

Executive Summary

**Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs
assessment for the Nottinghamshire local authorities
of:**

Ashfield

Broxtowe

Gedling

Mansfield

Newark & Sherwood

Nottingham City

Rushcliffe BC

With assistance from the East Nottinghamshire Travellers Association

May 2007

Document control sheet

Client	Newark & Sherwood DC
Document Title	Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs assessment for Ashfield DC, Broxtowe BC, Gedling BC, Mansfield DC, Newark & Sherwood DC, Nottingham City, Rushcliffe BC
Version	09
Status	Final
Reference	SH mc S\C&T\Notts GT\Final Report\Executive Summary 17345
Author	Stephen Hills
Date	May 2007
Further copies from	email: documents@tribalgroup.co.uk quoting reference and author

Quality assurance by:	
-----------------------	--

Document history			
Version	Date	Author	Comments
9	May 2007	Stephen Hills	Executive Summary only of Final Report

Contact details			
Main point of contact	Telephone number	Email address	Postal address
Stephen Hills	07866 594361	stephen.hills@tribalgroup.co.uk	Tribal House Hawthorne Park Coal Road Leeds LS14 1PQ



Mansfield District Council
Creating a District where People can Succeed



supporting **people** partnership
in **Nottinghamshire**

Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment for the Nottinghamshire Local Authorities of Ashfield, Broxtowe, Gedling, Mansfield, Newark and Sherwood, Nottingham City, Rushcliffe.

In partnership with the East Nottinghamshire Traveller Association (ENTA)

Nottinghamshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodations Needs Assessment Steering Group Membership:

- Ashfield District Council
- Broxtowe Borough Council
- Gedling Borough Council
- Newark and Sherwood District Council
- Nottingham City Council
- Nottinghamshire County Council
- Mansfield District Council
- Rushcliffe Borough Council
- Nottinghamshire Gypsy Liaison Group
- East Notts. Traveller Association (ENTA)
- Newark and Sherwood Primary Care Trust
- Nottingham City Council: Primary Care Trust
- Nottingham City Council: Nottingham Traveller Team
- Nottinghamshire County Council: Supporting People
- Notts. Race Equality Council
- Government Office for the East Midlands
- East Midlands Regional Assembly
- Nottinghamshire County Council: Traveller Education Service
- Nottinghamshire Rural Housing Enabler
- Newark and Sherwood Homes
- Ashfield Homes
- Floating Support Worker (Dedicated to Tolney Lane, Newark)

Contents

Executive summary..... 1

Figures

Table A - Local Authorities in the Study Area 1

Table B - Summary of overall site provision 2

Table C - Interview count of type of site and by district..... 2

Table D - Accommodation preferences 3

Table E - Summary of Gypsy and Traveller population figures 4

Table F - Summary of household numbers by Local Authority 4

Table G - Summary of extra provision required 5

Table H - Flow of need for new pitches 2007 – 2017..... 6

Executive summary

- Under section 8 of the Housing Act 1985 local authorities are required to consider the accommodation needs in their area and to carry out a periodic review of these needs. Section 225 of the Housing Act 2004 introduced a specific requirement for local authorities to assess the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers within their area. In response to this requirement, the authorities across the Nottinghamshire County (excluding Bassetlaw) jointly commissioned this work with the following aim:

“To understand the Accommodation Needs, and related support needs, of the Gypsy and Traveller community within Nottinghamshire in order to make a properly planned provision of sufficient and decent accommodation for this community, informing the allocation of new sites in both regional and local development documents. In addition, the Accommodation Needs assessment will provide robust and credible evidence in which the needs and wider demand of the Gypsy and Traveller communities for suitable accommodation can be considered and met equally and fairly alongside other sectors of the community.”

Table A - Local Authorities in the Study Area

Authority	Type of authority
Ashfield	District
Broxtowe	Borough
Gedling	Borough
Mansfield	District
Newark & Sherwood	District
Nottingham City	Unitary
Rushcliffe	Borough

- The focus of this study is to identify accommodation and support needs at a local and county level. It is intended that the findings will feed into the Local Development Framework process and the Regional Spatial Strategy process and the planning of site provision and services for Gypsies and Travellers.
- The requirements for the study have been set out in the project brief and include a requirement that the study be carried out in accordance with the relevant CLG guidance. This guidance, Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments, Draft practice guidance, was published in February 2006 by the then ODPM.
- The Tribal survey followed on from a snapshot survey carried out in the summer of 2006. Data from this Summer Survey has been used to supplement Tribal data throughout this report.
- The existing authorised provision for Gypsies and Travellers is as follows:

Table B - Summary of overall site provision

	Existing pitches occupied by Gypsies and Travellers ¹	Long term voids – not coming back into use	Current long term voids expected to come back into use	Pitches not available for Gypsy and Traveller use
Ashfield	21	0	19	0
Broxtowe	0	0	0	0
Gedling	13	0	0	0
Mansfield	0	0	0	0
Newark & Sherwood	72	70	21	168 ²
Nottingham City	44	0	0	0
Rushcliffe	4	0	0	0
Total	154	70	40	168

1 This includes use by Showpeople

2 128 pitches not treated as available for Gypsy and Traveller use and 38 currently in occupation but also not treated as available for use.

6. In addition to analysing a range of secondary data sources a survey was carried out with the following coverage.

Table C - Interview count of type of site and by district

District	Authorised sites	Housed	Unauthorised encampments	Unauthorised developments	Total
Ashfield	4	1	0	0	5
Broxtowe	0	4	0	0	4
Gedling	12	0	0	0	12
Mansfield	0	0	4	0	4
Newark and Sherwood	61	23	6	11	101
Nottingham City	30	22	3	0	55
Rushcliffe	3	3	1	0	7
TOTAL	110	53	14	11	188

7. Of those included in the sample 55% defined as English Gypsies (within this definition Tribal has also included people who described themselves as Romany), 27% were Irish Travellers and 18% fell into the “other category” which included some Scottish Travellers, Welsh Gypsies, Showpeople, one ‘new’ traveller and people who used a broad definition which did not allow us to make an assumption about which group they could fall within.
8. The majority of interviewees (77%) across all types of accommodation indicated that living on an authorised site was their preferred accommodation option. This concurs with figures from other studies, which have identified a preference for site based accommodation of between 70% and 80%.

Table D - Accommodation preferences

↓ Most appropriate accommodation for your household (1 st choice)	CURRENT ACCOMMODATION				TOTAL
	Authorised Development	Housing	Unauthorised Encampment	Unauthorised Development	
Permanent site	99	28	10	7	144
Authorised transit site	4	1	1		6
Housing (bricks and mortar)	5	20	1	2	28
Group housing	2	1	1		4
Other	1	3	1	1	5
TOTAL	111	53	14	10	188

9. The results of our survey indicate that 58% of people living on authorised sites have been there for three years or more. Many of those interviewed had lived in the local area for a considerable period. Overall 55% had lived in the local area for more than ten years.
10. The Tribal survey reveals a similar range of travelling patterns to that found in the Summer Survey. Of those households interviewed 49% had travelled in the last three years on a journey that required site accommodation. Of those that had travelled in the last three years 59% had travelled for three months or more and 18% had travelled for between four weeks and three months.
11. Estimating the total population is complex. The table below is a summary of the calculations made for this study:

Table E - Summary of Gypsy and Traveller population figures

Tenure	Estimated Households	Estimated Population	% of Gypsy and Traveller Population
Authorised Sites	154	508	34.3
Unauthorised Developments	52	172	11.6
Unauthorised Encampments	16	53	3.6
Housing	226	746	50.4
Total	448	1,479	100

12. At the local authority level this population breaks down as follows:

Table F - Summary of household numbers by Local Authority

Local Authority	Households on authorised sites	Households on unauthorised developments	Households on unauthorised encampments	Households in Housing	Total Households
Ashfield	21	0	3	24	48
Broxtowe	0	0	0	4	4
Gedling	13	0	0	13	26
Mansfield	0	0	3	3	6
Newark & Sherwood	72	52 ¹	4	128	256
Nottingham	44	0	3	47	94
Rushcliffe	4	0	3	7	14
Total	154	52	16	226	448

¹ Includes 38 households on an authorised site that is not solely for Gypsy and Traveller use

13. Demand is primarily for pitches in Newark and Sherwood. This is in part a consequence of people wishing to remain in the same district as they currently live and the higher numbers already prevalent in Newark and Sherwood. It should be noted that very few people expressed a desire to move out of the study area or between districts.
14. For many respondents there are difficulties in accessing services often due to the perceived prejudice of some service providers and sometimes due to their own lack of knowledge. There is reasonable access to health and education services but there seems to be much lower accessing of other support services. Those that do access wider services find them valuable and visiting services can help to overcome some of these barriers.
15. Those living on roadside encampments are least likely to access services and generally experience the poorest living conditions. Service providers need to think about how to make themselves more accessible to these groups.
16. The CLG guidance recommends that the calculation of pitch requirements is based upon five core variables:
 - Current Supply
 - Current Demand
 - Concealed Households
 - Transfers from Housing
 - Family Formation
17. Drawing on the CLG guidance this study has established the need for between 109 (using a study wide calculation) and 119 (using a council by council calculation) new permanent pitches to meet the current backlog and the needs of newly forming households over the next five years in the study area.
18. This need is broken down by each local authority area as follows:

Table G - Summary of extra provision required

District	Recommended Extra Pitch Provision 2007 – 2011
Ashfield	0
Broxtowe	2
Gedling	4
Mansfield	5
Newark & Sherwood	88
Nottingham	11
Rushcliffe	9
Total	119

19. A forward projection of these figures indicates that once the backlog is met the annual increase in demand can be met by an assumed turnover of 8%. On this basis new provision would only need to be considered in 20 – 25 years time.

Table H - Flow of need for new pitches 2007 – 2017

Year	Total No of HH	Total HH on site pitches	Backlog being met	New HH forming	New HH requiring pitches	New pitches needed
2007	448	154	0	13	9	0
2008	461	154	22	14	10	19
2009	475	173	21	14	10	17
2010	490	190	21	15	10	16
2011	504	207	21	15	11	15
2012	519	222	21	16	11	14
2013	535	236	21	16	11	13
2014	551	249	21	17	12	13
2015	568	262	21	17	12	12
2016	585	274	0	18	12	0
2017	602	274	0	18	13	0

20. There is some evidence of demand for a transit or emergency stopping site. However, the true extent of demand for this type of accommodation is not possible to determine whilst there is a large backlog of unmet need, including Gypsies and Travellers having to use roadside stopping places when they require permanent site accommodation.
21. The high numbers of long term voids on some sites highlights the fragile nature of relying solely on private provision to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers in the area. The survey found that almost 1 in 4 (24%) of respondents would prefer to live on a socially owned site. Thought should be given to establishing socially owned and run provision as part of the action plan to address the backlog needs identified by this study.
22. It is recommended that consideration is given to establishing a Gypsy and Traveller monitoring group based along the lines of the Steering Group established to oversee this project. This group would enable all districts within the study area to have a forum to work together and with the county and regional agencies where relevant. Such a group would also ensure consistency between this study and future studies.
23. It will be particularly important to monitor the progress of activity in regards to meeting the current backlog over the next nine years. It is therefore recommended that an update review be carried out in four years time and a full review five years later in 2015. Thereafter, a review can be carried out after six years (2021), assuming that satisfactory progress has been made, with a further full review in 2027.