East Surrey

Gypsy Traveller Needs Assessment

2006-2016

May 2007

Anglia Law School
East Surrey Gypsy Traveller Needs Assessment 2006-16

May 2007

Law School,
Anglia Ruskin University
Bishop Hall Lane
Chelmsford
Essex CM1 0SQ

01245 493131 ext 3349

Email of project leader: r.home@anglia.ac.uk
Project team and acknowledgments

Core team members: Dr Margaret Greenfields, Professor Rob Home, John Loveridge, Nick McWilliam, Rory O’Hara

Interviewers: Margaret Greenfields, Charmaine Haynes, Genty Lee, Breda Mahoney, Tom Sweeny, Charmaine Valler

We also wish to thank the following for their assistance: Alison Robinson, Jake Bowers
## CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ................................................................. 5
   1.1 Background .................................................................................. 5
   1.2 Sources of Data .............................................................................. 5
   1.3 Definitions ...................................................................................... 5
   1.4 Characteristics of East Surrey Gypsy/Traveller population .......... 5
   1.5 Population ...................................................................................... 6
   1.6 Travel Patterns ............................................................................... 6
   1.7 Employment ................................................................................... 6
   1.8 Health ............................................................................................. 7
   1.9 Education ....................................................................................... 7
   1.10 Accommodation Assessment – Current Provision ..................... 7
   1.11 Gypsies in Housing ........................................................................ 7
   1.12 Accommodation Preference and Overcrowding........................ 8
   1.13 Accommodation Assessment – Future Needs ............................. 8
   1.14 Gypsies and Travellers ................................................................. 8
   1.15 Travelling Showmen ..................................................................... 8

2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND ........................................... 9
   2.1 The brief ......................................................................................... 9
   2.2 National and legal background ...................................................... 9
   2.3 Sources .......................................................................................... 10

3. CHARACTERISTICS OF EAST SURREY GYPSY/TRAVELLER POPULATION ......................................................... 12
   3.1 Definitions ...................................................................................... 12
   3.2 Population ...................................................................................... 13
   3.3 Travel patterns ............................................................................... 14
   3.4 Employment ................................................................................... 19
   3.5 Health ............................................................................................. 20
   3.6 Education ....................................................................................... 22

4. ACCOMMODATION TYPES, CONDITION AND PREFERENCES .... 24
   4.1 Evidence from official counts ....................................................... 24
   4.2 Public sites ..................................................................................... 27
   4.3 Private authorized sites ................................................................. 28
   4.4 Unauthorised developments and encampments .......................... 28
   4.5 Transit sites ................................................................................... 29
   4.6 Gypsies in housing ........................................................................ 30
   4.7 Accommodation preferences ...................................................... 31
   4.8 Overcrowding ............................................................................... 31

5. ACCOMMODATION ASSESSMENT ................................................. 33
   5.1 Methodology .................................................................................. 33
   5.2 Policy implications ......................................................................... 35
   5.3 Travelling Showmen ...................................................................... 36
APPENDICES

A  District Assessments ........................................................................................................... 38
B  Selected references ........................................................................................................... 42
C  Survey methodology ......................................................................................................... 43
D  Survey questionnaire ......................................................................................................... 45

LIST OF TABLES

1  Change in caravan numbers, East Surrey Jan/July 1979-2005 ........................................ 15
2  Average caravan numbers, East Surrey 2002-2006 ....................................................... 24
3  Public Gypsy sites, East Surrey 2006 ............................................................................... 27
4  Private authorised Gypsy sites, East Surrey 2007 ........................................................... 28
5  Stated preference for more pitches .................................................................................. 32
6  Respondents reporting overcrowding ............................................................................. 32
7  East Surrey Gypsy Traveller Accommodation Needs 2006-2016 ................................... 35
8  Showman accommodation in East Surrey ...................................................................... 37

LIST OF FIGURES

1  January/July fluctuations in caravan numbers 1979-2005 ............................................... 16
2  Percentage variation in caravans January/July 1979-2005 ............................................. 17
3  January/July variations in total caravan numbers 1979-2005 ........................................ 18
4  Total caravan numbers, East Surrey districts 1979-2006 ............................................. 25
5  Caravan numbers by type of site East Surrey 1979-2006 .............................................. 26
6  Caravans by type of site, Epsom & Ewell 1979-2004 .................................................... 38
7  Caravans by type of site, Mole Valley 1979-2004 ........................................................... 39
8  Caravans by type of site, Reigate & Banstead 1979-2004 .............................................. 40
9  Caravans by type of site, Tandridge 1979-2004 .............................................................. 41

ABBREVIATIONS

ACERT  Advisory Council for the Education of Romanies and Other Travellers
BME  Black and Minority Ethnic
CRE  Commission for Racial equality
DCLG  Department for Communities and Local Government'
DfES  Department for Education & Skills
DH  Department of Health
GTAA  Gypsy Traveller Accommodation Assessment
ODPM  Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
RSL  Registered Social Landlord
TES  Traveller Education Service
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Background

1.1.1 This project assesses the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers in East Surrey. This area covers the districts of Epsom and Ewell, Reigate and Banstead, Mole Valley and Tandridge. The study was commissioned by a consortium of local councils and was undertaken by Anglia Ruskin University. The study includes an assessment of the need for both permanent and transit sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showmen, residing in or resorting to the area.

1.1.2 The assessment meets the requirements of the Housing Act 2004, and follows draft guidance issued by the then ODPM in February 2006. This guidance includes advice on using existing data sources and carrying out specialist surveys, and has a methodology for interpreting survey data and translating this into a pitch requirement for the area.

1.2 Sources of Data

1.2.1 The main source of data for the study was a survey of 108 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showmen households living both on sites and in housing. The interviews were undertaken by a supervised team of mainly Gypsies and Travellers between March and July 2006. The surveys provided data on 355 individuals.

1.2.2 The study also draws on a number of existing information sources including the official bi-annual caravan count, local data provided by the four districts, Surrey County Council, and the Strategic Assessment of Travellers’ Needs in Surrey undertaken by WS Planning in 2004, and other research undertaken about Gypsies and Travellers.

1.2.3 The survey asked questions about a range of related matters including ethnicity, family structure, travelling patterns, site conditions, current and future accommodation needs, health, education, and training and employment.

1.3 Definitions

1.3.1 The Government has undertaken a consultation (2006) on the statutory definition of ‘Gypsy’ for the purposes of the Housing Act 2004, recognising that somewhat different definitions may apply for housing and planning purposes. This study has used the definition set out in the Gypsy and Traveller and Accommodation Assessment Draft practice guidance (2006):

“Persons of a nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including such person who on grounds only of their own or their family’s or dependents’ education or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, and all other persons with a cultural tradition of nomadism and/or caravan dwelling”.

1.4 Characteristics of the East Surrey Gypsy/Traveller Population

1.4.1 The survey asked respondents to self identify under the following six categories: English Gypsies/Romanies, Irish Travellers, Showmen, new Traveller, Scottish Traveller-Gypsy and Other. The first three categories accounted for virtually all respondents, and gave a distribution of 77% English Gypsy, 12% Travelling Showmen and 10% Irish Traveller.

1.4.2 ODPM/DCLG guidance expects need to be assessed by ‘households’, which it equates to ‘residential site pitches’. The study found an average Gypsy / Traveller
household size of 3.3 persons per caravan, and 1.5 caravans per household. These varied slightly with different site types, age of respondent and ethnicity. National statistics for the majority white population of England (and East Surrey) produce an average size of 2.3 persons per household. Our survey found higher proportions of children and lower proportions of older people, reflecting higher birth rates and lower life expectancy respectively. Our survey included Showmen and found that they tend to have smaller households than the Gypsy/Traveller population, averaging 2.4 persons, and fewer children.

1.5 Population

1.5.1 The decennial national population Census does not identify Gypsies/Travellers as a separate racial group. The official caravan counts currently record some 14,000 Gypsy caravans in England, estimated to represent about 10,000 families, or up to 40,000 individuals. In the absence of Gypsy/Traveller data on births, marriages and deaths, it is difficult to apply normal population and household forecasting methods (e.g. components of change, household formation rates). Furthermore, the study population is small, mobile and shifting, creating further methodological difficulties.

1.5.2 East Surrey districts account for approximately 20% of the total recorded Surrey gypsy caravans (official counts), 55% of Showmen households (WS Planning 2004), and 25% of Surrey TES-supported children. We estimate the Gypsy/Traveller population (excluding Travelling Showmen) in East Surrey at about 300 in caravans, and a further 900 in housing.

1.6 Travel Patterns

1.6.1 Compared to the findings of other GTAAs, the East Surrey Gypsy and Traveller population appears relatively static and locally based. Of those responding, 65% had not been outside Surrey for more than a month in the past year. Some (mainly) older residents of local authority sites no longer owned a touring caravan. The highest proportion of touring caravans was found on unauthorised developments, and amongst Irish Travellers and Showmen.

1.6.2 As expected there is more travel during the summer months. Those that do travel generally do so in the South East of England, but some do travel all over the UK for work and horse fairs. A low proportion of respondents reported that their adult children still travelled (some 15% of those on sites, but only 3% of those in houses).

1.7 Employment

1.7.1 Most Gypsies/Travellers prefer self-employment, in such occupations as farm and land work, tree-lopping, vehicle trading, tarmacing, carpet-dealing and external building work. The study found the commonest types of work were landscaping/gardening, cleaning, and roofing/building. An increasing proportion of women found work outside the home, several respondents reported they were working in ‘cleaning’, teaching assistantships and shop work. Some respondents highlighted that their site address and low levels of literacy made it harder to find work.

1.8 Health

1.8.1 Travellers have health outcomes and status significantly poorer than that found in the lowest socio-economic group in the UK population. In contrast, Gypsies and Travellers in East Surrey have a relatively good health profile, particularly in
comparison to other GTAAS that we have undertaken with 43% of respondents reporting no health problems in the immediate family. This may reflect the settled nature of the population. All of those interviewed all were registered with a GP and the vast majority with a dentist.

1.8.2 We found that some health problems did exist but that these were more common within the housed population, possibly because poor health had led them to go into housing in the first place or conceivably because housing has a negative effect on the health of this group.

1.9 Education

1.9.1 Research nationally indicates that Gypsy and Traveller children are seriously disadvantaged in the education system, with low levels of attainment in GCSEs and the tendency to leave school early. There are some similarities in East Surrey with the national picture, but there was one strong contrast revealed by the survey; exceptionally high levels of school attendance. This suggests a good (and unusual) pattern of engagement with education, reflecting good work by the TES, and a relatively settled local Gypsy and Traveller community.

1.9.2 The survey found poor levels of adult literacy across all age ranges. Some positive responses were noted, with several adults reporting that they had remained in school until they had taken GCEs/GCSEs. Few respondents had undertaken post-school training. There was an interest in training for hairdressing, plumbing, business and work skills etc.

1.10 Accommodation Assessment – Current Provision

1.10.1 The study found a mixed provision for Gypsies and Travellers across East Surrey comprising both public and private sites, together with sites for Travelling Showmen. Some development was unauthorised, although the survey found no evidence to suggest that unlawful encampments occur in the study area with any degree of frequency.

1.10.2 Since 1979, the official six monthly caravan count shows that total numbers of caravans in East Surrey averaged between 120 and 140. East Surrey has nine public sites and eight small private Gypsy and Traveller authorised sites. Our survey confirms a relatively stable population on local authority sites. Of those responding, 78% had been on the site for more than two years and 39% for more than ten years.

1.10.3 There are no transit sites in East Surrey, although almost 60% of respondents indicated that they would use a network of transit sites if one existed, although they expressed no particular preference for location.

1.11 Gypsies in Housing

1.11.1 Our East Surrey survey located and interviewed 40 housed Gypsies/Travellers. They were mostly (95%) English Gypsies, and were distributed in ‘bricks-and-mortar’ accommodation as follows: local authority house/flat (55%), owner-occupied (32.5%) and the rest in social housing (registered social landlord). Of housed respondents, 41% had been in their accommodation more than 10 years, and the same percentage 3-10 years, and 58% said they intended to stay permanently.
1.12 Accommodation Preference and Overcrowding

1.12.1 Of 31 survey respondents seeking accommodation in the area, 21 wanted a caravan pitch, seven housing, and three had no preference. The preferred site solution was small, self-owned long-stay sites for family groups, with no specific geographical location proposed.

1.12.2 The assessment of current overcrowding in caravans is difficult, particularly because there is no official definition and only a limited amount of information could be collected. Our survey did ask views on overcrowding, and respondents raised a number of concerns such as the need for more space on plots for additional caravans, and the need for separate sleeping arrangements for boys and girls.

1.13 Accommodation Assessment – Future Needs

1.13.1 The overall purpose of the assessment is to bring the results of the questionnaire survey and secondary data together and to draw conclusions about the need for additional pitches in East Surrey for the period 2006-2011 with a projection for 2011 - 2016. Draft Government guidance sets out a step by step method for carrying out the assessment and bringing the information together. In following this method we have taken account of the existing supply of pitches and any new pitches that might gain permission in the next 12 months. We have also looked at the characteristics of the existing population, including overcrowding and likely family formation, as well as the extent of unauthorised developments in the study area.

1.13.2 The East Surrey survey separates out the needs of Gypsies and Travellers from Travelling Showmen. This was because of the different site needs associated with the latter group. Our overall conclusion is that there is a need for additional pitch provision for all groups over the next five years.

1.14 Gypsies and Travellers

1.14.1 Taking account of the estimated current shortfall of pitches, and the household growth expected over the period to 2011, our assessment indicates a need for an additional 36 useable pitches in East Surrey up to 2011.

1.14.2 Taking into account likely household growth over the five years from 2011 to 2016, we consider that there will be a further need for an additional 21 pitches in East Surrey, making a total of 57 over the period 2006 - 2011.

1.15 Travelling Showmen

1.15.1 With regard to Travelling Showmen we consider there is a need for up to an additional 9 pitches in East Surrey 2006-2011.
2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

2.1 The brief

2.1.1 The Housing Act 2004 (sec.225) imposes a new statutory requirement upon local authorities to produce a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Strategy, with a needs assessment (GTAA), for their areas. Such local needs assessments should provide a robust evidence base for future policy work, Local Development Schemes, Regional Spatial Strategies and planning appeals. Anglia Ruskin University has been commissioned to undertake a GTAA for the four districts comprising East Surrey, viz. Epsom & Ewell Borough Council, Mole Valley District Council, Reigate & Banstead Borough Council, and Tandridge District Council. The assessment is to be based upon a new survey and supported by material from relevant public agencies and other sources.

2.1.2 The survey for this GTAA comprised face-to-face interviews with Gypsies/Travellers on sites of all types and in housing, within the study area, undertaken between March and July 2006. A total of 108 interviews were undertaken by a supervised team of mainly Gypsy/Traveller interviewers (some local to Surrey), and provided data on 355 individuals, representing some 60% of the estimated Gypsy/Traveller population of the study area.

2.1.3 We have followed the recommended methodology in the draft ODPM guidance issued in February 2006, which recognizes that such accommodation needs may differ from those of the rest of the population. It cites five specific factors: patterns of extended family living, nomadism or semi-nomadism, a preference for caravan-dwelling, movement between housing and caravans, and presence on unauthorized caravans or developments. It proposes that GTAAs should address potential accommodation types, including standard housing, group homes, permanent residential sites, transit sites and stopping places.

2.1.4 The study separated the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers from those of Travelling Showmen, as required by the client.

2.2 National and legislative background

2.2.1 Three Acts of Parliament since 1960 have had a major impact upon the Gypsy/Traveller way of life.

a) The Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act of 1960 empowered local authorities to stop the unlicensed development of caravan sites and prohibit encampment on commons, and resulted in the closure of many sites traditionally used by Gypsies/Travellers.

b) The Caravan Sites Act 1968 (Part II) then required local authorities 'so far as may be necessary to provide adequate accommodation for Gypsies residing in or resorting to their area'. It also empowered the Secretary of State to make designation orders for areas where he was satisfied that there was adequate accommodation, or on grounds of expediency; designation gave local authorities additional powers to remove unlawful encampments. By 1994 a third of local authorities had achieved designation.
c) The 1994 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act repealed most of the 1968 Act, abolished any statutory obligation to provide accommodation, discontinued government grants for such sites, and made it a criminal offence, with heavy sanctions, to camp on land without the owner’s consent.

2.2.2 By the late 1990s, pressure was being exerted upon government over the effects of the 1994 Act. Councils spend substantial funds monitoring and securing the removal of unauthorised illegal encampments; amenity, countryside and the settled community are adversely affected; the costs, in financial, health and other respects, to the Gypsies/Travellers themselves are high.

2.2.3 The shortage of suitable accommodation has been recognised as the most pressing issue (IPPR 2003). The University of Birmingham study for ODPM, *The Provision and Condition of Local Authority Gypsy/Traveller Sites in England* (Niner 2002), estimated the need for more caravan pitches in England at 1,000-2,000 residential, and 2000-2500 transit or stopping places, over a five-year period. An even distribution of those figures across the country would equate to about thirty additional residential pitches and forty transit pitches in each county (although the target population is unevenly distributed, both in relation to land area and the general population).

2.2.4 A major review of law and policy is now reaching completion. The Housing Act 2004 placed a new requirement upon local housing authorities, when undertaking a review of housing needs in their area, to make a separate GTAA for those ‘residing in or resorting to their district’, although the statutory duty on local authorities to provide sites was not restored. New guidance was issued in February 2006, and further consultations and studies have been issued in 2007, particularly:

a) A benchmarking exercise on GTAAs for regional strategies, by the Universities of Birmingham, Salford and Sheffield Hallam.

b) Consultation for review of Circular on Planning for Travelling Showmen.


2.3 Sources

2.3.1 Apart from the survey, other sources for this study include:

a) **Official counts of caravans.** Central government has since 1979 required ‘gypsy caravans’ (distinguished from other types of caravan or mobile home) to be counted six-monthly by local authorities under three categories (council authorised, private authorised, and unauthorised). The first count recorded some 8,000 caravans in England, and the figure has now risen to over 15,000. The count has been criticised for various reasons but offers a time-series record of the distribution of Gypsy/Traveller caravans in England. The count does not record Travelling Showmen, New Travellers or those with a caravan stationed in a residential curtilage.
b) **Local data.** This includes the 2004 Strategic Assessment of Travellers’ Needs in Surrey (WS Planning 2004), data provided by study area local authorities, school roll summary data on Gypsy/Traveller children, and the emerging North Surrey GTAA.

c) **Other research.** This includes the Birmingham University study of council sites (Niner 2002), the recent benchmarking study (Niner 2007), the Sheffield University health study (Parry 2004), the Leeds University baseline study of Leeds (Baker 2005), and other GTAAAs (Cambridge 2006, Dorset 2006).
3. CHARACTERISTICS OF EAST SURREY GYPSY/TRAVELLER POPULATION

3.1 Definitions

3.1.1 The statutory definition of ‘gypsy’ (in the 1968 Caravan Sites Act, much amended in case law) refers to ‘persons of nomadic habit of life, whatever their race or origin’. It did not include ethnicity: ethnic ‘Gypsies’ could lose their legal status if they ceased to travel, and individuals with no ethnic connection adopting a nomadic way of life could become ‘gypsies’. The Government has undertaken a consultation on the definition for the purposes of the Housing Act 2004, recognising that somewhat different definitions may apply for housing and planning purposes. The new proposed definition (2007) is:

(a) persons with a cultural tradition of nomadism or living in a caravan; and
(b) all other persons of a nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin, including:

(i) such persons who, on grounds only of their own or their family’s or dependents’ educational or health needs or old age, have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently; and

(ii) members of an organized group of “travelling” showpeople or circus people (whether or not traveling together as such).’

This definition is more inclusive than before, and includes showmen, those leaving the settled community for a travelling lifestyle (‘New Travellers’), and ethnic gypsies in settled accommodation.

3.1.2 The definition of Gypsies and Travellers for planning purposes is contained in the Planning Circular 1/06 ‘Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Caravan Sites’. It excludes ‘members of an organised group of travelling show people or circus people travelling together as such’. For the purposes of this study the accommodation needs of Travelling Showmen have been separated out. Planning advice relating to Travelling Showmen is given in DoE Circular 22/91, which is currently being reviewed.

3.1.3 This study has used the definition set out in the GTAA Guidance. Our survey asked respondents to self-identify under the following six categories: English Gypsies/Romanies, Irish Travellers, Showmen, new Traveller, Scottish Traveller-Gypsy and Other. The first three categories accounted for virtually all respondents, and gave a distribution of 77% English Gypsy, 12% Travelling Showmen and 10% Irish Traveller. [Asked what was ‘special’ about being a Gypsy/Traveller, most commonly cited in our survey were ‘way of life’ (53%) and ‘family’ (50%), with emphasis upon family loyalties and ‘pride in who we are’.]

3.1.4 ODPM/DCLG guidance expects need to be assessed by ‘households’, which it equates to ‘residential site pitches’. For the purposes of census and housing needs
assessments, a ‘household unit’ is defined as those who share either a living room or at least one meal a day. Usually a household is in an identifiable physical unit behind its own front door, but Gypsies/Travellers are usually found in caravans. One household may comprise three generations living in several caravans, and travelling together. Thus a caravan often does not equate to a household, and the household unit is not usually the unit of occupation. The number of caravans on a pitch may vary, as does the size of a caravan (some 1200 square feet under present law). Some council pitches have a notional capacity for two caravans, but contain the larger twin-unit mobile homes; some in our survey no longer kept a touring caravan.

3.1.5 Our survey returns produced found an average household size of 3.3 persons, 2.2 persons per caravan, and 1.5 caravans per household. These varied slightly between site types, respondent age and ethnicity. The household size is consistent with Niner (2002), higher than found in our Dorset GTAA, but lower than found on our Cambridge GTAA. National statistics for the majority white British population of England (and East Surrey) produce a lower average household size of 2.3 persons (2005), which probably reflects an older age structure and higher proportion of one-person households in the general population. Our survey found (as expected) a higher proportion of children than the general population, and lower proportions of older people, reflecting high birth rates and low life expectancy respectively.

3.2 Population

3.2.1 The decennial national population census does not identify Gypsies/Travellers as a separate racial group. The official caravan counts currently record some 14,000 gypsy caravans in England, estimated to represent about 10,000 families, or up to 40,000 individuals. Estimates of the total Gypsy population (including those in conventional housing) range between 120,000 and 300,000, with Schools Census data suggesting a figure at the higher end of that range.

3.2.2 In the absence of Gypsy/Traveller data on births, marriages and deaths, it is difficult to apply normal population and household forecasting methods (e.g. components of change, household formation rates). Furthermore, the study population is small, mobile and shifting, creating further methodological difficulties.

3.2.3 School roll data can help to estimate population. The Annual Schools Census for England 2004 records 10,500 children in statutory schooling (aged 5-16) who declared as ‘Travellers of Irish heritage’ and ‘Gypsy/Roma’ in ethnic monitoring returns (two thirds of them Gypsy, the rest Irish); this represents 0.15% of the total school population of 6.8 million, but is recognised as an under-count, many being unwilling to declare their ethnicity. Gypsies/Travellers have more children than the settled population, which would increase the proportion of school age children to the total population. The 2005 Leeds study, for example, found 28.3% of Gypsy/Travellers were of school age, compared with 14.2% of the general Leeds population in the 2001 census (Baker 2004).

3.2.4 The 2006 Change Up report by the Gypsy Media Company estimated the Gypsy/Traveller population of Surrey (on sites and housed) at 10,000, but our analysis suggests a somewhat lower figure. Surrey TES support (January 2006 data)
1446 Gypsy/Traveller children, which includes showmen children, Gypsies housed (but only in first two years), and 551 children either being home-educated or out of county. An unidentified proportion will be transient (e.g. during Epsom week), and may not be recorded in the official caravan counts. The TES figures for August 2006 for East and North Surrey were 15% higher than January 2006, no doubt reflecting families resorting temporarily. If school age children comprised 25-28% of the total Gypsy/Traveller population (as the Leeds and other research suggests), the total Surrey Gypsy/Traveller population would be about 5,500-6,000 (in both caravans and housing). Surrey official caravan counts range between 600 and 670 total in the last 3 years, which translates to 1300-1600 people, assuming 2.2-2.4 persons per caravan (based upon our survey data for North and East Surrey). Gypsies in caravans could thus represent a quarter to a third of the total Gypsy and Traveller population, based upon our assumptions and recognising limitations in the data. These figures do not include showmen, who (according to the Showmen’s Guild) have about 120 pitches in Surrey, representing a further 250-300 people, and bringing the totals to 1550-1900.

3.2.5 East Surrey districts account for approximately 20% of the total recorded Surrey gypsy caravans (official counts), 55% of Showmen households (WS Planning 2004), and 25% of Surrey TES-supported children. We estimate the Gypsy/Traveller population (excluding travelling showpeople) in East Surrey as about 300 in caravans, and a further 900 in housing. These estimates are somewhat speculative, especially where the numbers in housing are concerned, but are based upon the best data available (average household sizes and caravan occupancy rates established from our survey).

3.3 Travel patterns

3.3.1 We examined the extent of summer travelling, and present the official count variations between January and July each year in Table 1 and Figures 1-3. These reveal that on average over the past 25 years only 3.8 more caravans were recorded in East Surrey in July over January. This disguises some marked fluctuations, mainly related to numbers of unauthorised caravans: in some years summer caravans exceed the winter figures, while in other years the opposite is the case. The range of variations has reduced since 1995, probably reflecting the effect of the 1994 Act in discouraging travelling. The overall pattern is much more stable than has been found in our other GTAAs: by comparison, Dorset averaged over the same period 35% more caravans in July than January, and the Cambridge sub-region 9% (Cambridge 2006, Dorset 2006). Numbers on council sites fall in July, as their occupiers are likely to travel in the summer months, while retaining their empty pitches, and unauthorised caravan numbers rise.
**Table 1: Change in caravan numbers in East Surrey districts between January and July, 1979-2005.**

Source: derived from official counts

**Note:** Changes of 10 or more caravans are shown in bold (increase) or italic (decrease).

|               | 79 | 80 | 81 | 82 | 83 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 87 | 88 | 89 | 90 | 91 | 92 | 93 | 94 | 95 | 96 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 |
|---------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Epsom & Ewell | -2 | -3 |  3 |  0 |  4 |  2 | -4 |  5 |  5 | 12 | -22|  2 | -2 |  4 |  4 |  3 | -1 | -12|  2 | 21 | -3 | -4 | -8 | -10|  2 |  3 | -3 |
| Mole Valley   | -7 | -3 |  5 |  0 | -5 | 15 |  6 | 15 | 18 | -24|  7 |  4 |  5 |  7 | -2 | -2 | -3 | -4 | -2 | -2 |  0 | -7 | -2 |  3 | -4 |
| Reigate & Banstead |  8 | -2 | 21 |  2 |  4 | -4 |  6 | 20 | -10|  8 | -11| -1 |  3 | -3 | 40 | -1 |  0 |  0 | -9 | -5 | -2 |  1 |  2 | -9 | 10 |  4 | -6 |
| Tandridge     | -1 |  5 | -15|  38| -18| 13 |  4 | -6 | 17 | -10|  9 | -29|  0 | n.a.|  3 | 10 |  9 | -8 |  7 | 15 | -1 | -8 |  9 |    |    |    |    |
| Average       | -1 | -1 |   4 | 10 | -4 |  7 |  3 |  9 |  8 | -12| -5 |  1 |  2 | 12 | -3 | -3 |  6 |  0 |  3 |  1 | -2 | -3 | -3 |  2 |  1 | -1 |
Figure 1: January/July fluctuations in caravan numbers by type of site, East Surrey districts, 1979-2005

Source: derived from official counts
Figure 2: Percentage variation in caravan numbers January/July by type of site, East Surrey districts, 1979-2005

Source: derived from official counts
Figure 3: January/July fluctuation in total caravan numbers, East Surrey districts, 1979-2005

Source: derived from official counts

Note: Overall average change (+3.8 caravans) shown by dotted line.
3.3.2 Geographical travel patterns

3.3.3 Given that the interviews undertaken in East Surrey did not find any ‘roadside’ or transient Gypsies and Travellers (discussed below at 3.5.1), our survey found it difficult to establish the likely level of need of Gypsies/Travellers ‘resorting to’ rather than ‘residing in’ East Surrey. Whilst it may be that unauthorised encampments rarely occur in East Surrey, and where these do take place the duration of the encampment is extremely short for various reasons, it is likely that at least some transit provision will be required within the locality for Gypsies and Travellers ‘passing through’ or stopping to visit relatives or for employment related purposes. Similarly, one cannot estimate (with any degree of accuracy) future demand which may arise as a result of unexpected movement into the area by Gypsies and Travellers not previously connected to the locality, or who for various reasons leave their usual place of resort or residence.

3.3.4 Amongst the ‘local’ (resident) population we found various reasons for living in the area, the commonest being nowhere else to go (38%), and to be near family (35%). Of those responding, 65% had not been outside Surrey for more than one month in the past year; compared with findings from other GTAAs, this suggests a relatively stable, locally-based population. Indeed, some (mainly older) residents of local authority sites no longer owned a touring caravan, suggesting that, despite their desire to retain a traditional way of living on a site, active travelling for work related purposes has ceased. In addition, a number of surveyed Gypsies/Travellers in housing reported that the terms of their housing tenancies precluded them from keeping a caravan in the curtilage of their premises, limiting their ability to travel even on a seasonal basis. The highest proportion of touring caravans was found (unsurprisingly) on unauthorised developments, and amongst Irish Travellers and Showmen.

3.3.5 Travel patterns outside Surrey varied, but the general picture was of travel more within the South-East region than further afield. Approximately one third of respondents noted that they travel ‘all over the UK’ (especially to horse fairs). 55% of all respondents reported that they no longer travel, with many (especially on council sites) stating that travelling had become more difficult since the 1994 Act.

3.3.6 A relatively low percentage of respondents reported that their adult children still travelled: about 15% of site residents, 3% of the housed sample. This decline may relate to: the age range of respondents’ children (many still living with their parents), constraints on travel, and changing employment patterns amongst younger people who may be less mobile than their parents’ generation. Some 9% of housed respondents had siblings who still travelled, and a higher proportion among site residents (66% in Mole Valley, 27% in Tandridge and 11% in Epsom and Ewell).

3.4 Employment

3.4.1 Most Gypsies/Travellers prefer self-employment, in such occupations as farm and land work, tree-lopping, vehicle trading, tarmacing, carpet-dealing and external building work. Our survey found evidence that:

a) Types of work had changed over the years, with a decline in traditional work, contributing to severe economic disadvantage and social exclusion.
b) Retired/disabled people comprised 15% of our respondents, unemployed/lone parents not economically active a further 29%, and ‘home-makers’ comprised a further 15%.

c) Gypsy and Traveller cultures are highly gendered with the majority of women either not economically active or working in part time and ‘family friendly’ /gendered employment.

d) Amongst men, the commonest types of work were landscaping/gardening, cleaning, and roofing/building. There is a move towards employment outside of the home amongst some women, with several respondents reporting that they were working in ‘cleaning’; teaching assistantships and shopwork.

e) Several respondents reported that living on a site (coupled with low literacy levels) made it harder to find work when this was known by potential employers (‘nobody knows I live on a site’), with typical comments including: ‘no responses to adverts when I gave an address’, ‘complications when the employer found out I was a Gypsy and illiterate’. In contrast, amongst respondents living in housing, only one person felt that they had experienced difficulty finding work because of their ethnicity, although one said that ‘I don’t tell people I’m a Gypsy’.

f) Family networks and informal reciprocal arrangements are important for encouraging and sustaining economic activity.

g) Seasonal social security benefits are important income sources, especially for those on council sites.

h) Difficulties with the theory part of the driving test (related to low literacy levels) is affecting work prospects for younger Gypsies/Travellers.

i) Some respondents reported that they could not get vehicle or other insurances (or were required to pay a higher premium) on giving their address as a ‘Gypsy site’. Such difficulties affect employment prospects.

j) Some respondents said that restrictions on what could and could not be stored at their accommodation (for example a ban on scrap metal) affected their traditional forms of work.

3.5 Health issues

3.5.1 Travellers have health outcomes and status significantly poorer than that found in the lowest socio-economic group in the UK population. They have mortality rates between one and one and a half times that of the housed population, maternal mortality higher than for any other one ethnic group, high infant mortality and perinatal death rates, and higher child accident rates (associated with insecure sites and lack of access to health care).

3.5.2 Our survey, however, found a relatively good health profile compared with other GTAAs that we have undertaken, with 43% of respondents reporting no health problems in immediate family. This may reflect the benefits of long-term secure site
accommodation, a more settled lifestyle, and better knowledge of (and access to) health care than in some localities. GTAAs commonly find those on local authority sites reporting poorer health than those on private sites, but this was not the case in East Surrey. Our survey found 100% of respondents registered with a GP, and 97% with a dentist. Few had problems in registering, except when moving around: one (doubled up on a site) had to travel back to Kent for health care.

3.5.3 As in other GTAAs we have undertaken, poor health problems were more often reported (58%) for those in housing than on sites. This may be because poor health or increasing age forced respondents into housing, or because being in housing adversely affected their health. The Sheffield University Health study found that residence in conventional housing affected negatively the physical and mental health of Gypsies and Travellers.

3.5.4 Our survey found health problems less than in other studies. Arthritis and cardiovascular disease rates were high (but less than usual amongst Gypsy and Traveller populations), while asthma and ‘nerves’ (or depression) were less than expected, perhaps reflecting better security and stability than elsewhere, and close family ties in a local, relatively static, population. Few survey respondents reported poor health affecting their ability to work and travel. Three respondents reported that disabled or chronically ill children limited the opportunities for family travelling, and several other participants noted that they were too old or ill to work or travel. In some cases the requirements for regular hospital treatment meant that it was impossible for a respondent to go far from their home base.

3.5.5 Secure sites can help establish stable relations with the health care system, and also facilitate support from family members (which can reduce the impacts of poor health). Accommodation problems have been found by other studies to affect health significantly. Unsited Travellers experience inequality in matters such as registering with a GP, obtaining hospital appointments and retaining continuity of contact with health services; a settled address is increasingly important for receiving post and obtaining access to medical, educational and welfare services.

3.5.6 A third of respondents were living at their current location for reasons of health-related care/support. Those in houses for health reasons could be because lack of adaptations and support from care agencies prevents them being on a site, or to avoid continual movement or doubling up/squatting on a site. Further investigation could improve support for disabled and/or ill Gypsies and Travellers, and ensure equality of opportunity/service delivery.

3.5.7 Grants for disabled access have recently been extended to those on caravan sites and this may in future have an impact on choice of residence. Several respondents in housing explicitly referred to the fact that they had moved into housing in response to family disability or illness, even when it may not have been their primary choice of accommodation. Asked whether physical adaptations for disability were needed, three respondents on sites and four in housing reported that they did need help, in some cases noting that they had been waiting years for ramps or other adaptations to their accommodation (particularly on sites in Tandridge and Mole Valley).
3.6 Education issues

3.6.1 Research shows that Gypsy/Traveller children are seriously and consistently disadvantaged in the education system. The Ofsted report of 1999 identified ‘Gypsy/Traveller pupils as the group most at risk in the education system today, and the Parekh Report (2000) noted the ‘generally low educational attainment’ of Gypsy and Traveller children as ‘a matter of serious concern’. In 2005, at Key Stage 2 (English and Maths), just over a quarter of Traveller of Irish Heritage pupils and around a third of Gypsy/Roma pupils achieved the expected level, compared to at least three quarters of all pupils on average (DfES statistical release, 1/3/06). At GCSE level (Key Stage 4) in 2005, 22.5% of Irish Traveller pupils and 14.7% of Gypsy/Roma pupils achieved 5+ A*-C grade GCSEs in contrast to a national average for all pupils of 54.9%. A persistent pattern of early school leaving is noted across the country, and as many as 12,000 Gypsy and Traveller children may be ‘out of school’ at any one time (Letter from Lord Adonis, Parliamentary Under Secretary for State of Schools to Directors of Children’s Service, 16th November 2006)

3.6.2 In contrast to the poor school attendance found in many areas, only 6.2% of respondents to our survey reported that their school-age children were out of education. This suggests a good (and unusual) pattern of engagement with education, reflecting good work by the TES, and a relatively settled local Gypsy and Traveller community.

3.6.3 Gypsies/Travellers often feel excluded from mainstream job opportunities requiring formal education, and may lack awareness of such opportunities. Working with young people of secondary school age (and young parents) to enhance skills-based learning may improve mainstream employability. With many young Gypsies and Travellers dissatisfied with their disadvantaged lifestyles, they could be interested in training opportunities if made more aware of them. We recommend additional outreach work with young Gypsy and Traveller women on work opportunities, particularly relating to child-care, education and beauty skills (7 responses).

3.6.4 Seven respondents reported problems getting their children into education (3 housed, 4 sites), citing various reasons: ‘they didn’t want to take my kids’, ‘they wouldn’t recognise and acknowledge our culture’, ‘I was told that the schools were all full’; ‘they does not blend in at that school’. Of parents (40% of those responding to this question) reported that their children had experienced problems at school, including racist bullying: ‘children get backlash from (anti-gypsy) TV programmes’, ‘it was bad enough that my daughter had to come out of school’, ‘bullying and name calling’. This finding is similar to that in other research, and is concerning.

3.6.5 Our survey found poor literacy levels amongst respondents, which is concerning, having regard to the largely stable population. Main reasons given were: little or disrupted schooling because of moving around (70% of reasons stated); bullying or unable to settle at school (24%); dyslexia ‘couldn’t learn’ (6%). Some positive responses were noted, with several adults reporting that they had remained in school until they had taken GCEs/GCSEs: ‘I went to school until I was 16’, ‘I went all the way up’, two had attended further and higher education.

3.6.6 Few respondents had undertaken any post-school training (slightly better if in housing). Some had taken courses in computing, first-aid and literacy skills
(women) and work related skills (bricklaying and building trades - male). There was interest in training for hairdressing, beauty therapy, plumbing, teaching assistants, care work, and/or business and computing skills; boys were interested in sporting activities (e.g. boxing). This reflects an unmet need for training, and poor knowledge of what is available (linked to low literacy skills and a reluctance to read newspapers).
4. ACCOMMODATION TYPES, CONDITIONS AND PREFERENCES

4.1 Evidence from official caravan counts

4.1.1 Official six-monthly counts distinguish three site categories (council or public authorised, private authorised, and unauthorised). Figures 4 and 5 present six-monthly caravan count data for the period 1979-2006, giving evidence on long-term trends, with total numbers stable around 120-140 caravans. Table 2 shows averaged survey figures for the past three years; these figures are not, however, consistently accurate, and were cross-checked for purposes of the accommodation assessment.

Table 2: Average number of caravans (rounded), East Surrey 2002-2006, by district, site type and time of year

Source: derived from official counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Average 2002-06</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>January</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Jan, July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>Authorised:</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authorised:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>Authorised:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authorised:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>Authorised:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authorised:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Authorised:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authorised:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Districts total</td>
<td>Authorised:</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authorised:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unauthorised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4: Total caravan numbers, January and July each year, 1979-2006 East Surrey districts.

Source: derived from official counts
Figure 5: Caravan numbers by type of site, 1979-2006 East Surrey

Source: derived from official counts
4.2 Public Gypsy sites

Table 3: Public Gypsy sites in East Surrey (2006)
Source: Official returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Site location</th>
<th>Pitches</th>
<th>Date opened (date upgraded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>Cox Lane, Ewell</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1978 (1997 &amp; 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>Kiln Lane, Epsom</td>
<td>14*</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>Young Street, Leatherhead</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1984 (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>Swanworth Lane, Mickleham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>Ranmore Road, Dorking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>Coldharbour Lane, Dorking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>Green Lane, Outwood</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1964 (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 10 of the 14 pitches currently unoccupied
** 11 of the 15 pitches currently closed and unavailable for reoccupation

4.2.1 In 1979 official returns for Surrey officially recorded 156 pitches (60 of them classed as ‘temporary’) on nine council-provided sites, of which Epsom & Ewell and Tandridge had two each. Epsom & Ewell was designated in 1985, and Tandridge in 1991, as having provided sufficient accommodation. By 2006 the official returns for the county were 230 pitches (five classed as ‘transit’, all in Waverley) on 19 sites. East Surrey contributes 37% of Surrey’s official pitches, and 20% of the total Surrey Gypsy/Traveller population. No new sites have been opened since 1995, although some sites have been upgraded with central Government grant.

4.2.2 Our survey confirms a relatively stable population. Occupiers of council sites were mostly English Gypsies, and long-stay (keeping their pitch when away travelling). Of 36 responding, 78% had been on the site more than two years, and 39% over ten years.

4.2.3 The quality of council sites varies. The best sites are often occupied by related families and older residents, and appear to function well, but others are in poor condition. Of 34 responding, the best aspects were cited as: near health facilities (59%), quiet location (42%), and near schooling (32%). Asked what improvements they would like (council sites, 45 respondents), commonest requests (ranked) were: better parking (60%), landscaping (60%), playspace (20%), laundry (9%), and work areas (9%). Tandridge respondents particularly complained that: ‘outside blocks should be refurbished’, ‘so slow with repairs’, blocked drains (4 cases). Mole Valley respondents complained as follows: ‘small, damp’ utility blocks and toilets, ‘don’t repair them’ ‘they could do better for us – with the expense of living here’, have to pay for ‘repairs of fences and gates’, ‘roads not swept’, ‘rubbish not collected regularly’ (5 cases). Epsom & Ewell respondents complained as follows: badly repaired utility blocks (8 cases) or ‘no utility blocks (2), cracked and damaged cess pits, ‘have to collect post from the sorting office – no site deliveries’ (2), ‘the sites are in very bad repair’ (2). All complained more about high electricity bills than high
rent, and reported dangerous cables (cracked, wires showing) and meters not secured properly. Poor fire precautions were another common complaint.

4.3 Private authorised sites

Table 4: Private Gypsy sites in East Surrey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Pitches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: East Surrey authorities (February 2007)

4.3.1 The number of such sites (mostly owner-occupied, with planning permissions granted on appeal) has grown in England, from 14% to 25% of total officially counted caravan numbers in 25 years. In East Surrey, however, there are fewer such sites (11% of caravans), reflecting presumably tight Green Belt controls and high land values. Travelling showmen are overwhelmingly found on private sites (classed as winter quarters), with space for their show equipment.

4.3.2 Private sites often accommodate small groups (e.g. single or extended families), and East Surrey does not have the large groups found elsewhere. Gypsies have gradually, and only reluctantly, been accorded special policy consideration in the planning system, with most local plans now having specific criterion-based planning policies for them. Research by Williams (1999) found that councils approve as few as 5% of planning applications for private Gypsy sites, with about 30-35% subsequently succeeding on appeal.

4.4 Unauthorised developments and encampments

4.4.1 Unauthorised caravans in England now number about 2500, about a quarter of six-monthly count totals. In East Surrey the average number in 2003-2006 was 15 (12% of total Surrey caravan numbers). Such low numbers, while unwelcome to the settled population, are tiny when compared, for example, with numbers of homelessness applications, or with housing supply forecasts for the general population.

4.4.2 Housing legislation defines the occupier of a caravan (or ‘moveable structure’) as legally homeless if there is nowhere that he or she can legally place it and reside in it, yet local authorities are not obliged to make equivalent accommodation available. According to the ODPM homelessness code of guidance Gypsies/Travellers should be considered on the same basis as any other applicant, and can be offered ‘some other suitable form of housing’, while recognising that they may not want conventional housing. Statistics of homelessness applications do not differentiate Gypsy/Traveller applicants from others, and few seem to apply. Homelessness Strategy documents in East Surrey make no mention of Gypsies/Travellers.
4.4.3 A distinction should be made between:

- Unauthorised developments of caravans on gypsy-owned land without planning permission, and often subject to local authority enforcement action (although some sites are ‘tolerated’); and

- ‘Unauthorised encampments’ of caravans on highway or other land. These may be subject to police action under the 1994 Act and council action through highway powers, or civil action.

The six-monthly counts record both such sites, but generally undercount roadside caravans (which have marked seasonal peaks). In Surrey police data is incomplete, and, even with a team of mainly Gypsy/Traveller interviewers, our survey was unable to interview any in roadside caravans. There is little evidence of recent unauthorised encampment in the study area. Of site respondents in our survey, however, 16 percent had stopped on roadside sites in the past five years, and a further 10 percent on unauthorised sites.

4.5 Transit sites

4.5.1 Even if every Gypsy/Traveller family in the country had their own long-stay or ‘settled’ base, there would still be a need for transit sites for those who are travelling, particularly in the summer months from April to October. If sites existed police could refer unauthorised encampments to them, and the count statistics for England show that authorities with transit provision have a lower incidence of unauthorised encampment. There is, however, little consensus on how they should be provided and what facilities offered, and they can be particularly difficult to manage. There are in England only about 300 council transit pitches (and perhaps 200 private).

4.5.2 Surrey in 1979 recorded sixty of its pitches as ‘temporary’, and during the 1980s maintained thirty transit pitches on various sites (in Runnymede, Spelthorne, Tandridge and Waverley), but during the 1990s these were reclassified as residential; it now records only five transit pitches (in Waverley district), and none in East Surrey. Previous transit pitches have become long-stay because of the pressure of demand for such sites and reduced travelling following the 1994 Act.

4.5.3 Our survey asked if respondents would use a network of transit sites. Some 59% of respondents said yes, expressing little preference for location. They were strongly against combining them with long-stay council sites, although those on private authorized sites would be willing to offer transit accommodation if they had space or planning permission. Our survey identified no roadside caravans, and the brief did not include interviewing those outside East Surrey who might want to go there, making it impossible to quantify potential demand. Given the geographical location of Surrey, work opportunities for Gypsies/Travellers arising from its economic prosperity, and the motorways and major roads that pass through it, we consider, based upon our experience, that there may be considerable suppressed demand for transit accommodation. We found no evidence to support any future transit provision being in East Surrey rather than some other part of Surrey.
4.5.4 As an alternative to transit sites, emergency stopping places have been suggested by government (with facilities suitable for overnight or short stay, up to 28 days, transit sites being officially intended for stays of up to 3 months). Such sites existed in Surrey in the 1980s, but we do not regard them as an appropriate element in any future site provision strategy.

4.6 Gypsies in housing

4.6.1 Official statistics are lacking on this group. RSLs do not generally identify the proportion of their tenants who are Gypsies/Travellers, whether such tenants would prefer to reside on a caravan site (if such were available), and support needed for newly-housed Gypsies/Travellers. Housing Strategies do not mention them, and there is little information on movement into (and out of) housing.

4.6.2 Best value thinking suggests that, if someone is accommodated in public housing who would prefer to be in a caravan, transfer into caravans would be a potential saving of public funds (a council caravan pitch has been estimated to cost half or less that of a council house), but our research elsewhere suggests that housed Gypsies/Travellers would only move out if appropriate sites were available.

4.6.3 Surrey TES has estimated that some 60 households were in housed accommodation in the whole county, but that figure only relates to families with school-age children and settled for less than two years. Our survey of both North and East Surrey (comprising 8 of the 11 Surrey districts) located 77 such households (not all with school-age children), which suggests that TES data may be an under-count.

4.6.4 Our East Surrey survey located and interviewed 40 housed Gypsies/Travellers. They were mostly (95%) English Gypsies, and were distributed in ‘bricks-and-mortar’ accommodation as follows: local authority house/flat (55%), owner-occupied (32.5%) and the rest in social housing (registered social landlord). Of housed respondents, 41% had been in their accommodation more than 10 years, and the same percentage 3-10 years, and 58% said they intended to stay permanently. Asked where they lived before, 19 (49%) had come off the roadside (presumably rehoused as homeless), 12 (31%) from a council site, one off his own land after failing to get planning permission, one off his mother’s land because he had no planning permission, and the rest transferred from other housing.

4.6.5 Continuing commitment to the Gypsy/Traveller way of life was strongly expressed, with 91% of respondents on sites not interested in living in a house. Of housed respondents 64% still travelled, and three (all in Tandridge) said they wanted a pitch on a site, with a further 5% intending to resume travelling at some stage. Reasons for moving into housing (respondents in or formerly in a house) included: ‘nowhere to stop’ (24%), closure of site, bad neighbours on site, pitch too small, family reasons. For those who had left housing, reasons included: couldn’t settle, ‘grew up’, or married a traveller; the length of stay varied (50% left within a year).

4.6.6 Complaints by housed survey respondents were most commonly lack of space for trailers (51%) and planning restrictions on operating a business. Of respondents 20% wanted larger (or more suitable) housing.
4.6.7 Positive aspects were health and school facilities, quiet location, and near facilities. Survey respondents in housing were slightly more likely to report health problems than those on sites (26% against 21% on sites), which may reflect their reasons for moving into housing, or difficulty in adjusting.

4.6.8 As recommended in ODPM/DCLG guidance, the survey asked whether respondents would be interested in small group housing schemes for Gypsies (which have had some success in Ireland and Northern Ireland). Of respondents, 73% did not know about them, and a similar proportion were not interested. Indeed, several said that they kept quiet about being Gypsies/Travellers to avoid racism, and would not want to draw attention to themselves by being grouped together in such a way.

4.7 **Accommodation preferences**

4.7.1 Local housing assessments usually attempt to differentiate need and demand. District or bottom-up assessments will tend to focus more on those residing in rather than resorting to an area. In the case of Surrey (as with the Home Counties in general) restrictive Green Belt policies have for decades constrained the numbers actually resorting to the area, and displaced them elsewhere (e.g. to Cambridgeshire and eastern Kent to our knowledge).

4.7.2 Of 31 survey respondents seeking accommodation in the area, 21 wanted a caravan pitch, seven housing, and three had no preference. The preferred site solution was small, self-owned long-stay sites for family groups, with no specific geographical location proposed. Of 66 responding to the question, 73% had never owned land (84% of those in housing), and 10 (15%) had tried but failed to get planning permission on their own land.

4.8 **Overcrowding**

4.8.1 While we are not aware of an official definition of over-crowding where the unit of accommodation is a caravan, the 1965 Gypsy census study equated a caravan to a room, and estimated that 65% of Gypsies were living in over-crowded conditions, more than 2 people per caravan (compared with less than 3% of the settled population in the 1961 census). Overcrowding may also be measured by ‘doubling-up’, where more than one family is sharing a pitch. Caravans may vary in size (and legally since the 1968 Act be up to 1200 square feet for a twin-unit mobile home), and have more than one room, which would reduce overcrowding.

4.8.2 Our overcrowding questions generated data supporting a variety of conclusions. It was not practical for our survey to measure physical dimensions of individual caravans, but it did record the numbers of mobile homes, finding a ratio to touring caravans of 2:1. Many survey respondents wanted more space on the plots they had (council and private), to allow separate sleeping arrangements for boys and girls, and 39% wanted more caravans on their pitch. 14% of sited respondents reported being overcrowded in present accommodation, but the survey did not investigate further. Table 5 shows responses to two questions, whether children would need their own pitch in the next 5 years, and ‘how many extra pitches does your family need in the area’. If these figures are accepted, 64 more pitches would represent an increase of 66% over total existing authorised provision in the study area, although preference may not reflect need.
Table 5: Stated preference for more pitches in East Surrey by district (excludes Showmen)
Source: Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Pitches for Children in next 5 years*</th>
<th>Number of Pitches Needed for the Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Respondents reporting overcrowding, East Surrey districts
Source: Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Local Authority site</th>
<th>House LA/RSL</th>
<th>Private Sites (authorised &amp; unauthorised)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 22/108 (20%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. ACCOMMODATION ASSESSMENT

5.1 Methodology

5.1.1 We have applied the recommended methodology in the ODPM/DCLG draft guidance issued in February 2006 (para.80, which has a total of 15 variables), with our comments.

Current supply

5.1.2 Variables 1-4 comprise occupied local authority residential sites and authorised private pitches, and pitches vacant or expected to become vacant in the near future. We have derived these from schedules of sites provided by councils, and from the Surrey Strategic Assessment (2004), checked against the six-monthly official counts and survey returns. For variable 5 (‘households expressing a desire to live in housing’) we enter a zero. In our survey, four survey respondents (in one district) ‘expressed a desire’, but we have not included the figure, since it was only a preference, and there is no commitment from the local authorities to effect any such transfer. The zero figure for variable 6 and figure one for variable 7 (new pitches planned or likely to get planning permission) were provided by the local authorities.

Current demand

5.1.3 The zero figure for variable 8 (‘households seeking permanent site accommodation in the area, based on waiting lists and results of survey’) reflects our view that little reliance can be placed on waiting lists, survey respondents generally did not name specific areas where they sought accommodation, and there is a risk of double-counting (e.g. with other GTAAs).

5.1.4 Variables 9 and 10 (‘unauthorised encampments’) are based upon local authority schedules of Gypsy-owned land without planning permission, cross-checked against recent count figures. Vigorous policing minimises roadside encampments in the study area (see, however, 3.5.3 above).

5.1.5 Variable 11 is households ‘currently overcrowded’. ODPM/DCLG defines this as ‘e.g. where family numbers have grown to the extent that there is now insufficient space for the family within its caravan accommodation and insufficient space on the pitch for a further caravan’. Survey respondents considering their current accommodation ‘overcrowded’ we did not take to be an accurate assessment under the ODPM/DCLG definition. The survey responses are considered too variable to be a basis for estimation, and in light of the risk of double counting, we have chosen to apply a standard estimation of need generated by overcrowding. Based on data gathered and our experience and judgement within the resources of this study it is considered that a 10% overcrowding adjustment should be applied to the current pitch supply, resulting in a pitch need of 9.

5.1.6 For variable 12 (‘new households expected to arrive from elsewhere’) we had no data or any way to reliably estimate this demand. For variable 13 (‘new family formation within existing households’) we note that the survey results from Table 5 for pitches needed for children in next five years, produced an apparently high demand, which would exceed any realistic estimation of population growth. This
variable is considered to double-count in part the need separately identified by overcrowding and in part that generated by population growth. Accordingly no reliable disaggregated data can be identified in respect of this variable and a zero figure has been recorded. For variable 14 (‘in housing but with a need for site accommodation’) we applied a zero figure, recognizing that any such demand cannot be expected to materialize until suitable sites are available; this should be reviewed in the light of future progress with site provision.

5.1.7 For family formation (variable 15) we followed the Birmingham/Salford/Sheffield Hallam benchmarking study (2007), which advises applying a 3% per annum household growth rate to households on authorized pitches (85 x 3% compound over 5 years). Such rates are significantly higher than that for the general population, but reflect the known demographic profile of the Gypsy/Traveller population. [Official estimates for the general population of England show an increase of 0.7% in 2001-2002, but Gypsy caravan numbers have grown much faster (17.2% in the 7 years 1996-2004), and our survey findings support a high natural growth rate.]

5.1.8 To provide an indicative needs forecast for the period 2011-2016 we applied 3% annual growth to the combined supply and need figures (96 + 36 x 3% over 5 years), but recognize that this will be affected by change in the period 2007-2011, and should be reviewed at the appropriate time, particularly in the light of reallocation of need between authorities and progress with pitch provision up to 2011.
Table 7: East Surrey Gypsy/Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (pitches rounded, Showmen excluded, DCLG variable number in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A Current residential supply</th>
<th>East Surrey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current supply of occupied local authority residential site pitches</strong> (1)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current supply of occupied authorized privately owned site pitches</strong> (2)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of unused local authority pitches, and vacancies on privately owned sites available in East Surrey (3)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of existing pitches expected to become vacant in near future (LA and privately owned) (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of households in caravans expressing a desire to live in housing (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New local authority pitches planned in year 1 (6)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sites likely to gain planning permission during year 1 (7)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total pitch provision available (2006)</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking permanent site accommodation in the area (8)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorised encampments (9)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorised developments for which planning permission is not expected (10)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently overcrowded (11)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New households expecting to arrive from elsewhere (12)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New family formations expected to arise from within existing households (13)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In housing but with a need for site accommodation (14)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current shortfall</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family formation 2006 – 2011 (15)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra pitch need 2006 – 2011</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household growth 2011-2016</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2. Policy implications

5.2.1 Further authorised accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers can potentially come from the following sources:

a) Public sites (new sites, or expansion or intensification of existing).

b) Private sites with planning permission.

c) Movement into conventional housing.

5.2.2 In Surrey (as with the Home Counties in general) restrictive Green Belt policies have for decades constrained the numbers actually resorting to the area, displacing them elsewhere, and particularly limited the number of private authorised sites.

5.2.3 Our needs assessment does not distinguish between private and public provision. According to the January 2005 counts, the ratio of council:private authorised
caravans in England was 54:46, in the South-West region 52:48, and in East Surrey 87:13. While national and regional proportions should not be taken as a target, there is suppressed demand for private sites, which would require a more positive approach by local planning authorities.

5.2.4 The assessment in Table 8 is for residential pitches. We are unable to quantify demand for transit pitches, which we consider should be negotiated county-wide. Transit pitches could be provided partly by flexible use of existing pitch provision on both public and private sites.

5.2.5 Some Gypsies/Travellers currently in public housing would prefer to be in caravans; while others in caravans would prefer to be in housing. We were unable to determine this relative demand, and recommend that councils and RSLs should plan for a mix of provision to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers, recognizing the ‘best value’ benefits, caravan pitches being cheaper to provide than social housing units.

5.2.6 Larger pitch sizes on long-stay sites would be consistent with the community’s preferences for extended family living (to accommodate three caravans, including one mobile home, rather than the two recommended in official guidance), and allow some accommodation for visitors (which would count as transit). [DCLG guidance on site guidance is promised soon.]

5.3 Travelling Showmen

5.3.1 A separate assessment of the needs of Travelling Showmen has been undertaken as required by the clients. We have used the WS Planning 2004 data, supplemented by our own survey data (including North Surrey survey data where appropriate).

5.3.2 Travelling showmen are overwhelmingly found on private sites, usually classed as winter quarters. Showmen are specifically excluded from the statutory definition of Gypsy, and separate circulars (most recently 22/91, now under review) have addressed their specific needs for winter quarters, which combine residential use with areas for maintenance of rides and other equipment. Official statistics are lacking on them, and they have not been included in the official counts, or in the former statutory duty upon local authorities to provide Gypsy sites. Circular 22/91 recognises that specific local proposals may be appropriate where there is a tradition, and local need can be demonstrated; Mole Valley and Tandridge include specific planning policies in their local plans. The Environment, Transport and Regional Affairs Committee Ninth Report (2000) addressed the issue of ‘Travelling Fairs’, and recommended the involvement of the Showmen’s Guild in assessing need.

5.3.3 The Showmen’s Guild has identified about 117 pitches and 150 paid-up members within Surrey, of which 55% were located in East Surrey, on sites either long-established or with planning permission (usually won on appeal). WS Planning (2004) identified two large and six small such sites in the four study area districts. The WS Planning study (2004) addressed the issue in detail, and we broadly support its findings. Our survey included Showmen, and found that they tend to have smaller household sizes than the general Gypsy/Traveller population (2.4 against 3.3 persons per household), and fewer children.
5.3.4 Although it pre-dated the new guidance issued in February 2006, WS Planning (2004) estimated need by applying similar variables: unauthorized pitches (none in East Surrey), overcrowding (17 ‘doubled-up’ caravans on East Surrey sites), and family formation. The Environment Committee Report suggested a possible shortfall of 139 plots in London and the South-East, while WS Planning estimated total demand in Surrey as 66 pitches (or plots), of which East Surrey would require 30. We applied a 2.5% annual natural growth rate (lower than for other Gypsies/Travellers to reflect smaller proportions of children), producing a requirement for 9 additional pitches over the next five years. We recommend that these figures are discussed with the Showman’s Guild and site occupiers.

*Table 8: Showmen accommodation in East Surrey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Current Pitches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epsom &amp; Ewell</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole Valley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reigate &amp; Banstead</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandridge</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A - DISTRICT ACCOMMODATION

EPSOM & EWELL: 1979 – 2004

GYPSY/TRAVELLER ACCOMMODATION

Existing situation. The district has two public sites, one private authorized site for Travelling Showmen (next to the Cox’s Lane Gypsy site), accommodating four pitches, and no other private sites. The Cox’s Lane site (also known as Greenlands) is regarded as a good site, but with doubling up on four of the pitches; turnover of pitches is low (two in the past eight years, due to death of occupiers). The Kiln Lane site (also known as Conifer Park) has had serious on-site problems and is currently under-occupied. Council information and our survey indicate a small population in housing.

Council policy The District Wide Local Plan (2000) has a criterion-based policy RSG10 on Gypsies/Travellers and the submitted Core Strategy (July 2006) contains a policy specifically covering the issue.

*Number of caravans (January and July counts) by type of site, Epsom & Ewell District, 1979-2004.*
MOLE VALLEY: 1979 – 2004

GYPSY/TRAVERLLER ACCOMMODATION

**Existing provision** The District has four public sites (three of them small ones), one small private showmen site, two small private sites (three pitches in total), and a private single pitch site that is under construction. There is one unauthorized site (River Lane, Leatherhead). There is some evidence of Gypsies in housing. In the light of an increasing waiting list for Council-managed sites and criticism in recent appeal decisions, the Council has decided to seek planning permission to extend the three existing small public sites with one additional pitch at each site. It has also agreed to seek views on providing a new four-pitch site on land at Gatwick Diary Farm, Hookwood (which has a lapsed permission for a Gypsy site).

**Council policy:** The District has a criteria-based policy in the Mole Valley Local Plan.

*Number of caravans (January and July) by type of site, Mole Valley District, 1979-2004*
Existing situation. The Borough four small private sites. Two are adjacent to each other at Rectory Lane, Woodmansterne. A third site, is located in Lonesome Lane, Reigate and a fourth site is in Peeksbrook Lane, Smallfield. This fourth site has expanded since planning permission was given and part of it is unauthorised development.

The Borough has one authorised Travelling Showmen site at Axes Lane, Salfords (12 pitches).

There are three unauthorised sites in the Borough, two in Peeksbrook Lane (one of which has planning permission for part of the site), and one in Perrylands Lane, Smallfield. There is little evidence about the Gypsy population in housing.

Council policy: The Reigate and Banstead Borough Local Plan (2005) has a criterion-based policy HO5 for Gypsy Caravan Sites. Some 70% of the Borough is subject to Green Belt policy.

Number of caravans (January and July counts) by type of site, Reigate & Banstead District 1979-2004.
TANDRIDGE DISTRICT:
GYPSY/TRAVELLER ACCOMMODATION

Existing situation. There are three public sites, one of which (Green Lane, Outwood with 14 pitches) is the largest and oldest such site in the area; all have been refurbished in the 1990s. The Caterham site (The Downs) was originally classed as a transit site (10 pitches). The site at Pendell in Bletchingley has a potential capacity of 15 pitches, although in 2006, 11 of the pitches were closed. The district has two small private authorised sites.

There are two private authorised sites for Travelling Showmen. The Terning Wheel site at Copthorne Road (7 pitches) is occupied by one family and is not divided up into defined pitches and therefore the capacity is notional. The Plantation at Newchapel has 30 pitches. However many of these pitches are occupied by up to three generations of the one family, including retired Showmen. The site currently has spare capacity.

Our survey also indicates a significant Gypsy population in housing.

Council policy: The 2001 Local Plan contains criterion-based policies on Gypsy and Showmen sites, but excludes Green Belt locations, and considered existing provision to be ‘adequate’.

Number of caravans (January and July counts) by type of site, Tandridge District, 1979-2004.
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APPENDIX C - SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey was undertaken by a supervised team of mainly Gypsy/Traveller interviewers (some local to Surrey), and comprising face-to-face interviews with Gypsies/Travellers on sites of all types and in housing, within the study area. 108 interviews were undertaken between March and July 2006, and provided data on 355 individuals, representing some 36% of the estimated Gypsy/Traveller population of the study area. The gender split of those interviewed was 80:20 women:men, and 62:38 sited:haused.

The involvement of Gypsy/Traveller interviewers is recommended in official guidance, and the new plan-making system requires statements of community involvement. Gypsies/Travellers are often treated in official studies and policy documents as ‘hard to reach’ and ‘socially excluded’. Those surveyed may be reluctant to respond for a study promoted by official agencies who they may believe to be monitoring them for ‘hostile’ purposes. Gypsies and Travellers may feel exploited by researchers and academics, and consider that their views will be misrepresented or ignored. The lead researchers were well-networked into the community, and able to bring legal, planning and social policy experience to the project, responding to its various and complex elements.

Confidentiality The survey guaranteed anonymity to respondents as a condition for their participation, and this has imposed some limitations upon the presentation of data in the public domain, especially where survey numbers are small and individuals might be identifiable. In line with good practice for this type of work, the survey was unable to pursue certain aspects of the original brief as too intrusive, eg financial and employment data.

Survey design While the relatively small numbers of the survey population mean in theory that good coverage can be achieved, in practice the target population (being by definition largely nomadic) moves around, and there may be difficulties in physically locating respondents and getting a response. In quantitative social surveys the sample frame is usually drawn from a list of addresses, such as council tax register or postcode address file, but there is no such reliable list for Gypsies/Travellers, especially those on unauthorised and roadside sites. The study therefore used a snowball sampling method, with referrals from respondents on known sites to reach others in ‘hard-to-reach’ categories (unauthorised and housed). The six-monthly official counts (supplemented by schedules of sites in some authorities) provide data on numbers of caravans in different categories, from which a stratified sample can be derived. The sample was segmented by geographical area, site type (including housing) and ethnic category. It proved difficult to achieve the representativeness sought for various reasons. Similar surveys have encountered difficulty in locating willing respondents, and even Gypsy/Traveller interviewers found the same problems. Thus the responses are weighted towards more ‘settled’ respondents, especially those on council sites. Housed Gypsies/Travellers were located for interview by referral from other interviewees, using the modified Andalusian snowball sampling technique.

Questionnaire design This was informed by the ODPM guidance, and designed in consultation with the client authorities, and an advisory panel from the Gypsy/Traveller community. With equality matters acquiring greater importance since the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, access to local services was investigated. Questions about travel
patterns were included, but the quality of response was variable, perhaps reflecting suspicion of the motives for asking.

**Survey implementation** The fieldwork was resource intensive, involving much travel, some of it abortive where interviewees were not at home or unwilling to respond. Attempts to set up interviews in advance by telephone had limited success, so in most cases surveyors arrived unannounced. The ODPM guidance recommends use of qualitative assessments through focus groups and open interviews as the only feasible way of obtaining information where numbers are small. Two focus group meetings were also held, using an experienced focus group facilitator who is a member of the Gypsy/Traveller community.
D - SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

ACCOMMODATION TYPE

CARAVANS, TOURERS, AND MOBILE HOMES:
Council site/Self-owned/Privately Owned Site (With/Without planning
permission)/Authorised non-Gypsy site (e.g. caravan, mobile home park,
etc)/Unauthorised: roadside/Other (please specify)

PERMANENT HOUSING:
Local authority house/flat; Housing Association House/Flat; Private Rented
House/Flat

TEMPORARY HOUSING

Interviewee
1. How would you describe yourself?
   English Gypsy/Romany
   Irish Traveller
   New Traveller
   Showman
   Other (please specify

2. How many people live with you? Spouse/Partner; Father; Mother; Other (specify)

3. How many children will need their own pitch in the next five years?

4. How many pitches does your family need in this area?

5. How many trailers do you have? (mobile homes/static; tourers; other)

6. Do you think your accommodation is overcrowded?

7. Do you have problems with your accommodation? Please specify

8. What facilities do you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reliable postal service</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>inside?</td>
<td>outside?</td>
<td>shared?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electricity</td>
<td>mains?</td>
<td>generator?</td>
<td>battery?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drainage</td>
<td>mains?</td>
<td>cesspit?</td>
<td>other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>mains?</td>
<td>bottled?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures</td>
<td>amenity block?</td>
<td>utility block?</td>
<td>toilet block?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refuse disposal</td>
<td>Skip?</td>
<td>bins?</td>
<td>council collection?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45
9. Are there any problems about the way the site / house is managed/maintained?

- Vermin
- Fire prevention
- Electrical equipment
- Site traffic
- Other

10. Is there anything about here that could be improved or made better?

- Parking areas
- Landscaping
- Laundry facilities
- Working areas
- Communal social centres
- Other

10a. Is there anything about here that you like?

- Access to work
- Education/schools
- Family members on site
- Health facilities
- Close to facilities
- Other

11. What animals can you keep here? Do you need permission?

12. How long have you been here?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Up to a week</th>
<th>6 months to 1 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 days to 1 month</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 months</td>
<td>3-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How long do you plan to stay here?

14. Are you looking for accommodation in the district?

15. In the last five years, have you stopped by the roadside?

16. In the last five years, have you stopped on an unauthorised site?

16a. Where were you before you came here?

17. Why did you come here? Eg Work, Family, Festival/Fair, Other

18. Where do you normally travel?

18a. (Housed) Do you still travel?

18b. (Housed) Do your children travel?

18c. (Housed & sited) Are your children housed and do they travel?
18d.  (Housed) Do you keep a caravan here?
19. Have you been outside of Surrey for over a month in the last year?
20. Have you stopped in the past on (other) Council sites?
21. Why did you leave?
21a. What type of accommodation would you like?
22. Have you ever owned your own land? If yes, did you have planning permission? Did you apply for planning permission?
23. Would you live in a house if you had the chance?
24. If you want your own site, what would make it difficult?
25. Have you ever lived in a house?
25a&b. If yes, when and for how long?
26. Do you know the difference between residential and transit sites for Travellers?
27. If there was a network of transit sites, would you use them?
28. Would you be prepared to live with other types of Traveller?
29. Have you heard of group housing?
29a. Would you like to try group housing?
30. What kinds of work have you done over the last 12 months? And previously over the last five years? (prompt: land work, tarmac, dealing, carpets, etc.)
31. Is there any work-related training that you would like? Please state, i.e. chainsaw, driving theory, computers
32. Have you ever had trouble getting work because of your address?
33. Do you work with your own family and/or people from your own site?
34. (Housed) Can you keep your work equipment and vehicles here?
35. Do you, or any members of your family, have a serious illness (please specify) Do you, or any members of your family, have a disability?
35a. Does it affect work?
36. Are you registered with a doctor? Are you registered with a dentist?
36a. Have you at any time in the past had difficulty registering with a doctor? (If yes, can you provide details?)

37. Are you or any of your family receiving specialist hospital treatment?

37a. Have you had any difficulties with hospital/medical care?

38. Is there any health related reason for you living here? (E.g. access to a clinic or hospital, close to relative)

39. Do you need any adaptation to your accommodation? Is anyone helping you do this? Do you want advice on disability benefit?

40. If you have children of school age, are they attending schools?

41. Did you have any problems getting them into their present schools? If yes, can you provide details?

42. Have your children ever experienced problems at school because they were Gypsies/Travellers?

43. Can you read newspapers easily? Can you write a letter easily? Do you have problems filling in forms? If no, why not? Did you get any schooling, any other reasons?

44. Does anyone living here go to post-school classes (prompt: evening classes, technical college, computing, learning a trade, etc.)?

45. Have you or your family been victims of racism?

46. Have you or your family been victims of discrimination?

47. What has been your experience of the police?

48. What has been your experience of the media?

49. What Council services do you use?