

Direct Dial/Ext: (01622) 694297  
Fax:  
e-mail: andrew.ballard@kent.gov.uk  
Ask for: Andy Ballard  
Your Ref:  
Our Ref:  
Date: 17 July 2009

Dear Member

**GYPSY AND TRAVELLER ADVISORY BOARD - WEDNESDAY, 22 JULY 2009**

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at next Wednesday, 22 July 2009 meeting of the Gypsy and Traveller Advisory Board, the following reports that were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

**Agenda No    Item**

7.    **South East Plan: Consultation on Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show People Pitch Allocations 2006-2016 - Oral Report (Pages 1 - 42)**

Yours sincerely



**Peter Sass**  
**Head of Democratic Services & Local Leadership**

This page is intentionally left blank

Final

**By:** Mike Austerberry, Executive Director, Environment, Highways and Waste  
Oliver Mills, Managing Director, Adult Social Services

**To:** Gypsy and Traveller Advisory Board - 22 July 2009

**Subject:** South East Plan: Consultation on Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling  
Show People Pitch Allocations 2006-2016

**Classification:** Unrestricted

---

**Summary:** This paper and its appendices describe the current consultation on the partial review of the South East Plan over Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation needs 2006-2016, including especially the total numbers of pitches required in total for Kent and Medway, and also their distribution within the county.

---

## 1. Purpose of Report

The attached papers were prepared for a meeting of the Joint Member Steering Group (JMSG) on 13 July. This meeting explored the scope for a common approach for all Kent and Medway authorities in responding to consultation on the option submitted by the regional planning body to Government on providing for Gypsy and Traveller plus Travelling Showpeople accommodation needs 2006-16.

This consultation extends until on 1 September 2009, and is based on Option D of the previous four options that were the subject of public consultation in Autumn 2008. This would allocate to Kent and Medway 290 of the 1064 Gypsy and Traveller pitches identified as being needed in the South East by 2016, and 28 of the 302 Travelling Showpeople pitches required in the region. The tables in the appendices provide greater detail and explanation of distribution options.

An oral report will be given by officers on the outcome of the discussions at the 13 July meeting.

## 2. Recommendations

We recommend:

- a) that the Advisory Board consider the outcome of the discussions with Kent and Medway authorities;
- b) that the Advisory Board consider what the best response to the consultation by KCC would be;
- c) that the Board advise the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services accordingly;

**Final**

**Officer details:**

Richard Feasey, Planning Policy Manager, Environment, Highways and Waste Directorate

Bill Forrester, Head of Gypsy and Traveller Unit. Kent Adult Social Services

Background Documents

**Background Documents**

Partial Review of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople: Recommendations for new policy H7 June 2009.

**APPENDIX 1 TO ITEM 7 OF THE GYPSY AND TRAVELLER  
ADVISORY BOARD – 22 JULY 2009**

**RSS (South East Plan)**  
**Partial Review: Provision for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation**

**Joint Local Authority Member Steering Group**

**5.30pm: Monday 13<sup>th</sup> July 2009**  
**Medway Room, Sessions House, County Hall, Maidstone**

***NB Sandwiches/ refreshments will be available from 5.00pm***

**Agenda**

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Note of the Joint Member Steering Group Meeting 10<sup>th</sup> November 2008  
(enclosed )
3. RSS Partial Review : Current position (paper enclosed)
4. South East England Partnership Board : RSS Partial Review : Provision for  
Gypsies , Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - : Recommendations for  
new policy H7
  - a) Gypsies and Travellers [paper enclosed]
  - b) Travelling Showpeople [paper enclosed]
  - c) Transit provision [paper enclosed]
5. Any Other Business

Integrated Strategy and Planning Division / Gypsy and Traveller Unit  
Kent County Council  
July 2009



**APPENDIX 2 TO ITEM 7 OF THE GYPSY AND TRAVELLER  
ADVISORY BOARD – 22 JULY 2009**

**Item 3**

**RSS Partial Review: Provision for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation**

**Joint Member Steering Group: 13<sup>th</sup> July 2009**

**Subject: RSS Partial Review: Current Position**

---

**Summary**

**This report updates the Joint Member Steering Group (JMSG) on the current position regarding the South East England Partnership Board's partial review of the South East Plan on Gypsy and Traveller accommodation**

---

**Background**

1. At its final meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2009 the Regional Assembly agreed the content of the partial RSS review submission to Government. The details of this are set out in the next agenda paper (Item 4a).

2. This followed the public consultation on Issues and Options conducted between 1 September 2008 and 21 November 2008. Public response was sought primarily by means of a structured questionnaire. There were local consultation events across the region, a regional stakeholder workshop, Gypsy and Traveller focus group sessions, and a MORI poll of 1,000 residents. 9 of 27 local events were held in Kent and Medway - more than in any other County. These comprised exhibitions in 6 towns and 3 stakeholder meetings across the GTAA areas.

3. Representations from individual Kent and Medway local authorities were submitted as a result of the consultation on options. Shortly before most local authorities responded a meeting of the JMSG took place on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2008. This provided a useful exchange of views and understanding of where each local authority stood although no unified view on the options consulted on by SEERA was reached.

4. There was significant variation in the responses from Kent Districts and Medway Council to the consultation options. The total number of additional pitches across Kent implied as a consequence of Districts' responses falls well short of any of the totals for Kent and Medway associated with the approaches taken in the region's consultation options (see Appendix 1) or its current preference. The County Council's response at that time suggested an alternative option which would provide for the higher rate of regional redistribution contemplated by SEERA's options but involving an alternative basis for pitch distribution in Kent.

**Current Position**

5. The regional planning body's proposals for the number and distribution of pitches for both Gypsies and Travellers accommodation and Travelling Showpeople have been submitted to Government. Consultation by Government began on 8<sup>th</sup> June and runs to **1<sup>st</sup> September 2009**.

**Next steps**

6. Following consideration of the representations received a Government appointed independent Inspector will hold an Examination in Public from **2<sup>nd</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> February 2010**. At the request of the Inspectorate this is later than the original programme which had envisaged an EIP in Autumn 2009.

7. It is assumed that the Panel report can therefore be expected in the Spring/early Summer of 2010. Allowing for publication and consultation on any Proposed Changes, final publication setting out pitch numbers and their district by district distribution of pitches to be provided is unlikely before late 2010.

8. For Members' information.

---

Strategy and Planning Division/ Gypsy and Traveller Unit:  
Kent County Council

On behalf of the Kent Authorities RSS Review Officer Working Group

## APPENDIX 1

**Table 3: Kent Authorities' Responses to the Autumn 2008 Consultation**

<i>District/ GTAA area</i>	<i>Preferred option</i>	<i>Additional pitches 2006-2016</i>
Ashford	A	20
Maidstone	C	32
Tonbridge & Malling	C*	10
Tunbridge Wells	A	11
<b>West Kent GTAA</b>		<b>73</b>
<b>Sevenoaks/ Sevenoaks GTAA</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>14</b>
Dartford	C	17
Gravesham	D	12
Swale	B	31
Medway	#	#
<b>North Kent GTAA</b>		<b>60</b>
Canterbury	A	32
Dover	A	6
Shepway	A	2
Thanet	A	5
<b>East Kent GTAA</b>		<b>45</b>
<b>(Kent &amp; Medway)</b>		<b>(192)</b>
<b>Kent CC – 'Option E</b>		<b>241</b>
<b>Regional Option A/B for Kent and Medway</b>		<b>320</b>
<b>Regional Option C for Kent and Medway</b>		<b>241</b>
<b>Regional Option D for Kent and Medway</b>		<b>281</b>

Note:

Option A = based on 'needs arising established by GTAA's with no redistribution to the rest of the region.

Option B: with the same total provision figure for the county as Option A, with no redistribution to the rest of the region but with distribution of pitch numbers in Kent and Medway based on sustainability (environmental and planning) criteria.

Option C: the higher regional redistribution option with internal (Kent and Medway) distribution of pitch numbers based on Option B.

Option D: the lower regional redistribution option with internal (Kent and Medway) distribution of pitch numbers also based on Option B.

see paper for Item 4a for further details.

C\* = An alternative Option C devised by Tonbridge and Malling BC but based on the internal distribution in Option A not B.

# Medway Council was of the view that *'insufficient evidence exists to justify a specific requirement for additional pitches in Medway'*

There is a substantial shortfall between the summation of these preferences and either of the regional options providing for regional redistribution (between 49 and 89 pitches) and even more so in relation to the needs based total (128 pitches).

**APPENDIX 3 TO ITEM 7 OF THE GYPSY AND TRAVELLER  
ADVISORY BOARD – 22 JULY 2009**

Item 4a

**RSS Partial Review: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation**

**Joint Member Steering Group: 13<sup>th</sup> July 2009**

**Subject: South East Plan Review: Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers in the South East: Consultation on Proposals submitted to Government by the Regional Planning Body for the South East**

---

**Summary**

**This note considers the issues raised in the Government's current public consultation on the proposals submitted by the South East England Partnership Board for the level and distribution of pitches to be provided for Gypsies and Travellers in the South East**

---

**Introduction**

1. Between 1 September 2008 and 21 November 2008 the former Regional Assembly undertook public consultation on four options for the distribution of permanent residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople based on the total level of need identified in combined final council advice, and, in the case of Showpeople, an additional element of unaccounted for regional need. The issues raised were discussed at the last JMSG on the 10<sup>th</sup> November 2009.

2. At its plenary meeting in March the former Regional Assembly approved its preferred option for submission to Government and subsequent consultation. Its main elements are:

- i. A draft replacement for Policy H7 of the South East Plan including provision for 1,064 residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and 302 for travelling Showpeople in the period 2006-2016 ;
- ii. A distribution of residential pitches for both Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople based upon Option D consulted on in the Autumn of 2008;
- iii. A delegated approach to determining provision for transit, temporary and emergency stopping places through county group-based joint working.

3. The proposed policy is:

*"Policy H7: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople*

*Local Planning Authorities will make provision in Local Development Documents to deliver **1,064 net additional permanent residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers** in the period 2006-2016, and 302 for Travelling Showpeople, as set out in Table H7a which details pitch requirements by local authority. Local Planning*

*Authorities will also make appropriate provision in Local Development Documents to meet requirements for transit and temporary stopping places.”*

4. This paper concentrates on the elements of the proposed policy approach which relate to gypsies and travellers. Subsequent papers on this agenda address matters relating to travelling Showpeople and transit provision.

**Consultation by SEERA on Options (Autumn 2008)**

5. In summary the 4 original options in SEERA’s consultation on Gypsies and Travellers accommodation were:

**Table 1: Summary of 2008 Consultation Options:**

	<b>South East Region</b>	<b>Kent &amp; Medway</b>
	<i>(Additional Pitches)</i>	
Option A – new pitches all provided as close as possible to where Gypsies and Travellers currently live	1064	320
Option B new pitches all provided in the same general area* but with neighbouring authorities within this area sharing the duty for providing new pitches	1064	320
Option C - half of new pitches should be in the same general area* where Gypsies and Travellers currently live with the other half spread across the region	1064	241
Option D – most (75%) of new pitches should be in the same general area* where Gypsies and Travellers currently live with a quarter spread across the region	1064	281

*\* i.e. Kent and Medway*

6. The Kent and Medway figures for Options A and B were those included in the advice provided by Kent authorities as revised in April 2008. Option A reflected the pattern of need identified through the GTAA’s but with some adjustment to ensure greater consistency in treatment of specific factors in the needs assessment. Option B, as advised by the Kent authorities to SEERA, was the composite outcome of alternative distributions that reflected 6 planning and environmental criteria including the Metropolitan Green Belt.

7. Two additional options (C and D) were introduced by SEERA to provide for redistribution of accommodation need across the region. These have the effect of reducing, to varying degrees, overall provision in Kent and Medway which contains a substantial proportion (29%) of the region’s existing authorised pitches. As far as Kent and Medway are concerned Options A and B have the same total (320 pitches) whilst under Option C provision reduces by 25% and under Option D by 12%.

8. The total additional pitches at District and GTAA area level for each of these options and the range between them are in **Appendix 1**.

9 In submitting their original advice to the region on Options A and B the Kent authorities supported a pattern of new pitch provision which provided for some redistribution within the region given the historic concentration of supply in certain parts of the South East (notably Kent and Surrey).

10. However in their responses to the consultation on options in respect of their own areas the views expressed by Kent authorities were varied:

Option A: Ashford, Canterbury, Dover, Shepway, Thanet, Tunbridge Wells

Option B: Swale

Option C: Dartford, Maidstone, Sevenoaks, Tonbridge & Malling <sup>1</sup>

Option D: Gravesham

Others: KCC (alternative Option E – see below)  
Medway (no provision).

11. The differences in local authorities' views largely centred around those who considered that the level and distribution of pitches should be based solely on the needs assessments of the GTAAs (Option A) and those favouring the options influenced by a degree of redistribution within the region and within Kent (Options C and D). These options tend to increase requirements in areas where need assessments are relatively low, and decrease them where they are comparatively high. A distribution of new pitches based on needs based evidence alone (Option A) concentrates provision in the region and locally where sites already exist and has the disadvantage of reducing the degree of choice of locations available to Gypsies and Travellers.

12. Across the region 61% of Councils considered that the regional provision of pitches was "*about right*" and two thirds favoured the non-redistributive options A and B. However a majority of respondents supported some redistribution – 57% of respondents across the region favoured Options C or D. Significantly, two thirds of Gypsies and Travellers respondents also supported these options with more than half supporting the more redistributive Option C<sup>2</sup>.

13. Government advice<sup>3</sup> advocates consideration of an element of redistribution so that the responsibility for new pitch provision can be shared more widely between authorities than at present.

14. This redistributive approach has been reflected in the outturn of other RSS reviews. In the East of England, making provision in all districts (minimum of 15 pitches regardless of where need arises) was supported by the Examination Panel to provide increased flexibility and choice for Gypsies and Travellers and to assist the increased rate of delivery of additional pitches. Distribution away from the three

---

<sup>1</sup> But based on Option A not B

<sup>2</sup> Partial Review of the RSS for the South East : Provision for Gypsies , Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Annex F page 48

<sup>3</sup> CLG: Preparing Regional spatial Strategy Reviews on Gypsies and Travellers. March 2007

districts with the largest current provision and local need was advocated because of the historic reasons for the marked differences that existed.

### **The Regional Planning Body's preferred option (D)**

15. Acting on what they considered to be a 'good' level of response the conclusions drawn by the Regional Assembly from the consultation were that:

- Whilst a majority of councils opposed regional redistribution and prefer options A and/or B, to proceed on this basis would ignore the mandate established for a degree of regional redistribution to widen GTTS choice and responsibility for provision.
- An 'Option A plus top-up' approach was considered similar to the approach used in the East of England Region. Whilst this would follow the need assessment approach favoured by the Gypsy and Traveller community, the conclusion was that it would diverge from the previously agreed approach, that allocations should be guided by planning and sustainability criteria.
- Option C found most support in the SE consultation, but the Assembly considered that its implications for Hampshire, more than doubling its contribution, would be too extreme.

16. In the light of this **Option D** was favoured, on balance, as a deliverable compromise. It was also agreed that that option B should continue to be the starting point for regional redistribution (rather than A), as the local redistributions put forward within option B will also help deliverability by widening responsibility for provision.

17. In summary the Regional Assembly found that none of the options were unchallengeable but that the alternatives to Option D, whilst credible, did not appear 'inherently preferable'.

18. In moving to its submission the Regional Planning Body (RPB) has revised its application of the methodology guiding the options on regional redistribution (Options C and D) using the latest data on land constraints. As result the total number of pitches allocated to Kent and Medway is increased from **281 to 290** for the preferred option D (the corresponding increase for Option C (not pursued) would have been considerably higher - 21 more pitches i.e. 262 not 241).

19. Option D is the lesser of the redistributive options considered by the RPB. At 290 pitches Kent and Medway would still have by far the largest number and proportion of pitches of the county areas in the region at 27% of the regional total (see Appendix 2). This is close to Kent and Medway's share of existing authorised provision in the South East region (29%) and thus reflects only very modest redistribution away from the Kent area. Option D is now only 30 pitches (9%) below the needs based total of Option A (320 pitches).

20. Whilst the option D total is distributed to District level (see Table 2) the submission provides for and indeed encourages collaborative working between

authorities and allows scope for allocations to be combined and redistributed between partner authorities 'where this would improve delivery outcomes'<sup>4</sup>.

**TABLE 3: Regional Planning Body's Preferred Option D as submitted to Government**

<b>District/ GTAA area</b>	<b>Option D submitted to Secretary of State: Additional pitches 2006-16</b>
Ashford	30
Maidstone	35
Tonbridge & Malling	18
Tunbridge Wells	14
<b>(West Kent GTAA)</b>	<b>(97)</b>
<b>Sevenoaks/Seven oaks GTAA</b>	<b>19</b>
Dartford	22
Gravesham	12
Swale	28
Medway	30
<b>(North Kent GTAA)</b>	<b>(92)</b>
Canterbury	30
Dover	23
Shepway	12
Thanet	17
<b>East Kent GTAA</b>	<b>(82)</b>
<b>Kent &amp; Medway</b>	<b>290</b>

*Note: Figures in brackets are the implied totals for GTAA areas but figures submitted are for county and district areas only*

### **Alternative perspectives for consideration**

21. It is worth recounting some of the features of the original consultation options:

**Option A:** was solely needs based but does not provide any element of redistribution of provision at GTAA area, county or regional levels;

**Option B:** reflected the level of need at a county level but provides no direct local need component (GTAA or district) as its distribution is driven solely by planning, environmental and sustainability criteria. This would redistribute provision within Kent but with no element of regional redistribution;

<sup>4</sup> Partial Review para 4.5

**Options C and D:** provided alternative levels of redistribution on a regional basis but:

(i) They used the Option B distribution as a starting point and thus there is no direct alignment, below the county level, with the pattern of need where it arises, that is shown in Option A;

(ii) For the apportionment of the redistributed element the RPB has used two 'broad brush' criteria (pattern of environmental constraints and population forecasts at 2016). Whilst the former is comparable with some of the criteria used by the Kent authorities for Option B the latter is used as a very general, proxy, measure for 'availability of opportunity'. No specific account is taken of considerations such as the extent of brownfield land development opportunities, the wider role of authorities in housing supply or comparative accessibility to key services which are taken into account in Kent's Option B. The latter also incorporates greater sensitivity to the nature of environmental constraints at, and around, key settlements where new pitch provision might be expected to be made;

(iii) the preferred Option D therefore reflects a pitch distribution based on the application of different mixes of planning and sustainability factors – part county wide and part regional;

(iv) The omission of a component reflecting the local pattern of need means that Options C and D involved substantial redistribution within Kent to parts of East Kent and stark curtailment of provision in districts with the highest levels of identified local need (Sevenoaks; Swale)

22. Given these considerations KCC felt that none of the four original options provided a sufficient balance between the factors outlined above. An alternative (Option E – see **Appendix 3**) was put forward which:

- retained a larger element of regional redistribution in line with Option C ;
- incorporated an element of the local pattern of need by using Option A, rather than Option B, as the starting point;
- adopted a local distribution of the 'pooled' regional element that 'comes back' to Kent that takes account of the more detailed and refined local planning and sustainability factors that were developed locally in the development of Option B.

23. The merits of Option E were considered to be that it:

- mirrored more closely and widely the pattern of need at district level while still providing an element of redistribution within Kent away from the localities with the highest levels of need;
- moderated the severity of impact of this redistribution on certain areas (parts of East Kent and Medway ) in comparison with Option C;
- continued to ensure that all districts make a contribution to new pitch provision ;
- ensured that at least 60% of district based need is accommodated in the same district where it arises in addition to the element of regional redistribution.

### **Other alternatives**

24. As previously explained the pitch allocation to Kent and Medway has increased from 281 to 290 under Option D as now submitted. This also reflects revised shares of the regional reapportionment pool that would be allocated to each authority in Kent and Medway. Similar reworking would apply to Option C if it were still to be considered (see – Table 4 below - Option C (Revised ) involving a total of 262 pitches.

25. The Kent authorities Officers Steering Group has considered the changes to Options C and D relative to other options. The County totals in Option C (Revised) and 'submitted' Option D are now somewhat closer to Options A and B and this has 'weakened' the degree of implied regional redistribution from Kent. However their pattern within Kent has not significantly changed and remains subject to the concerns outlined in para. 21 above

26. In these circumstances Members' may wish to consider the merits of other approaches that:

- maintain the principle of regional redistribution; and
- provide for an internally coherent and consistent approach to the apportionment of the resultant Kent /Medway totals

***(a) Based on the higher level of regional redistribution (Option C approach) which has not been taken forward in the region's preferred option***

**(ii) Option C1:** Based on the Option C total (262 pitches) but using the pattern of need (Option A) as the starting point and for distributing the share of the regional apportionment (102 pitches) that 'comes back' to Kent/Medway.

**(iii) Option E (Revised):** reflecting the revised total (262 pitches) that would apply under Option C. This approach uses Option A as the starting point, but distributes the element of the 'pooled' regional requirement that is apportioned to Kent and Medway in Option C (102 pitches) on the basis of Option B.

***(b) Based on the lower level of regional redistribution provided for under the region's preferred option (Option D approach)***

**(iii) Option D1:** Based on the revised Option D total (290 pitches) but using the pattern of need (Option A) both as the starting point and for distributing the share of the regional apportionment (50 pitches) that 'comes back' to Kent/Medway.

**(iv) 'Option F':** Adopts the same approach as Option E but applied to the total of 290 pitches under Option D. This approach uses Option A as the starting point, but distributes the element of the 'pooled' regional requirement that is apportioned to Kent and Medway in Option D (50 pitches) on the basis of Option B.

27. These approaches are summarised in **Table 4** alongside the original consultation options (with account taken of subsequent revisions) and the region's preferred option (Option D).

Table 4 : Previous consultation options , the Regional Planning Body's submitted proposals and alternative approaches

	Option A	Option B	Option C (Revised)	RPB's Preferred Option D as Submitted to Government and subject of current consultation)	Option C1	Option E (Revised)	Option D1	Option F
Ashford	20	32	29	30	16	20	18	20
Maidstone	48	39	31	35	39	36	43	42
Tonbridge & Malling	14	20	16	18	11	13	13	14
Tunbridge Wells	11	15	13	14	9	10	10	11
Sevenoaks	57	22	16	19	47	36	52	46
Dartford	33	27	17	22	27	25	30	29
Gravesham	16	13	10	12	13	12	14	14
Swale	64	31	25	28	52	42	58	53
Medway	12	32	28	30	10	16	11	14
Canterbury	32	33	27	30	26	27	29	29
Dover	6	24	22	23	5	11	5	8
Shepway	2	13	11	12	2	5	2	4
Thanet	5	19	16	17	4	9	5	7
Kent and Medway Total	320	320	262	290	262	262	290	290

## Recent Changes in the Supply of Pitches

28. The South East Plan review relates to provision to be made over the period 2006-2016. One of the elements considered in the Kent local authorities' revised advice to SEERA in April 2008 was the need to take account of changes in the supply of permanent authorised pitches permitted since completion of the needs assessments. This has been updated for the period 2006-2009. Table 5 sets out the proposed Option D pitch allocations in Kent and Medway 2006-2016 alongside the residual number of pitches which would need to be found after taking account of additional permanent pitches permitted since 2006. Some 52 additional pitches have been permitted since 2006 with new supply concentrated in Maidstone and to a lesser degree Gravesham, Sevenoaks, Swale and Dartford.

**Table 5: Change in supply of permanent authorised residential pitches 2006-9 and residual requirements to 2016**

<i>District/ GTAA area</i>	<i>Existing private and public authorised residential pitches at mid 2006 (corrected figures )</i>	<i>Existing private and public authorised residential pitches at April 2009 (taking account of change in supply 2006-09)</i>	<i>Option D as submitted to the Secretary of State – Additional Pitches 2006-16</i>	<i>Option D Residual no. of pitches required 2009-16</i>
Ashford	106	108	30	28
Maidstone	115	135	35	15
Tonbridge & Malling	37	37	18	18
Tunbridge Wells	17	20	14	11
<b>West Kent GTAA</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Sevenoaks/ Sevenoaks GTAA</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12</b>
Dartford	45	50	22	17
Gravesham	13	21	12	4
Swale	48	53	28	23
Medway	14	14	30	30
<b>North Kent GTAA</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>74</b>
Canterbury	50	51	30	29
Dover	18	19	23	22
Shepway	1	1	12	12
Thanet	0	0	17	17
<b>East Kent GTAA</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Kent &amp; Medway</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>238</b>

### Points for discussion

29. In considering the both the region's preferred option and the alternative approaches set out in this report Members may wish to consider the following:

- i. Whether the total pitch provision for Kent and Medway should allow for a degree of redistribution within the region and away from Kent. Kent authorities have expressed a preference for this at earlier stages of formulating the partial review and there is support for this in Government guidance,

experience from other regions and the balance of public response to the RPB's earlier consultation.

- ii. If redistribution is supported in principle whether the total additional pitch provision now proposed for Kent and Medway (290 pitches 2006-2016) is appropriate given the modest degree of redistribution to the rest of the South East that this represents (30 pitches) in comparison with a wholly needs based approach
- iii. If the degree of regional redistribution proposed under option D is deemed insufficient, whether that implied under a revised Option C ( 58 pitches ) is more in line with reducing the historic concentration in the Kent area. An approach based on the Option C total would still see Kent and Medway accommodating 25% of the total new provision proposed for the South East.
- iv. Whether a Kent and Medway total, that incorporates an element of regional redistribution, should incorporate a distribution within Kent that
  - o continues to be based solely on the pattern of need ( Options C1 and D1 follow this approach ) ; or
  - o reflects some redistribution away from areas where provision has been historically high <sup>5</sup> and where need is currently concentrated by taking account of local planning and sustainability criteria<sup>6</sup> in conjunction with the pattern of need (Options E (Revised) and F follow this approach; or
  - o whether the distribution should be based solely on that indicated by the pattern of local planning and sustainability criteria (the region's preferred option D and Option C (revised) follow this approach.
- v. Whether consensus can be established around pitch provision to be made in Kent and Medway as a whole, and optionally for GTAA study areas, with a view to further partnership working to secure delivery through Local Development document preparation. The Partial Review provides scope for this subject to confidence that such provisions will be secured.

30. The approach to provision for additional pitches both regionally and locally will ultimately be considered and tested before Planning Inspectors at an Examination in Public. Consistency and coherence of approach that reflects a collective view from partnerships of authorities is likely to have more force. Some regional redistribution of provision will be challenged in certain quarters and potentially compromised if areas such as Kent /Medway do not have a robust approach to this supported by a coherent approach to dealing with pitch allocations at a sub regional scale. A wholly 'bottom up' approach based on previously expressed preferences is most unlikely to hold sway if it falls substantially short of the current proposals for the Kent and Medway area as a whole. The likely consequence of this would be an alternative (and higher) distribution imposed through the Examination Panel.

## **Recommendation**

31. It is recommended that the Joint Members Steering Group:

---

<sup>5</sup> Three districts in Kent ( Maidstone , Ashford and Sevenoaks have accounted for more than half (55%) of existing permanent residential pitches in Kent and Medway

<sup>6</sup> e.g. as originally developed in local authority advice to the region developed locally in the development of Option B

(i) note and consider the proposed level and distribution of additional Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision in Kent and Medway set out in the Partial Review submission (Option D) ;

(ii) review the case for, and terms of, a collective response to these proposals by the Kent authorities taking account of the considerations raised in paras 29 & 30 and the alternative approaches set out in Table 4;

(iii) in the light of (ii), determine whether a coordinated approach should be adopted by Kent authorities during the scrutiny and testing of the Partial Review proposals at the forthcoming Examination in Public.

---

Strategy and Planning Division/ Gypsy and Traveller Unit:  
Kent County Council  
On behalf of the Kent Authorities RSS Review Officer Working Group

### **Background Documents**

Partial Review of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople: Recommendations for new policy H7  
June 2009.

## APPENDIX 1 – THE REGION’S PREVIOUS CONSULTATION OPTIONS (2008)

### *SEERA Consultation (Sept – Nov 2008): Options A – D: Kent and Medway area*

<b>District/ GTAA area</b>	<b>Additional pitches</b>				
	<b>Option A</b>	<b>Option B</b>	<b>Option C</b>	<b>Option D</b>	<b>Range within A – D</b>
Ashford	20	32	28	30	12
Maidstone	48	39	32	36	16
Tonbridge & Malling	14	20	14	17	6
Tunbridge Wells	11	15	11	13	4
<b>West Kent GTAA</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Sevenoaks/ Sevenoaks GTAA</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>43</b>
Dartford	33	27	17	22	16
Gravesham	16	13	10	11	6
Swale	64	31	20	25	44
Medway	12	32	24	28	20
<b>North Kent GTAA</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>54</b>
Canterbury	32	33	26	30	7
Dover	6	24	20	22	18
Shepway	2	13	9	12	11
Thanet	5	19	16	17	26
<b>East Kent GTAA</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Kent &amp; Medway</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>79</b>

#### Option A

The needs assessments and Option A reflect the existing distribution of Gypsies and Travellers. Under this option additional provision of pitches would be relatively concentrated in three districts in Kent (Swale, Sevenoaks and Maidstone). They would account for more than half (53%) of the total county provision. However every district would make a contribution although this would be very modest in Dover, Shepway and Thanet reflecting the minimal evidenced presence of the Gypsy and Traveller communities in these areas.

#### Option B

Like Option A this option was based on data provided by the local authorities to the RPB. It has the same level of pitch provision as Option A (320 pitches) but this is redistributed within Kent on the basis of planning and environmental criteria including the incidence of Metropolitan Green Belt and national environmental constraints, the extent of urbanisation, housing land supply and commitments and accessibility to services. The effect is to redistribute pitch distribution more widely within Kent than that based solely on the GTAAs:

- towards parts of East Kent (Dover, Shepway, Thanet) Medway and Ashford; and
- in varying degrees away from districts with high need assessments (particularly Sevenoaks and Swale and to a lesser extent Maidstone).

### Options C and D.

These options were produced by the Regional Assembly in response to the request by Kent local authorities and other parts of the region that the Assembly should consider additional options providing for wider distribution of pitch provision across the region and which reduce the concentration of pitch provision in Kent provided for under Options A and B. Options C and D respectively retain 50% and 75% of the district level requirements under Option B with the balance re-apportioned across the region by equal weighting between two criteria:

- Land area free of major environmental constraints
- Forecast population at 2016 used as a general proxy for economic and social opportunities and access to employment and services.

Options C and D reduce overall provision in Kent and Medway in comparison with Options A and B. Option D numbers are higher than Option C given the smaller element of regional redistribution. The effects within Kent and Medway of Option C and D are variable:

- In North Kent provision is lower in all districts ( especially Swale ) but higher than Option A in Medway;
- In Sevenoaks the C and D options are substantially lower than Option A but vary only modestly from Option B;
- In West Kent the C and D options are lower than Option A in Maidstone but higher in Ashford and at a comparable level in Tonbridge and Malling and Tunbridge Wells ;
- In East Kent the C and D options are significantly higher than Option A in Dover, Shepway and Thanet and only marginally different from the Option B numbers; Canterbury's figures are very similar across all 4 options.

**APPENDIX 2 PARTIAL REVIEW PROPOSALS (OPTION D – COUNTY SHARES)**

	<b>2006 baseline</b>	<b>% of region</b>	<b>Submitted Option D requirement</b>	<b>% of region</b>	<b>% change</b>
Berkshire	214	11	77	7	36
Bucks and Milton Keynes	194	10	114	11	59
East Sussex	43	2	55	5	128
Hampshire and Isle of Wight	160	9	143	13	89
<b>Kent and Medway</b>	<b>546</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>53</b>
Oxfordshire	202	11	62	6	31
Surrey	336	18	146	14	44
West Sussex	173	9	177	17	102
SE REGION	1,868	100	1,064	100	59

**APPENDIX 3 Option E (as in KCC's representation to the Regional Assembly's consultation on options A to D in Autumn 2008).**

In essence Option E takes the Option A distribution as the starting point, retains the element of the 'pooled' regional requirement that is reapportioned to Kent (81 pitches) under Option C but distributes this within Kent on the basis on the distribution pattern of Option B which reflects the locally based planning and environmental criteria:

	<i><b>Additional pitches</b></i>
<b><i>District/ GTAA area</i></b>	
Ashford	18
Maidstone	34
Tonbridge & Malling	12
Tunbridge Wells	9
<b><i>West Kent GTAA</i></b>	<b>73</b>
<b><i>Sevenoaks/ Sevenoaks GTAA</i></b>	<b>34</b>
Dartford	23
Gravesham	12
Swale	40
Medway	14
<b><i>North Kent GTAA</i></b>	<b>89</b>
Canterbury	25
Dover	9
Shepway	4
Thanet	7
<b><i>East Kent GTAA</i></b>	<b>45</b>
<b><i>Kent &amp; Medway</i></b>	<b>241</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

**APPENDIX 4 TO ITEM 7 OF THE GYPSY AND TRAVELLER  
ADVISORY BOARD – 22 JULY 2009**

**ITEM 4b**

**RSS Partial Review: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation**

**Joint Member Steering Group: 13<sup>th</sup> July 2009**

**Subject: South East Plan Review: Accommodation for Travelling Showpeople in the South East: Consultation on Proposals submitted to Government by the Regional Planning Body for the South East**

---

**Summary**

**This note considers the issues raised in the Government's current public consultation on the proposals submitted by the South East England Partnership Board for the level and distribution of pitches to be provided for Travelling Showpeople.**

---

**Introduction**

1. The partial review of the RSS is also addressing the accommodation needs of Travelling Showpeople<sup>1</sup>. In the Autumn 2008 consultation 3 options were presented regarding Showpeople:

- Option A based on the level of need identified in the local authority advice<sup>2</sup>
- Options C and D take Option A as a starting point but, as with gypsy and traveller pitches, they provided for different degrees of redistribution of provision in the region
  - Option C 50% pooled for regional redistribution
  - Option D 25% pooled for regional redistribution.

The responses of the Kent Districts and Medway Council to the Autumn 2008 consultation are summarised in Appendix 1.

2. Options C and D also included apportionment of an additional 42 families whose needs have not been accounted for in the area based needs assessments. The effect of this and the redistribution represented by Options C and D was to raise plot provision requirements in Kent and Medway to 23 – 30 plots (within a higher regional total of 276 plots).

3. The needs based assessment for Travelling Showpeople displays a rather different pattern to that for Gypsies and Travellers with the latter relatively concentrated in Kent and Surrey (47%) but with the former concentrated in Hampshire and Surrey (54% of the regional total).

---

<sup>1</sup> Defined in Planning Circular 04/2007 as "Members of a group organised for the purposes of holding fairs, circuses or shows (whether or not travelling together as such). This includes such persons who on the grounds of their own or their family's or dependants' more localised pattern of trading, educational or health needs or old age have ceased to travel temporarily or permanently, but excludes Gypsies and Travellers as defined in ODPM Circular 1/2006."

<sup>2</sup> There is no Option B with regard to Travelling Showpeople.

4. The recommendations for new Policy H7 of the South East Plan propose 302 residential pitches for Travelling Showpeople in the region 2006-2016 against a current baseline of 431. Distribution would be based on Option D. For Kent and Medway this involves provision for 28 pitches (against a current baseline of 48). As with Gypsies and Travellers, the Option D figures for Kent and Medway have increased slightly (5 additional plots) since the Autumn 2008 consultation as a result of adjustments to the region's methodology for apportioning the element that is redistributed across the region and the higher regional total (302 pitches) now proposed.

**Table 1 Net additional pitch provision**

	2006 baseline	Consultation Options (Autumn 2008)				2009 Submitted Proposals Option (D)
		Option A (Need as arises)	42 families (allocation by C/D approach)	Option C (50% pooled + share of 42)	Option D (25% pooled + share of 42)	
Ashford	4	0	1	4	2	3
Maidstone	8	0	1	4	2	3
Tonbridge & Malling	3	0	1	1	1	1
Tunbridge Wells	0	0	0	1	1	1
<b>West Kent GTAA</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Sevenoaks/ Sevenoaks GTAA</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Dartford	3	7	0	5	5	4
Gravesham	0	0	0	1	1	1
Swale	3	0	0	1	1	2
Medway	15	0	1	2	1	3
<b>North Kent GTAA</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>
Canterbury	10	2	1	4	3	4
Dover	0	0	1	3	2	2
Shepway	0	0	0	1	1	1
Thanet	1	1	1	2	2	2
<b>East Kent GTAA</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Kent &amp; Medway</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>28</b>

*Note: There are some other minor differences between Option D as consulted on in 2008 and the current Option D. As explained in a footnote to SEERA's Planning Committee in January 2009, the original Dartford Showpeople allocation (under Option A ) contained the entire post 2011 requirement for North and West Kent which was a product of the methodology used . The RPB has now reduced the Dartford allocation but this has some consequences for other North Kent authorities albeit that the numbers are very small.*

5. In Kent and Medway needs assessment surveys for Travelling Showpeople were conducted in East Kent (as an integral part of the GTAA) and a separate, specific study for the remainder of the county. The latter, in particular, proved difficult, achieving a low response rate and the robustness of the data is therefore more questionable. The needs based assessments indicated a very modest level of need over the period to 2016 (10 plots within a regional total of 234).

6. The previous Option C and both the previous and current version of Option D involve higher provision in Kent than the needs based Option A and they include 7 of 42 households not covered in the local needs assessments. However if the principle of redistribution is endorsed in respect of provision for Gypsy and Travellers the same consideration should apply with regard to Travelling Showpeople. In the case of the latter redistribution serves to increase provision in Kent and Medway but involves only modest additional pitch numbers (18 pitches) over the level indicated by the needs assessment. The scale of redistribution into Kent for Showpeople pitches is marginally less than the redistribution from Kent under the comparable option for gypsies and travellers.

7. However there is no apparent, locationally based, needs assessment for the 42 homeless families included within the redistribution arrangements and this serves to increase provision that is redistributed in the region beyond the 25% provided for under Option D. Further understanding is required to understand the particular needs and circumstances of the 42 homeless families.

8. The proposed distribution is highly dispersed across the county (generally only 1-4 plots per district). As indicated in the report to the JMSG in November last year, this distribution is of questionable realism in terms of delivery. Showpeople normally form part of a travelling group and do not tend to be located in isolation. Under Option D many Districts, with no history of Showpeople present or wishing to resort to the area would be required to embark on a protracted process of making provision for just one or two plots for which there may be no demand. As the consultation document itself states, if redistribution is taken too far there is a potential, but unquantifiable risk, that some pitches provided would not be occupied, reducing overall sustainability benefits.

## **Conclusions**

9. If the principle of redistribution is accepted for Gypsies and Travellers then it could be argued that, for similar reasons, the principle should also apply to accommodation for Travelling Showmen. However the effect of regional redistribution under Option D for Kent and Medway (and Option C) is much more pronounced in proportionate terms. In regional terms Kent /Medway has a relatively modest number of existing pitches and estimated need for additional pitches. This coupled with the relatively high concentration of existing pitches in certain other parts of the region (Hampshire, Surrey) means that the additional pitch requirement that is redistributed into Kent under Option D is disproportionately high in comparison with Option A (28 compared to 10 or 180%).

10. The approach taken to the 42 homeless Showpeople families in the region is also questionable. Even if this element were to be set aside, the remaining requirement for 21 pitches under Option D still represents double the number that would be required under the 'no redistribution' approach (Option A).

11. The evidence base on both need and the case for the level and manner of redistribution is considered less than satisfactory and on this basis the foundations of Option D are not strong.

## **Recommendation**

12. It is recommended that the Joint Members Steering Group:

(i) note and consider the proposed level and distribution of additional Travelling Showpeople pitch provision in Kent and Medway set out in the Partial Review submission (Option D);

(ii) review the case for, and terms of a collective response, to these proposals taking account of the concerns raised in paras 5 to 11;

(iii) in the light of (ii), determine whether a coordinated approach should be adopted by Kent authorities during the scrutiny and testing of the Partial Review proposals at the forthcoming Examination in Public.

---

Strategy and Planning Division/ Gypsy and Traveller Unit:  
Kent County Council  
On behalf of the Kent Authorities RSS Review Officer Working Group

### **Background Documents**

Partial Review of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople: Recommendations for new policy H7 June 2009.

## APPENDIX 1

### Kent Authorities Responses to Autumn 2008 Consultation: Travelling Showpeople

<i>District/ GTAA area</i>	<i>Preferred option</i>	<i>Pitches</i>
Ashford	A	0
Maidstone	A	0
Tonbridge & Malling	*	?
Tunbridge Wells	A	0
Sevenoaks	C	1
Dartford	C/D <sup>§</sup>	5
Gravesham	A	1
Swale	A	0
Medway	#	-
Canterbury	A	2
Dover	A	0
Shepway	A	0
Thanet	A	1
(Kent and Medway)		(10?)
Regional Option A for Kent/Medway		10
Regional Option C for Kent/Medway		30
Regional Option D for Kent/Medway		23

\* = T&M BC requested the matter of homeless Travelling Showpeople should be referred back to SEERA and the Guild of Travelling Showpeople as the Council did not accept the distribution of single pitches across the region.

§ = Dartford BC objected to the methodology used to calculate the Option A figures requesting the additional pitches arising from natural growth of the existing travelling Showpeople population should be apportioned according to the current distribution of pitches throughout the sub-region. Following this re-apportionment, Options C and D should be changed accordingly (see note at foot of Table 1 in main report).

# = Medway Council was of the view that '*insufficient evidence exists to justify a specific requirement for additional pitches in Medway*'

This page is intentionally left blank

**APPENDIX 5 TO ITEM 7 OF THE GYPSY AND TRAVELLER  
ADVISORY BOARD – 22 JULY 2009**

**ITEM 4c**

**RSS Partial Review: Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation**

**Joint Member Steering Group: 13<sup>th</sup> July 2009**

**Subject: South East Plan Review: Gypsies and Travellers: Transit Provision:  
Consultation on Proposals submitted to Government by the Regional Planning  
Body for the South East**

---

**Summary**

**This note considers the issues raised in the Government's current public consultation on the proposals submitted by the South East England Partnership Board for approach to be taken to transit provision for gypsies and travellers**

---

**Introduction and Context**

1. Government advice <sup>1</sup> indicates that the South East Plan should provide district level allocations for transit spaces as well as permanent residential pitches. In October 2007 as part of the local authority advice submitted to SEERA, the Kent authorities submitted an agreed paper on the accommodation needs of transient Gypsies and Travellers (Appendix 1). In summary this indicated a possible need for transit site provision in the following areas:

- West Kent : Tonbridge & Malling (small site)
- North Kent : Dartford, (6- 8 vans in summer months)  
Gravesham (6-8 vans in summer months)  
Swale (12 to 15 caravans - all year)
- Sevenoaks (One facility – small to medium size site)
- East Kent : Canterbury (15 pitch site)  
Dover (6 pitch site).

2. Consultation by the former regional assembly in 2008 noted the lack of a comprehensive set of transit need assessments and advice making it *'impossible to allocate transit pitch provision to individual council area level in a robust and consistent way'*. The question was raised as to whether the South East Plan should indicate only a general level of need and delegate final determination of need and location to councils working in consultation with Gypsy and Traveller communities.

3. In response to this consultation KCC commented:

- There was a need for 7 transit sites or stopping places in Kent

---

<sup>1</sup> Circular 01/2006

- In view of the incomplete set of transit need assessments and local authority advice for the region the allocation of pitch provision should be delegated to local authorities in consultation with the Gypsy and Traveller community
- Such provision would need to be reviewed in view of the volatility of the current number of encampments.

4. The proposals now submitted supports a delegated approach and recommends county based joint working to establish the level and form of provision required. To assist local authorities in this and to help address the current evidence gap the RPB has commissioned a regional study into transit movement patterns and ‘higher level’ evidence of need. Draft Policy H7 states that *‘local planning authorities will also be making appropriate provision in Local Development Documents for transit and temporary stopping purposes.’*

5. In the context of this proposed approach KCC’s Gypsy and Traveller Unit has carried a review of unauthorised encampment (UE) data from 2004 to 2008 to inform an updated assessment of transit requirements and the current region wide study. The background data is shown in Appendix 2.

**Unauthorised Encampments (UEs) Data**

3. Data for the period 2004-8 is incomplete for 2005/6 as no date for Medway is available for those years. Over the 5 years the number of UEs (not numbers of caravans) was as follows:

<b>Year</b>	<b>UEs in Kent</b>	<b>UEs in Medway</b>	<b>Total</b>
2004	129	48	177
2005	136	N/A	136 plus?
2006	141	N/A	141 plus?
2007	93	19	112
2008	111	14	125

Despite the data gaps a steadily reducing trend for Kent and Medway is evident - the combined Kent and Medway figure for 2008 is nearly 30% lower than the 2004 figure.

4. Main points to consider are:
- i. The number of unauthorised encampments (UEs) is not, in itself, a good indicator of demand, either for permanent residential sites or for transit sites, or both.
  - ii. If an encampment of, say, five caravans, is moved on three times within a month, then it will show in the data as three UEs. However, if the same encampment is allowed to stay for the month, it will show as one.
  - iii. For this reason the most telling data are the number of **caravan/days**. This is the number of caravans on an encampment multiplied by the number of days that each encampment remains. These are then added together, to give a very good idea of the volume and frequency of encampments in an area.

- iv. **Caravan/days** do not reflect the number of individuals or households involved in the encampment. There is no automatic relationship between households and caravan numbers and the same people may appear on different encampments over time, but clearly cannot appear at the same time on different encampments. The data cannot differentiate between these circumstances. However the data does indicate the usage that would be made of any facilities or sites for families in each local authority area not on legal sites, if that accommodation were provided and they could access it.
- v. Appendix 3 indicates that, in most areas of Kent the volume and frequency of encampment has reduced substantially.
- vi. The other relevant figure is the number of months (i.e. all or any part of a calendar month) during which encampments have been recorded in each area. This varies from during just one month in 2008 in Tunbridge Wells to 12 months in Medway in 2004.
- vii. The most recent data suggests that if fixed transit site were to be provided in those areas where the frequency and volume of encampment has reduced substantially, and if this lower demand were to continue sites would not be used for so long in the year by those on unauthorised encampments.
- viii. Another possibility is that provision of transit sites would lead to greater demand, including from other areas within Kent and Medway, and beyond. That is a further issue to consider, but there is little if any research data that indicates whether or not increased demand arises from site provision.

## Conclusions

5. There is now a longer and improved time series of data on unauthorised encampment in Kent and Medway. Joint handling of data between local authorities and Kent Police within a single database, and with checking of data with all involved before publication, enables the most accurate data to be recorded. If there is subsequent evidence of unrecorded encampments the data can be updated.

6. The data, especially that for 2007/8 was not available when the original advice to SEERA on transit site needs was compiled (October 2007). The earlier Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAAs), in Sevenoaks and West Kent, which commenced in 2004 and 2005 respectively, did not take account of some of the 2005 and 2006 data on UEs.

7. Provisional conclusions from the data are that :

- a) the need for transit site facilities in certain Districts appears to be lower than previously indicated ( Canterbury, Dartford, Dover, Gravesham)
- b) if the current managed encampment in Sittingbourne can continue, the numbers of unauthorised encampments will continue at a low level, and further transit provision may not be needed.
- c) In Medway there will be a continuing but reduced need for transit site accommodation if this is not met by residential provision.

- d) there may be a continuing need for transit site accommodation in Tonbridge & Malling Borough, but the lack of any unauthorised encampments in the area during 2009 suggests, at least, reduced demand, at least.
- e) there appears to be continuing need for a transit site in Sevenoaks District.

### **Recommendations**

8. It is recommended that the JMSG agrees that:

- a) Fresh advice should be submitted in response to the current review of transit provision across the South East and this advice should reflect the latest data and indications of demand for transient provision in Kent and Medway;
- b) KCC clarifies either the definitions used in the October 2007 advice (large, medium, small sites), or the specific pitch needs for transient accommodation for each area so that the terminology is put on a more consistent basis;
- c) Before revised advice is confirmed further consideration be given to whether the needs identified reflect needs for permanent residential provision, transit provision or provision of temporary stopping-places, and the appropriate proportion of each;
- d) The proposal in the RSS review for county based joint working to establish the level and form of transit provision required be supported
- e) The response to consultation should emphasise that areas within the South East which have indicated they cannot assess transit site needs, should do so, if necessary by introducing proper collection and monitoring of UE data. Kent authorities should not meeting transient needs in Kent and Medway that other authorities in the South East are ignoring or failing to address in their areas.
- f) There should be close collaboration with the current regional exercise on transit needs commissioned by the RPB and with other authorities, within and outside the county, to set the context for county based provision.

---

Gypsy and Traveller Unit  
Kent County Council

On behalf of the Kent Authorities RSS Review Officer Working Group

### **Background Documents**

Partial Review of the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople: Recommendations for new policy H7  
June 2009.

## **APPENDIX 1**

**(Extract from October 2007 Kent and Medway advice, relating to transit sites)**

### **Section 8: Transit Sites – Needs and Provision**

---

8.1 SEERA require separate advice on the nature of demand for transit provision and need for transit caravan pitches. Whilst the GTAA's in Kent (North Kent, East Kent, and Sevenoaks) have considered the issue of transit demand there has also been recognition of a requirement for transit provision to be planned, and developed on a county wide basis. A provisional assessment of need for transit pitches draws on data from the continuous monitoring of unauthorised encampments from the beginning of 2004 to date.

8.2 Since 2003, Kent and Medway Local Authorities and other public bodies have operated a protocol for managing unauthorised encampments (UEs) [that is caravans which occur on others' land without their consent] - and a system for recording UE data, regardless of who owns the land, that has been encamped upon. It also covers who "manages" the encampment and makes the decision about whether people should be directed to leave or moved on from it, or allowed to remain. There is now a database for 3 complete years (2004-06 inclusive).

8.3 The Government's twice yearly caravan count data of unauthorised encampments is also relevant, but as a snapshot of caravans on two days of the year (in January and July), the count does not accurately record UE patterns. The caravan counts for unauthorised sites over the 2002-2006 period are summarised in Appendix 16.

8.4 The January 2007 Caravan Count indicated the following pattern of unauthorised developments and unauthorised encampments in Kent and Medway:

**Table 8.1: Gypsies and Travellers: Unauthorised sites: January 2007**

District/GTAA area	Unauthorised developments	Unauthorised Developments	Unauthorised Encampments	Unauthorised Encampments	Total
	'Tolerated' Sites	'Not tolerated' Sites	Tolerated sites	'Not tolerated' Sites	
Ashford	0	0	0	0	0
Maidstone @	21	17	16	14	68
Ton & Malling	2	6	10	0	18
Tunbridge Wells	4	9	0	0	13
<b>West Kent GTAA area</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>99</b>
Sevenoaks @	25	0	0	0	25
<b>Sevenoaks GTAA area</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>
Dartford*	14	0	0	0	14
Gravesham	0	11	0	0	11
Medway	8	0	0	0	8
Swale	32	4	0	0	36
<b>North Kent GTAA area</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>69</b>
Canterbury	0	9	0	8	17
Dover	0	2	0	0	2
Shepway	0	0	0	0	0
Thanet	0	0	0	0	0
<b>East Kent GTAA area</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Kent and Medway</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>212</b>

Source: Department for Communities and Local Government Caravan Count data

\* based on July 2006

@ based on Jan 2006

8.5 Overall, the pattern of UEs over the last three years has been fairly consistent, although there had been a slight eastward shift. The average stay of encampments has remained quite low - at about two weeks- and the average number of caravans on encampments has also been consistent ( at five ) over this three year period, although the pattern can vary considerably between districts.

8.6 The four Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments (GTAAs) have interviewed very few Gypsies and Travellers on UEs and In Kent and Medway we do not believe that their views and needs have been assessed sufficiently to inform the advice to the Regional Assembly on pitch requirements. However, we are aware that the same is true for other local authorities in the South East Region, and we therefore believe that a special study of transit need, and the need for transit site accommodation, should be undertaken across the Region.

8.7 The following provisional assessment of need for transit pitches, drawing upon information on the continuous monitoring of unauthorised encampments in Kent and Medway 2004-6, suggests that:

- **East Kent**

There are about eight to ten households which have contributed to about fifty percent of the UE caravans in Canterbury District and adjacent Swale Borough in the North Kent GTAA area. So far as the local authorities who manage UEs in those authorities are aware, these households are essentially homeless and may well represent permanent residential need although it is recognised that some might not (currently or at all) have that intention.

According to the East Kent GTAA, there appears to be an ongoing and consistent need for transit site provision in Canterbury. It is suggested that the site needed in Canterbury district would be for a 15 pitch transit site. In Dover a need for a 6 pitch transit site is indicated.

- **North Kent**

The GTAA recommends provision of a small managed transit site in Swale.

The three years' UE data provisionally indicate that in Dartford district a small site with limited facilities to accommodate six to eight caravans for short stays during the summer may be appropriate. In Gravesham a permanent transit site with reasonable facilities to accommodate six to eight caravans would seem to be appropriate, based on the three years' UE data.

- **West Kent**

A small site to accommodate small encampments on an emergency basis might be considered in Tonbridge & Malling, based on three years' UE data.

- **Sevenoaks**

The three years' data indicate that Sevenoaks experiences a number of medium size encampments, generally in the west of the district and predominantly during the summer months. A medium-sized summer facility with moderate services would accommodate that pattern.

The GTAA identifies a requirement for a small transit site facility in the district.

8.8 In summary, the additional transit site provision which may be proposed based on GTAA data and three years' UE data is:

<b>GTAA</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Proposed additional provision and other possibilities</b>
West Kent	Ashford	none at present
	Maidstone	none at present
	Tonbridge & Malling	a small site for emergency use
	Tunbridge Wells	none at present
North Kent	Dartford	a small site for 6 to 8 caravans in summer months may be appropriate
	Gravesham	a permanent site for 6 to 8 caravans in summer months may be appropriate
	Medway	none
	Swale	a site for 12 to 15 caravans
Sevenoaks	Sevenoaks	one facility small-medium size
East Kent	Canterbury	a 15 pitch site
	Dover	a 6 pitch site
	Shepway	None
	Thanet	None

\*\* (Department for) Communities and Local Government

## APPENDIX 2

### Extract from Kent County Council's letter of 21<sup>st</sup> November 2008 in response to SEERA's Autumn 2008 consultation

#### ***"Transit Accommodation Requirements***

*Government guidance is that the South East Plan should provide district level allocations for transit spaces as well as permanent residential pitches. At SEERA's request advice was provided by the Kent authorities indicating a need for 7 transit sites or stopping places in Kent (not 8 as indicated in Table 3 of the Assembly's consultation document) and indicating a broad distribution within the county and the size and type of facility envisaged. This drew on the distinctive information from the monitoring of unauthorised encampments that has been available in Kent since 2004. Kent authorities did nonetheless advocate that a specific study of transit need should be undertaken on a regional basis.*

*In the consultation the Assembly notes that there is not a complete set of transit need assessments and local authority advice for the region as a whole making it impossible to allocate transit pitch provision in a 'robust and consistent way'. It therefore asks whether the South East Plan should simply delegate the final distribution of transit sites to local Councils working in consultation with the Gypsy and Traveller community. Whilst this would appear to be the only practical way forward in current circumstances it is important that this is approached on a wide area basis. If this is to be determined in this manner the provision required should be reviewed taking into account the current volatility in the number of encampments and the impact of increases in permanent site provision arising from this Plan. "*

### APPENDIX 3: Unauthorised Encampment Data by District

Tables for unauthorised encampments recorded in each district in Kent and for Medway Council show the following for the years for which data is complete. For 2005 and 2006, there was no data for the Medway Council area but there is data for Kent Districts and Boroughs, which is on the KCC website at: <http://www.kent.gov.uk/Community/equality-and-diversity/gypsies-and-travellers/published-reports.htm>

#### Ashford

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	7	16	134	1-4	5
2007	7	40	297	1-20	4
2008	3	10	84	2-6	1

#### Canterbury

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	22	121	1053	1-20	10
2007	18	80	1064	1-20	10
2008	6	21	213	1-5	5

#### Dartford

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	33	238	855	1-26	10
2007	7	29	225	1-6	5
2008	17	43	180	2-4	5

#### Dover

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	10	46	396	2-11	5
2007	3	11	323	1-8	4
2008	5	16	30	2-5	4

#### Gravesham

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	22	66	482	1-7	11
2007	4	8	72	2 only	3
2008	5	14	82	1-4	4

### Maidstone

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	7	44	190	2-15	5
2007	5	12	188	1-6	5
2008	4	17	487*	1-8	4

\* one unauthorised caravan for 323 days on one public site made up most of this figure.

### Medway

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	48	322	4728	1-16	12
2007	19	61	255	2-15	6
2008	13	61	679	1-11	7

### Sevenoaks

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	13	66	1339	1-8	8
2007	9	57	1492	1-16	8
2008	12	43	482	1-9	4

### Shepway

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	4	35	154	1-17	3
2007	2	9	132	1-8	3
2008	2	4	N/A	0-3	2

### Swale

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	49	377	4679	1-20	12
2007	32	201	5,500 approx	2-20	11
2008	51	200 (approx.)	5538	1-16	12

[But only two encampments between September and December 2008, and the low number is continuing, while a managed encampment continues.]

### Thanet

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	4	4	15	1 only	2
2007	2	11	71	5-6	2
2008	None	None	None	None	None

### Tonbridge & Malling

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	6	31	210	4-7	6
2007	2	13	138	1-10	2
2008	5	37	383	2-20	4

[No recorded UE yet in 2009.]

### Tunbridge Wells

YEAR	Number of UEs	Total caravans	Number of caravan/days	Range – caravan numbers	Number of months within which UEs recorded
2004	None	None	None	None	None
2007	1	8	16	8 only	1
2008	2	10	100	0-9	1