group, works very closely with Irish Traveller Movement in Britain, and other Gypsy and Traveller groups on 2 key strategies; Department of Health Health Innovation Fund project to look at Gypsy and Traveller inclusion into health and DCLG Gypsy and Traveller Stakeholder group. We are also a co-opted group onto the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups. Travellers are supported to engage directly and we also raise issues on their behalf where attendance is not possible.

- Of the responses received, many reported that little action had been undertaken to raise awareness, and some did not know whether action had been undertaken or not. Additional comments included local examples:
 - Setting up of an internal Task Group to ensure all Council departments are aware of requirements;
 - Diversity courses for professional staff;
 - Cultural awareness training to schools, colleges and universities;
 - Showcase event of cultural activities in Plaza Cinema; and
 - Open Days at Wallasey Town Hall.

Provision of Accommodation

D.12 *Do you think that there is currently sufficient or insufficient provision of permanent sites/pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople across the Liverpool City Region? Why do you think this?*

- Of those who did respond, a significant number were not aware of either demand or supply, so were unable to comment further.
- The majority of respondents who did make comment believed that there are insufficient sites/pitches. Lack of funding was noted as a reason. Local resident resistance was also mentioned.
- *Insufficient: There have been no additional pitches developed since the last GTAA process which recommended (only baseline minimal figures) increases / new pitches for all areas within Liverpool City Region. No local authority has complied with DCLG's "Planning policy for traveller (sic) sites" within the last year, which was issued 27th March 2012 and is now fully operational from 27th March 2013. Wirral still does not have an operational policy and procedure for Gypsies and Travellers and there is no consistency to local authority web site information. There is a distinct fear of offending the settled communities locally which are, at least the ones who speak out - in my experience, completely negative about the development of Gypsy and Traveller sites, and there is no leadership support from any authority to challenge the negative stereotypes, support cohesion and the Equalities Act / Human Rights Act, which local authorities have a duty to promote.*

D.13 *If new permanent sites/pitches are needed, where do you think that these should be located? What are your reasons for identifying this locality?*

- Several Stakeholders commented on the need for provision in Wirral, where there are no existing authorised sites. One suggested that a good location would be land bordered by Wallasey Bridge Road/A5139 (Wallasey Docks Link Road) as it would serve as a transit area for those seeking access to Irish Ferries.
- One respondent reported that St Helens received £1.5m to build a transit site but this has not yet been developed.
- Another respondent suggested that a site in the Bootle area could be beneficial.
- *I feel that new permanent pitches need to be developed through community consultation. Each local authority's Gypsy and Traveller communities have their own needs and are distinct to each area, family, community. There does however need to be recognition of community places and spaces, of familial and extended family links, which will also affect the need for transit provision, and also the needs of housed families need to be taken into consideration, as there are two areas within the research region which have no current site provision, but effort needs to be made to access opinions of those who may be harder to reach, and advice from other than local authority officers /data about need.*

D.14 *What do you perceive to be the main barriers to new provision?*

- *Key barriers are the unwillingness of the local authority to provide the pitches whilst it is not seemingly the will of the local settled community, particularly pressure groups that are created to oppose the development. What this does however is intimidate the settled community who are more supportive of local site development and therefore suppresses more than the opportunity of the Traveller community to have suitable accommodation to meet their needs, it silences free speech and equality. Another barrier is the lack of information and training for staff in statutory roles in dealing with and responding to negativity and racism, there is also a lack of positive images of Travellers and their cultures in the general community, this means that the negative media has no challenge and settled communities have no real understanding of exactly what a site in their area means;*
- Site availability;
- Cost, lack of funding;
- Prejudice, stigma;
- Local opposition by public,
- Lack of political will;
- Perception that there is no demand;
- Planning laws and policies.

D.15 *Do you think that transit sites are needed? If so, why, and where do you think these should be located? Please note: Transit provision is a pitch or site intended for short-term use whilst in transit; such provision is usually permanent and authorised, but there is a limit on the length of time that residents can stay there.*

- Yes they are: There are very few across the Liverpool City region, the best areas must be identified by the communities themselves, although there needs to be a cohesive approach across the region so that people do not have to travel too far to access transit sites or they will not be populated and effective. We are talking about nomadic communities with different needs who travel for work, family and cultural reasons, there are key areas in the region, that need to be considered, road networks for work access, routes for access to travel to Ireland and Wales, family sites already established – all of these will have an effect on the placing of any transit sites.
- There was an overall agreement amongst stakeholders that more transit sites are needed. Locations suggested were those which have experienced unauthorised sites in recent years, including:
 - Wirral;
 - Knowsley;
 - Sefton, probably around the Crosby area; and
 - Specifically, off the A41 to facilitate those travelling to Ireland.

D.16 *What do you perceive to be the main barriers to new provision?*

- Site availability;
- Cost, lack of funding;
- Prejudice, stigma;

- Local opposition by public,
- Lack of political will;
- Perception that there is no demand;
- Planning laws and policies;
- I think that the barriers are the same – settled communities in my experience have absolutely no idea of the difference in definitions of site provision, transit, permanent or unauthorised encampment – and that is where good and balanced information is key.

D.17 *Are you aware of any Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople living in bricks and mortar accommodation? How is this?*

- Some respondents answered negatively and were not aware of Travellers living in bricks and mortar accommodation.
- The majority of Stakeholders were aware that some Travellers live in bricks and mortar accommodation. For some, this was via a general awareness through training, media, etc.
- Other Stakeholders had a more specific awareness, some because of their direct role in having contact with Traveller families. Some because of anecdotal evidence, such as: households being rehoused; a family building a home; families known to local partner agencies such as Irish Community Care Merseyside, families known to the Education Department; and allegations of hate crimes.
- *Yes: they are our service users, and we have anecdotal evidence of other Travellers and during our research document for Wirral we were approached by Travellers living in bricks and mortar, in Wirral, who we had no previous links with.*

D.18 *Do you think that additional provision of sites/pitches needs to be made to accommodate the requirements of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople currently living in settled (i.e. bricks and mortar) accommodation across the Liverpool City Region?*

- The majority of respondents did not know.
- A few stakeholders commented that there are probably some Traveller families who live in bricks and mortar accommodation due to lack of appropriate site provision and would prefer to live in caravans. However, it was also acknowledged that some Traveller families are happy to live in permanent housing.
- *The needs of housed Travellers are often the least considered, by local authorities, many have experienced hate crimes, stereotyping or racism and so do not identify as Traveller to agencies. House dwelling is often not the accommodation of first choice, and so negative impacts on health (mental and physical) are greater for housed Travellers. Many Travellers are only in housing until the local authority they reside in develops new site provision.*

D.19 *If you provide accommodation, how many Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople households have approached you for housing or for housing related*

support during the past five years? Of these households, how many wanted a pitch on a site and how many wanted bricks and mortar accommodation?

- Of the respondents who answered this question, the majority noted that they did not know, or that it was not applicable to them (not within their remit). A couple of respondents said that they have not had any direct approaches.
- In terms of other comments, a number of other respondents cited examples of a number of direct approaches for pitches on sites across Sefton, St Helens and Wirral.

D.20 *In terms of existing sites, what are your views on the standard of facilities on sites in your area?*

- Many of the Stakeholders said that this question was not applicable, as there are no sites in their area.
- ICCM noted that site standards are variable, with the best facilities on local authority sites.
- There were several comments relating to Broad Lane, Sefton, suggesting that the facilities are not adequate, particularly in terms of space, utility block facilities and hot water flow. There are funds to improve facilities and extend the site with an additional four pitches.
- Other respondents noted that the Council-owned sites in St Helens are well maintained by the Traveller Liaison Officer, with good facilities. Other private sites in St Helens are also of a good standard in terms of amenities and facilities, although some are not in the best locations (e.g. next to tip, hard to access, etc). It was noted that there are some vacant sites in the locality also which are not being looked after.
- The standards at Formby were considered to be adequate.
- In Liverpool, one Stakeholder noted that the “sheds” are poor, small, damp and cold. The site a long way from main road and bus route, with a garage as the nearest shop. Another respondent from Liverpool considered that the facilities are generally good, but could be improved by better landscaping.
- *Site standards are variable, the best facilities are on the local authority sites, they have the best multi-agency working too, there are huge variations in private site provision standards and there is very little that can be done currently to ensure that there are quality assurance for facilities on private sites and control of who can manage them.*

D.21 *Do you have any views on how existing sites in your area are managed?*

- *As stated above, local authority sites have good standards of management generally; the GMMAGTN is a useful group to facilitate communication between local authorities and site managers/GTLOs. The Traveller communities we work with, not living on private sites currently are fearful of Travellers managing sites, some have been in that position, but others are worried about what they have heard described. The majority of all our Service Users have stated that they prefer local authority landlords due to fairness in administration of sites or they would wish to be in small family sites that are easier for them to manage.*

- There were only a few comments received. One respondent noted that local authority sites have good standards of management. Specific comments also included:
 - In St Helens, there is a dedicated manager who assists many family members with accommodation and other needs. The private sites are owned by individual families who manage their own sites.
 - The site in Sefton was considered to be well managed, with dialogue possible and low crime levels.
 - In Liverpool, a range of issues and challenges are well managed.

D.22 *On existing sites in your area, are you aware of any issues/tensions between Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and the settled community, and if so what have steps have you taken to address these?*

- There were a few responses to this question, some not certain and some not aware of any issues. A few respondents were aware of tensions, but most of these tensions were between the community, rather than between Travellers and the settled community.
- *There are less tensions when a site has a stable community – this is understandable, the settled community and Traveller community get to know each other and fear decreases – this has occurred on all sites, but there are more tensions if new people arrive – a key point of consideration for the placing of transit sites – and where there is a high turnover of settled community too. We have had increases of hate crime linked directly to Big Fat Gypsy Wedding – recorded to police and have resulted in a vulnerable single parent Mum and four children being re-housed (from bricks and mortar to bricks and mortar) out of the immediate area.*

D.23 *Is there sufficient support available to Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople living in settled accommodation to help them manage their housing effectively (i.e. help in dealing with practical tenancy issues, such as paying rent, bills and making benefit applications)?*

- The overall feeling was that sufficient support is available to Travellers. ICCM provide floating support in some districts. Other councils have their own designated officers (e.g. Traveller Liaison Officer in St Helens; a Support Officer for Broad Lane in Sefton; and a commissioned Support provider in Wirral).
- *Support is much more available around sites – multi agency working is much easier to co-ordinate, need more readily identified and services are much more easily delivered. ICCM has two Supporting People contacts in the region: 20 units of floating support in Liverpool and work with housed Travellers – floating support and delivering support to unauthorised encamped families in Wirral, and undertaking the welfare needs assessment process with local authority officers. I feel that this misses out all but the most vulnerable and that there are many Travellers that we are still not reaching. ICCM is the only community organisation working with Irish and Irish Traveller/other Traveller communities within Merseyside.*

D.24 *Do Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople living in settled accommodation feel safe and are their specific cultural needs considered by the local authority when offering conventional accommodation?*

- Of the limited responses received, most Stakeholders did not know.
- One respondent stated that the majority of housed families do not feel safe – many have had anti-social behaviour accusations and complaints made against them that on investigation have proved to be erroneous. In Wirral research identified that 100% of participants did not identify as Travellers, and only use their prefix cultural identifier (ie Irish, Scottish or Welsh); 47% had in the past identified as Traveller, but no longer chose to do so due to negative experiences.
- One respondent stated that families are usually forced into housing due to a lack of pitch provision.
- Another respondent made the observation that rehousing into settled accommodation is through the Choice Based Lettings system and therefore any household chooses their accommodation.
- *The offer of bricks and mortar accommodation (the term conventional is confusing – trailers are conventional to the Travelling community – what does the definition you are using actually identify?) usually in the vast majority of cases suggests that there is no culturally appropriate accommodation available - or that is it not suitable for some reason. This suggests that specific cultural needs are not considered. The majority of our housed families do not feel safe – many have had anti-social behaviour accusations and complaints made that have proven on investigation by landlord/housing officer or police to be erroneous. In our Wirral Community research 100% of participants now do not identify as Traveller, using only their prefix cultural identifier, Irish, Scottish or Welsh, without the Traveller identifier added, though 47% have in the past identified as Traveller, but choose not to due to their experience of when they did. There are huge variations of standards of cultural support in ICCM's experience – often based upon the individual worker rather than any organisational ethos, which is a lack of training and professionalism given that Gypsies and Irish Travellers have had ethnicity recognition in the UK since 2000.*

D.25 *If you are a local housing authority, how many unauthorised encampments do you have each year in your area? Please note: An unauthorised encampment refers to land where Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople reside in vehicles or tents without permission. Unauthorised encampments can occur in a variety of locations and constitute trespass. The 1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act made it a criminal offence to camp on land without the owner's consent.*

- A number of respondents identified unauthorised encampment activity.
- In St Helens it was noted that there have been very few unauthorised encampments in recent years, but that there have been a number of unauthorised developments.

D.26 *Are unauthorised encampments problematic for your organisation? If so, how?*

- There was a mixture of responses to this question, in terms of stakeholders who do not experience any problems and those who noted specific problems arising, including the following:
 - Resource-intensive, taking up officer time and costing money.
 - Some cases of criminal damage, disorder and other incidents.
- It was noted that much depends on the location of encampments in terms of problems arising.
- *No: ICCM supports Gypsies and Travellers on unauthorised encampments across the region, and have robust lone working and risk assessment policies and procedures.*

D.27 *How do unauthorised encampments affect local perceptions?*

- Responses to this question suggested that unauthorised encampments generally reflect negatively on the perception of Traveller communities by local residents, councillors or the police/other authorities. One respondent commented that unauthorised encampments are often the only experience the settled community has of Travellers. This reinforces the stereotypes people have - of rubbish left around and people not paying their way.
- Negative perceptions are more likely in residential locations. Local communities are less concerned when encampments occur in non-residential or industrial locations.
- Complaints are often received when caravans are parked in beauty spots or recreational areas.
- Local perceptions are adversely affected when rubbish is left behind and an increase in crime or antisocial behaviour is experienced.
- Local communities and businesses can feel vulnerable and intimidated by unauthorised encampments.
- *Unauthorised encampments are often the only experience the settled community has of Travellers. They reinforce all the stereotypes of rubbish left around and people not paying their way. They are utilised by the media to challenge authorities and their politics, and to scaremonger within communities, there is never any balanced reporting where Travellers are spoken with and their comments reported, bias in reporting is also evident when new sites/pitches are reported – that’s never a positive thing either! Local perceptions are therefore vulnerable to this bias and this can lead to hate crime and antisocial behaviour against Travellers. Community cohesion will never develop whilst there are no managed sites, be they permanent or transit, nor any information about the benefits of managed sites. The local authority has a duty of care to support their Traveller communities, and where this does happen there can be very positive outcomes, where the local authority does not support Travellers in encampments this also creates social disaffection for the Travellers who see the local authority as unwelcoming and unsupportive so they will be less likely to co-operate when engaged.*

Planning

D.28 *To date, what if anything has hampered provision of new sites/pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the Liverpool City Region? What steps could be taken to address these issues in the future?*

- Of the responses received, there were a number of issues identified that stakeholders felt had hampered provision. These included the following:
 - Funding limitations,
 - Green Belt,
 - Lack of identification of the issue,
 - Lack of robust evidence of need, and
 - Changes in the planning system.
- In terms of the future, it was noted that research is underway (namely the GTAA) to provide evidence and understanding of the issues so that site allocations can be made in the future, if and where necessary.

D.29 *Do you think that more could be done to identify and bring forward new sites for the provision of pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople? If so, what?*

- Of the few Stakeholders who responded to the question, the overall feeling was that more could probably be done.
- The importance of establishing robust evidence of need, through the GTAA, was emphasised by several respondents.
- *The local plan has to be central to all development now – including identifying land for sites and ensuring future planning is written into the rolling process. Authorities have to do more than look at their maps and state that they own no land – within the Wirral area for example when a local community was fearful that land would be developed as a site, the local authority helped the community to purchase it – the message was loud and clear about Gypsy and Traveller need for that community. Land must be looked at within the area to meet local need but also a sub-regional/regional approach has to be sensible, and also with respect to the other local authorities around that – and to engage with Gypsies and Travellers to help them to identify and provide for their own need (para 4 bullet point 5 page 1).*

D.30 *What impact do you think that the Government's recent change to planning policy (set out in CLG's publication 'Planning Policy for traveller sites', 23 March 2012) will have on future provision?*

The key points made in the Policy guidance are:

- *that local planning authorities should make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning*
- *to ensure that local planning authorities, working collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites*
- *to encourage local planning authorities to plan for sites over a reasonable timescale*

- *that plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development*
 - *to promote more private traveller site provision while recognising that there will always be those travellers who cannot provide their own sites*
 - *that plan-making and decision-taking should aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments and make enforcement more effective*
 - *for local planning authorities to ensure that their Local Plan includes fair, realistic and inclusive policies*
 - *to increase the number of traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply*
 - *to reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities in plan-making and planning decisions*
 - *to enable provision of suitable accommodation from which travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure*
 - *for local planning authorities to have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.*
- Where respondents made a comment on this question, there was in many cases a positive view of the policy, and an expectation that it would result in making adequate provision where there is an identified need. This often included an acknowledgement of the requirement for robust evidence in the planning process, and a hope that this would have the effect (where need is identified) of land being allocated and sites delivered.
 - The importance of the planning system was acknowledged, and the policy was considered to raise awareness of Traveller issues, acting as a reminder that plans need to consider the needs of communities, weighed up against local issues and objections.
 - One respondent was concerned that there is no express requirement to consult and involve Traveller communities themselves in assessments and the planning process. Another respondent noted that if no-one is advocating on behalf of this client group then councils may be able to ignore their requirements.
 - *This document offers the opportunity to fairly implement accommodation strategies in parity with the settled community. Using Evidence p2 para 6 is a set of straightforward guidelines which allow for a positive planning strategy, there will be resources needed to engage as much Traveller/Authority engagement in the region is based solely around the local authority owned site (if such exists) and is therefore not fully reflective of all local need. Real engagement takes time and resources, good staff and training to bring about positive outcomes for all, currently there are few vehicles within authorities i.e. community stakeholder groups that exist to take this work forward with any rapidity. Plan B outlines with clarity the processes involved, they are clear and straightforward, with SMART outcomes, so that if all authorities in the region comply Travellers will be able to know what is happening much more clearly. Hopefully this process will enable a less head-to-head adversarial approach to site planning, if there are the resources to ensure this.*

D.31 *Are there any cross-boundary issues in respect of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople that need to be considered as part of this study?*

- *The key issues are that most Travellers do move across local authority boundaries, and therefore working together cohesively is imperative for joined up thinking, planning and delivery of need. There are families who do not get on and whilst site development is so under the numbers required there needs to be attention paid to the opinions of Travellers and a risk assessment undertaken when families say they cannot co-exist. This will support the trust relationships that are required, although the decisions will be supportable by the risk assessment processes. Hopefully all local authorities will utilise the same paperwork and communications protocols to ensure there are no gaps.*
- There were a few comments received regarding cross-boundary issues. These included:
 - An acknowledgement by several respondents that most Travellers do move across local authority boundaries. Working together cohesively is therefore imperative for joined up thinking, planning and delivery of need.
 - There are links that should be made to the other sub-regional assessments that are currently underway, eg. Cheshire.
 - Travelling routes across the region should be considered, and how the groups are linked.

Other Issues

D.32 *What do you see as the key issues affecting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople living in the study area?*

- Perception/ignorance/stigma of Travellers.
- Lack of site provision generally.
- Lack of transit sites (particularly in Wirral).
- Reluctance of local authorities to compulsory purchase where necessary to develop sites.
- Access to services, including health (maternity) and housing options for future needs.
- Child education (particularly 11 years+).
- Community safety and resolving tensions (particularly in St Helens).
- *Key issues are lack of options, land priced out of communities' range, and a reluctance to compulsory purchase by local authorities where necessary to develop sites.*

D.33 *What would you want to see as the key strategic messages coming from the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment?*

- The GTAA should establish a clear need for increased site provision, including permanent pitches, transit sites and bricks and mortar accommodation. This should lead to the allocation of an appropriate number

of sites to meet identified need in suitable, appropriate and sustainable locations.

- Traveller communities should be involved in needs assessments and decision-making regarding their future.
- Continuation of public awareness and acceptance.
- One respondent was particularly keen to see positive messages regarding duty of care; also training and resources to support proper infrastructure developments across authorities. In addition, they would like to see the development of appropriate community engagement with Travellers in the region.
- *Positive messages re duty of care, training and resources to support proper infrastructure developments across authorities and to develop appropriate community engagement with Travellers in the region.*

D.34 *Are you interested in finding out more about this study and the work of the Steering Group in relation to the GTAA?*

- 29 respondents confirmed an interest.

Appendix E: Glossary of Terms

Caravans: Mobile living vehicles used by Gypsies and Travellers; also referred to as trailers.

CJandPOA: Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994; includes powers for local authorities and police to act against unauthorised developments.

CRE: Commission for Racial Equality.

CLG: Department for Communities and Local Government; created in May 2006. Responsible for the remit on Gypsies and Travellers, which was previously held by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (O.D.P.M.).

Gypsies and Travellers: Defined by CLG 'Planning policy for traveller sites' (March 2012) as 'Persons of nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such persons who on grounds only of their own or their family's or dependants' educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excluding members of an organised group of Travelling Showpeople or circus people travelling together as such.'

'Members of a group organised for the purposes of holding fairs, circuses or shows (whether or not travelling together as such). This includes such persons who on the grounds of their own or their family's or dependants' more localised pattern of trading, educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excludes Gypsies and Travellers as defined above.'

Irish Traveller: Member of one of the main groups of Gypsies and Travellers in England. Irish Travellers have a distinct indigenous origin in Ireland and have been in England since the mid nineteenth century. They have been recognised as an ethnic group since August 2000 in England and Wales (O'Leary v Allied Domecq).

Mobile home: Legally a 'caravan' but not usually capable of being moved by towing.

Pitch: Area of land on a Gypsy/Traveller site occupied by one resident family; sometimes referred to as a plot.

Plot: see pitch

Roadside: Term used here to indicate families on unauthorised encampments, whether literally on the roadside or on other locations such as fields, car parks or other open spaces.

Romany: Member of one of the main groups of Gypsies and Travellers in England. Romany Gypsies trace their ethnic origin back to migrations, probably from India, taking place at intervals since before 1500. Gypsies have been a recognised ethnic group for the purposes of British race relations legislation since 1988 (CRE V Dutton).

Sheds: On most residential Gypsy/Traveller sites 'shed' refers to a small basic building with plumbing amenities (bath/shower, WC, sink), which are provided at the rate of one per plot/pitch. Some contain a cooker and basic kitchen facilities.

Showpeople: Defined by CLG 'Planning policy for traveller sites' (March 2012) as 'Members of a group organised for the purposes of holding fairs, circuses or shows (whether or not travelling together as such). This includes such persons who on the grounds of their own or their family's or dependants' more localised pattern of trading,

educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excludes Gypsies and Travellers as defined above.'

Site: An area of land laid out and used for Gypsy/Traveller caravans; often though not always comprising slabs and amenity blocks or 'sheds'. An authorised site will have planning permission. An unauthorised development lacks planning permission.

Slab: An area of concrete or tarmac on sites allocated to a household for the parking of trailers (caravans)

Stopping places: A term used to denote an unauthorised temporary camping area tolerated by local authorities, used by Gypsies and Travellers for short-term encampments, and sometimes with the provision of temporary toilet facilities, water supplies and refuse collection services.

Tolerated site: An unauthorised development/site where a Local Authority has decided not to take enforcement action to seek its removal.

Trailers: Term used for mobile living vehicles used by Gypsies and Travellers; also referred to as caravans.

Transit site: A site intended for short-term use while in transit. The site is usually permanent and authorised, but there is a limit on the length of time residents can stay.

Unauthorised development: Establishment of Gypsy and Traveller sites without planning permission, usually on land owned by those establishing the site. Unauthorised development may involve ground works for roadways and hard standings. People parking caravans on their own land without planning permission are not Unauthorised Developments in that they cannot trespass on their own land – they are therefore Unauthorised Developments and enforcement is always dealt with by local planning authorities enforcing planning legislation.

Unauthorised encampment: Land where Gypsies or Travellers reside in vehicles or tents without permission. Unauthorised encampments can occur in a variety of locations (roadside, car parks, parks, fields, etc.) and constitute trespass. The 1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act made it a criminal offence to camp on land without the owner's consent. Unauthorised encampments fall into two main categories: those on land owned by local authorities and those on privately owned land. It is up to the land owner to take enforcement action in conjunction with the Police.

Wagons: This is the preferred term for the vehicles used for accommodation by Showpeople.

Yards: Showpeople travel in connection with their work and therefore live, almost universally, in wagons. During the winter months these are parked up in what was traditionally known as 'winter quarters'. These 'yards' are now often occupied all year around by some family members.

Appendix F: Longer-term pitch requirement analysis

F.1 The approaches to calculating future household formation can be summarised as follows:

- **Approach 1:** Using demographic information and assuming a 100% household formation rate, i.e. assume that all children will form a household in the Local Authority when they reach 18;
- **Approach 2:** Using demographic information and assuming a 50% household formation rate, i.e. assume that half the children will form a household in the Local Authority when they reach 18; and
- **Approach 3:** Using a standard 3% annual growth rate across each Local Authority.

F.2 The main report details the results of Approach 1. The results from modelling alternative approaches are now presented.

Approach 1: 100% household formation rate

F.3 Approach 1 assumes that all people evidenced in Table 6.4 form new households within the study area and require a pitch. This analysis begins with the results of the analysis of pitch requirements for the period 2013/14 to 2017/18. For the period 2018/19, it is assumed that the baseline number of pitches increases to address the additional requirements for the 2013/14 to 2017/18 period and that the underlining trends in need from existing households remain constant (this means that assumptions regarding migration and the movement of existing households remains constant).

F.4 Approach 1 assumes the scale of household formation as set out in Table F.1

Table F.1 Scale of new household formation 2018/19 to 2027/28

| | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral |
|---|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|-----------------|----------|
| Time period | | | | | | |
| 2018/19-2022/23 people likely to form emerging households | 1 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 1 |
| 2023/24-2027/28 people likely to form emerging households | 1 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 0 |
| Total | 2 | 0 | 16 | 14 | 8 | 1 |

F.5 The overall change in pitch requirements based on the 100% household formation approach is set out in Table F.2

Table F.2 Longer-term pitch requirements based on 100% household formation

| 2013/14 to 2017/18 | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
|--|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| Baseline authorised pitches | 14 | 0 | 18 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 83 |
| Total Need (row 5 of needs model) | 19 | 0 | 24 | 62 | 15 | 6 | 126 |
| Total Supply (row 9c of needs model) | 19 | 0 | 20 | 56 | 1 | 0 | 96 |
| Reconciling need and supply | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 30 |
| 2018/19-2022/23 | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
| Baseline authorised pitches (assuming previous 5 year shortfall is addressed) | 14 | 0 | 22 | 56 | 15 | 6 | 113 |
| 5 year turnover on revised authorised pitch figure | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 15 |
| Additional newly-forming need | 1 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 23 |
| Reconciling need and supply | -4 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| 2023/24-2027/28 | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
| Baseline authorised pitches (assuming previous 10 year shortfall is addressed) | 14 | 0 | 28 | 57 | 18 | 7 | 124 |
| 5 year turnover on revised authorised pitch figure | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| Additional newly-forming need | 1 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 18 |
| Reconciling need and supply | -4 | 0 | 4 | -1 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| | | | | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
| Total net need 2013/14 to 2027/28 | -8 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 20 | 7 | 39* |

**The Merseyside and West Lancashire totals are inclusive of the negative figures for Liverpool and hence are net totals and will be different if Liverpool's oversupply is exceeded. This will not alter recommendations for others districts who should meet their own needs*

F.6 Analysis using Approach 1 (100% household formation rate) suggests a total additional net pitch requirement of 39 across the study area over the fifteen year period 2013/14 to 2027/28.

Approach 2 50% household formation rate

F.7 Approach 2 assumes a 50% household formation rate s set out in Table F.3. All other assumptions regarding the approach are the same as for Approach 1.

Table F.3 Scale of new household formation 2018/19 to 2027/28

| Time period | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral |
|-------------------------------|-----------|----------|--------|------------|-----------------|--------|
| 2018-2022 emerging households | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 2023-2027 emerging households | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Total | 2 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 1 |

F.8 The overall change in pitch requirements based on the 50% household formation approach is set out in Table F.4

Table F.4 Longer-term pitch requirements based on 50% household formation

| 2013/14 to 2017/18 | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|------------|-----------------|----------|--------------------------------|
| Baseline authorised pitches | 14 | 0 | 18 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 83 |
| Total Need (row 10 of needs model) | 19 | 0 | 24 | 62 | 15 | 6 | 126 |
| Total Supply (row 11 of needs model) | 19 | 0 | 20 | 56 | 1 | 0 | 96 |
| Reconciling need and supply | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 30 |
| 2018/19-2022/23 | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
| Baseline authorised pitches (assuming previous 5 year shortfall is addressed) | 14 | 0 | 22 | 56 | 15 | 6 | 113 |
| 5 year turnover on revised authorised pitch figure | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| Additional newly-forming need | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 13 |
| Reconciling need and supply | -4 | 0 | 2 | -3 | 1 | 1 | -3 |
| 2023/24-2027/28 | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
| Baseline authorised pitches (assuming previous 10 year shortfall is addressed) | 14 | 0 | 24 | 56 | 16 | 7 | 117 |
| 5 year turnover on revised authorised pitch figure | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| Additional newly-forming need | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| Reconciling need and supply | -4 | 0 | 1 | -4 | 1 | 0 | -6 |
| | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
| Total net need 2013/14 to 2027/28 | -8 | 0 | 7 | -1 | 16 | 7 | 21 |

F.9 Analysis using Approach 2 (50% household formation rate) suggests a total additional net pitch requirement of 21 across the study area over the fifteen year period 2013/14 to 2027/28.

Approach 3 3% annual growth rate

F.10 CLG guidance suggests using a 3% growth rate to assess longer-term pitch requirements. The following table assumes the growth of households assuming a baseline position of one household per pitch. This modelling suggests a longer-term requirement of 35 pitches across the study area

Table F.5 Modelling of future pitch requirements using 3% household growth rate

| 2018/19-2022/23 | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
|--|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| At end 2017/18 (assumes new pitches developed) | 14 | 0 | 22 | 56 | 15 | 6 | 113 |
| Pitch requirements after 5 yrs to 2022/23 | 16 | 0 | 25 | 65 | 17 | 7 | 130 |
| Additional need | 2 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 17 |
| Turnover on authorised pitches | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| Reconciling need and supply | -3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| 2023/24-2027/28 | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
|---|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| At end 2022/23 | 14 | 0 | 22 | 58 | 16 | 7 | 117 |
| Pitch requirements after 5 yrs to 2027/27 | 16 | 0 | 27 | 67 | 20 | 8 | 138 |
| Additional need | 2 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 19 |
| Turnover on authorised pitches | 5 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Reconciling need and supply | -3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| Total net need 2013/14 to 2027/28 | -6 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 18 | 8 | 35 |
|--|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|

Conclusion

F.11 Three approaches to assessing longer-term pitch requirements have been presented. Each approach uses the same baseline information derived for the five year period 2013/14 to 2027/28 and the results of each approach are summarised in Table F.6

Table F.6 Overall pitch requirements 2013/14 to 2027/28

| Approach | Liverpool | Knowsley | Sefton | St. Helens | West Lancashire | Wirral | Merseyside and West Lancashire |
|---|-----------|----------|--------|------------|-----------------|--------|--------------------------------|
| Approach 1: all households emerge | -8 | 0 | 14 | 6 | 20 | 7 | 39 |
| Approach 2: 50% of children emerge to form new households | -8 | 0 | 7 | -1 | 16 | 7 | 21 |
| Approach 3: CLG assumption of 3% growth in households living on pitches each year | -6 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 19 | 8 | 35 |