

Research into Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Supply



(c) Johanna Price

The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups



The National Federation is a Company Limited by Guarantee registered in England and Wales, Company No: 6983027, Charity number with the Charity Commission Registered Charity No: 1136730.

The Aims of the Federation are:

1. To promote social inclusion for the public benefit by working with Gypsy and Traveller groups who are socially excluded and to relieve the needs of such people to assist them to integrate into society, in particular by:-

Providing a network group that encourages and enables members of the Gypsy and Traveller community to participate more effectively with the wider community.

Increasing, or co-ordinating, opportunities for members of the Gypsy and Traveller community to engage with service providers, to enable those providers to adapt services to better meet the needs of that community.

2. To educate the public, for the benefit of the public, in the culture, life and traditions of the Gypsy and Traveller community.

<http://www.nationalgypsytravellerfederation.org/>

[Please see information about the monitoring of the UK Integration Strategy on the Europe page](#)

The Federation office is hosted by DGLG (www.dglg.org)

NFGLG planning work is funded through Tudor Trust:

Contents

Introduction	2
Summary	2
Findings of Friends Families and Travellers (South East of England)	4
Findings of National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (East and West Midlands)	6
Appendix A:Additional Information provided by local planning authorities in the East and West Midlands	10
Appendix B: 5 year supply data from the South East	12
Appendix C: 5 year supply data from the East Midlands	15
Appendix D: 5 year supply data from the West Midlands	17

Introduction

This report contains the research findings of the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups and Friends, Families and Travellers into the progress made by local planning authorities to meet the requirements of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (August 2015) to provide a supply of sites for pitches for Gypsies and Travellers. It also complements more detailed research by the London Gypsy and Traveller Unit which considered the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers in London.

Planning Policy for Traveller Sites sets out the requirement for local planning authorities to "identify and maintain a five year supply of specific, deliverable sites, sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against their locally set targets".

The following research provides a snapshot into the progress made in the South East (by Friends, Families and Travellers) and the East and West Midlands (by National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups) in identifying this supply of land.

Summary

The main findings by Friends, Families and Travellers in the South East were:

- Only 10 local authorities out of 66 had identified a full 5 year supply of specific deliverable sites
- 5 local authorities had no identified need for sites
- Up to 2033, a total of 1745 additional pitches are needed in the South East of England

The main findings by the London Gypsy and Traveller Unit (presented separately in the document 'Planning for the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers in London' www.lgtu.org.uk) were:

- Since 2012, less than one third of London Boroughs have completed a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment
- Only half of those Boroughs that have adopted a Local Plan post March 2012 have set a pitch target
- A very small number of Boroughs (5 in total) have gone on to identify a supply of land in order to achieve the pitch target. In all but one case this has been through extensions to existing sites rather than new sites.

In the East and West Midlands, the National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups found the following:

- 1675 pitches are needed to 2034 across the two regions
- Out of 70 local planning authorities across the two regions, 15 have identified a full 5 year supply of specific deliverable sites
- 10 local planning authorities had not yet identified a 5 year pitch requirement figure

The headline findings show that there has been insufficient progress in meeting the requirements of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and in meeting the accommodation

needs of Gypsies and Travellers. Some local planning authorities have made significant progress but do not yet have a full supply, which is not explicitly shown in the data presented here, and best practice shows that identifying and maintaining a supply of specific deliverable sites is by no means an impossible task, to the benefit of all communities. The lack of accommodation provision has a huge impact on the health, education and wellbeing of Gypsies and Travellers, maintaining the chronic exclusion and vulnerability that these communities face.

Prepared for NFGLG by Alice de La Rue November 2016



Friends Families & Travellers
Community Base
113 Queens Road
Brighton
BN1 3XG
Telephone: 01273 234 777
Fax: 01273 234 778
www.gypsy-traveller.org
fft@gypsy-traveller.org

Research on the five year supply of deliverable Gypsy and Traveller sites in the South East.

In May and June 2016 Friends, Families and Travellers (FFT) undertook a piece of research to ascertain if local authorities were meeting their requirements under the Department for Communities and Local Government's (DCLG) Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) to identify a supply of specific deliverable sites¹ sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of sites against their locally set targets. We carried out this research because the government does not currently collect this data centrally.

We asked the following questions, under the Freedom of Information Act, to the 66 local authorities in the South East of England:

- What is the need identified by your authority's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Need Assessment for new pitches, and what period does this GTANA cover?
- What is the figure identified by your authority for its up to date 5 year 'supply of specific deliverable sites'?
- Please provide copies of the relevant extract of your authority's Local Plan and/or any other documentation in which the up to date 5 year 'supply of specific deliverable sites' is identified.

The research found that:

Only 10 local authorities had identified a 5 year supply of specific deliverable sites.

5 local authorities had no identified need for new sites.

The research found that up to 2033 a total of 1745 additional pitches are needed in the South East of England.

This research clearly highlights the mechanism to ensure more sites for Gypsies and Travellers are provided in the immediate future is not working. In the meanwhile Gypsies and Travellers continue to be evicted from one place to the next. This has a huge impact on Gypsies and Travellers and means families cannot access healthcare, education and other services. These chronically excluded communities become even more vulnerable as a result of the constant cycle of evictions.

¹PPTS, footnote 4, DCLG 'To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that development will be delivered on the site within five years.'

FFT recommends that the government monitors compliance with the requirement in PPTS to have a 5 year supply of deliverable sites and acts to ensure the requirement is met.

FFT also recommends that the government re-introduce targets, and a statutory duty to meet the assessed accommodation need of Gypsies and Travellers, as introduced in Wales in March 2016 (section 103 Part 3, Housing (Wales) Act 2014).

Research into Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Supply Across the East and West Midlands

The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups (NFGLG) commissioned research into pitch supply across the East and West Midlands in September and October 2016. This research was designed to supplement the findings of Friends, Families and Travellers (FFT) carried out earlier in the year, as well as research by the London Gypsy and Traveller Unit (LGTU) undertaken in 2016.

In the East Midlands, the following was found:

- Across the 40 local planning authorities in the region, 782 pitches are required to 2034
- 7 local planning authorities have identified a full 5 year supply of specific deliverable sites, representing 21 pitches out of 330 needed in the region by 2022, or 6.3%
- Actual pitch supply is higher than 6.3% as some local authorities have made significant progress but have yet to meet the full requirement. Some examples provided by local authorities are given in this report, below.
- 6 local planning authorities had not yet identified a 5 year pitch requirement figure

Similarly, in the West Midlands, the main findings were:

- Across the 30 local planning authorities in the region, 893 pitches are needed by 2034
- 8 local planning authorities had identified a full 5 year supply of pitches, representing 102 pitches out of 348 needed by 2021, or 29%
- As in the East Midlands, actual pitch supply is higher, where some local authorities have made significant progress in delivery of sites which is not shown in the data
- 4 local planning authorities had not identified a 5 year figure of need.

The primary message from this snapshot into the current situation is that there is a lack of identified land to meet evidenced need, and insufficient land to provide a 5 year supply of pitches across the East and West Midlands as well as in the South East and London. However this is not the whole picture and there are also some positive examples of site delivery which should be highlighted because significant progress has been made in some local authority areas which is not shown in the data.

In conformity with the research by FFT, the data for the East and West Midlands captured only whether or not local authorities had identified a supply of land to meet the full 5 year pitch requirement, but many local authorities fall short of their requirement by only a few pitches. To highlight this, local authorities were asked not only to fact check the data sheet, but to contribute a brief description of the situation in their area, for inclusion in this report.

In response to the request for information, the following responses were provided:

In Wychavon, 23 new permanent pitches for Gypsies and Travellers have been granted since 1st April 2014, against a 5 year requirement of 31 in the period 2014-2019. In South Derbyshire there are currently more than 80 Traveller pitches with consent. The five-year requirement to 2019 is for a further 14 pitches and since 1 April 2014, South Derbyshire District Council has granted permission for 7 further Traveller pitches. Also in Derbyshire Dales four pitches have been recently approved.

Leicester City Council provided the following response:

“Since 2012, Leicester City Council has made a significant investment in new and improved Gypsy and Traveller site provision within the city. In response to increasing concerns about issues caused by unauthorised encampments, many of which were local families in need of permanent accommodation, the City Council took advantage of HCA funding to identify and develop two new public sites in the city totalling 16 pitches. These sites opened in April 2015. At the same time, the one existing public site, comprising 21 pitches, was completely remodelled and refurbished to bring it up to modern standards. All of these sites are now managed directly by the City Council, and are the only authorised provision in the city, as no private sites have come forward.”

Harborough District Council could not demonstrate a 5 year supply of pitches against a relatively high level of need in their area, but highlighted that recent permissions included intensification of an existing site, and the erection of the Council’s only public site, at Boneham’s Lane, Gilmorton. The site is run by Leicestershire County Council, and was able to come forward through Government funding to a housing association.

Other local authorities are intending to meet their identified need as part of large scale developments, such as Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs). This is the case in Charnwood, where the approach to delivery has been to make provision through the Local Plan Core Strategy by allocating sites in the Sustainable Urban Extensions whose delivery will be assured through legally binding Section 106 Agreements. This will provide for the need identified in the Core Strategy as evidenced by the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment, May 2013.

In Appendix A of this report I have included some additional information from other local authorities who felt that the figures in their area required additional explanation.

Impacts of the lack of accommodation: Case Study

In themselves, the figures are startling and provide clear evidence that local authorities are not currently meeting their requirements under the Government’s Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. However it is also useful to provide some context to these figures. Below a Romany Gypsy lady talks about how the lack of provision of pitches has affected her family and the wider Gypsy and Traveller community.

A Romany Gypsy lady who lives with her family on a small, privately owned site in the West Midlands shared her experience of the impact of the lack of pitch provision. The family have been on their site for 9 years on various temporary planning permissions, on condition that they find a new site. So far it has been impossible to find an alternative site, and as can be seen in the figures in the research, there are simply not enough sites coming forward, with local authorities not meeting their requirements.

The effect of having the uncertainty of the temporary planning permission hanging over the family was described: "It's a trauma to go through planning each time. The uncertainty is always in the back of your mind". At the family's last application process, they received around 120 letters of support, almost all of them from local residents. She went on to explain: "The land was used for tipping, it was an eyesore, covered in rubbish and scrap. We've cleaned it up and invested in this site to get the planning. We've got good friends in the village, the children are happy at school. If they want us to fit in like this, then we need more sites".

As with other members of the Gypsy community, the main concerns are about the next generation "What's going to happen to our children and grandchildren? There's nowhere for them to go. How can they get a full education if they are being moved on all the time? And when you are moved on daily, you can't even get running water. Without a permanent address you can't register with a doctor or a dentist."

The difficulties in maintaining cultural identity in the current planning context were also raised: "We want to travel, and we have to travel to get the planning status, but we can't travel easily now because you get moved on daily. People just see the caravans that shouldn't be there and want them gone. But if you haven't got a site you can't go home either. The council is helping the settled community, what about the Gypsies? We don't want favouritism, but we do want to live".

This brief case study highlights the importance of authorised site provision on community cohesion, health and education, as well as the stress of the uncertainty of losing a home. This was summed up in the report 'Inequalities experienced by Gypsy and Traveller communities: A review' (www.equalityhumanrights.com/researchreports) by the quote: **"the lack of secure accommodation for nomadic groups remains the lynchpin of a plethora of other inequalities."**

The Accommodation Needs of Showmen

The research undertaken by FFT and LGTU focused on the supply of pitches for Gypsies and Travellers. However there is also a requirement to provide plots for Showmen (who are referred to as Travelling Showpeople in Government policy). We also did not request this information specifically, but for those local authorities who provided data, the information on plot supply was disappointing.

Key findings from the data set, which was incomplete, were:

- Of the 35 local authorities who provided data, 186 additional plots were needed across the East and West Midlands from 2012 to 2036.
- Of these 186 additional plots, 67 are needed by 2021 as part of current 5 year supply of specific deliverable sites
- 5 local planning authorities, of the 35 who provided data, had identified a full 5 year supply of specific deliverable sites, which amounted to 24 plots, approximately 36% of the total required.

Harborough District Council has made significant progress with regards to meeting the needs of provision for Showmen, with both new sites and intensification of existing sites permitted over the past 18 months, and can now demonstrate a 5year supply of plots for Showmen.

Wellingborough Borough Council have also met the identified need of 2 plots for Showmen in their area to 2022.

Transit Pitches and Emergency Stopping Places

Apart from the need to provide permanent pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and plots for Showmen, local authorities need to plan for transit pitch requirements. The data on transit provision was again not specifically requested in this case, but there seemed to have been very little progress on delivering transit provision where that information had been provided.

Across the 27 local authorities who provided data:

- 162 transit pitches/emergency stopping places were needed by 2034
- None of the 27 local authorities who had provided the data had met a supply of land to meet transit/emergency need

Again, more research is needed in this area.

Conclusions

The evidence collated in this report highlights that there has been insufficient progress made in the East and West Midlands, as well as in the South East and London, in identifying a 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers. This is also true of the land supply to meet the needs of Showmen. The impact of the lack of accommodation supply is far reaching, with provision of authorised sites key to addressing inequalities. However there are some local authorities who are making good progress towards meeting their 5 year land supply needs and this is welcomed and should be promoted so that other local authorities are encouraged to do the same. Provision of a 5 year supply of specific deliverable sites to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers should not be an impossible task, but the importance of it cannot be underestimated.

Appendix A: Additional Information provided by local planning authorities in the East and West Midlands in relation to Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Need/5 year supply of specific deliverable sites in their area

Birmingham City Council

The process for bringing the sites forward is to firstly allocate them in the Birmingham Development Plan (BDP) and, once the plan is adopted, obtain planning permission.

The intention was for the BDP to be adopted by the Council in July.

However, on 26th May the Minister of State for Housing and Planning, directed the City Council not to take any steps with regard to adoption of the Plan following concerns expressed by a local MP in respect of the plan's proposals for 6,000 new homes on Green Belt land in Sutton Coldfield. Officials from the Department of Communities and Local Government are reviewing the plan. The Minister will then make a decision on whether the direction can be lifted and the plan be adopted. We are still awaiting a decision.

Once the Plan is adopted (and the sites allocated) the process for bringing the sites forward for development will be:

- Identify a development / site management partner with experience in this work area to work alongside the City Council.
- Prepare and submit a bid to the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) for funding to develop the sites.

North East Derbyshire District Council

North East Derbyshire District Council is currently preparing a Local Plan, with consultation on a Draft Proposed Strategy in February 2017. The Council intends to identify site(s) for travellers in the Plan; however the supply of available sites with interested land-owners is limited, public land being the principal source of potential sites.

Bolsover District Council

Whilst Bolsover District Council does not have a 5 year supply at November 2016, the Council has not had sufficient applications for pitches coming forward, which if approved, would help to contribute towards a 5 year supply. In the last few weeks, one planning application (for 3 pitches) has been received. The Council is currently consulting on a Consultation Draft Local Plan and at the same time is undertaking a call for sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople's plots.

Cannock Chase District Council

CCDC Local Plan (Part 1) Policy CP7 identified an 'Area of Search' for further GTTS provision, but did not allocate any sites at that time. CCDC is currently preparing its Local

Plan (Part 2) which will seek to allocate sites to meet the additional provision requirements set out in Local Plan (Part 1). The Council is expecting to consult on its Local Plan (Part 2) Issues and Options document in early 2017.

Nottingham City Council

The figure for Nottingham of 2 pitches is a gross figure arising in the period 2014 to 2019. In the period 2019 to 2029 the GTAA Assessment (2015) concludes that there is no identified demand, as illustrated in the table below:

2014 -19	1.76
2019 - 24	-1.98
2024 - 29	-1.27

Appendix B: 5 year supply data from the South East (FFT Research)

Local Authority	Full GTAA Figure	Beginning of Period Identified for GTAA	End of Period Identified for GTAA	5 Year Supply of Specific Deliverable Sites Figure	5 Year Supply of Specific Deliverable Sites Met	Beginning of Period Identified for 5 Year Plan	End of Period Identified for 5 Year Plan
Adur and Worthing Councils	7	2012	2027	5	No	2012	2017
Arun District Council	14	2012	2027	6	No	2012	2017
Ashford Borough Council	48	2013	2028	No figure identified	No	-	-
Aylesbury Vale District Council	47	2013	2028	33	No	2013	2018
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	7	2012	2017	9	No	2012	2017
Bracknell Forest Borough Council	15	2006	2016	No figure identified	No	-	-
Brighton & Hove City Council	32	2014	2019	18	No	2014	2019
Canterbury City Council	40	2012	2028	23	No	2013	2017
Cherwell District Council	16	2012	2027	5	No	2012	2017
Chichester District Council	59	2012	2027	27	No	2012	2017
Chiltern District Council	42	2013	2023	No figure identified	No	-	-
Crawley Borough Council	10	2013	2030	0	N/A	2015	2020
Dartford Borough Council	34	2013	2028	19	No	2016	2021
Dover District Council	17	2013	2027	12	No	2013	2017
East Hampshire District Council	12	2016	2028	2	No	2016	2021
Eastbourne Borough Council	0	2016	2027	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Eastleigh Borough Council	15	2014	2029	9	No	2014	2019
Elmbridge Borough Council	36	2012	2027	28	No	2015	2020
Epsom and Ewell Borough Council	No current GTAA	N/A	N/A	No figure identified	No	-	-
Fareham Borough Council	8	2013	2027	6	No	2013	2017
Gosport Borough Council	1	2013	2027	1	Yes	2013	2027
Gravesham Borough Council	16	2013	2028	8	No	2013	2017
Guildford Borough Council	73	2012	2027	43	Yes	2012	2017
Hart District Council	No current GTAA	N/A	N/A	No figure identified	No	-	-

Hastings Borough Council	2	2013	2028	2	Yes	2013	2018
Havant Borough Council	0	2013	2027	0	N/A	2013	2018
Horsham District Council	78	2012	2027	55	No	2016	2021
Isle of Wight Council	38	2015	2027	33	No	2015	2020
Lewes District Council	13	2014	2030	No figure identified	No	-	-
Maidstone Borough Council	187	2011	2031	36	Yes	2016	2021
Medway Council	22	2013	2018	13	No	2013	2018
Mid Sussex District Council	34	2013	2031	15	Yes	2016	2021
Milton Keynes Council	12	2013	2031	3.33	Yes	2016	2021
Mole Valley District Council	44	2012	2027	14.5	No	2016	2021
New Forest District Council	12	2013	2027	10	No	2013	2017
Oxford City Council	0	2012	2026	0	N/A	2012	2017
Portsmouth City Council	No current GTAA	N/A	N/A	No figure identified	No	-	-
Reading Borough Council	No current GTAA	N/A	N/A	No figure identified	No	-	-
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	52	2012	2027	No figure identified	No	-	-
Rother District Council	11	2011	2028	2	No	2015	2020
Runnymede Borough Council	117	2013	2028	No figure identified	No	-	-
Rushmoor Borough Council	0	2012	2017	0	N/A	2012	2017
Sevenoaks District Council	72	2012	2026	No figure identified	No	-	-
Shepway District Council	6	2013	2027	4	No	2013	2017
Slough Borough Council	No current GTAA	N/A	N/A	No figure identified	No	-	-
South Buckinghamshire District Council	31	2013	2023	None identified	No	-	-
South Oxfordshire District Council	19	2012	2031	None identified	No	-	-
Southampton City Council	5	2014	2029	1	No	2014	2019
Spelthorne Borough Council	No current GTAA	N/A	N/A	No figure identified	No	-	-
Surrey Heath Borough Council	No current GTAA	N/A	N/A	No figure identified	No	-	-
Swale Borough Council	61	2013	2031	35	Yes	2013	2018
Tandridge District Council	63	2013	2028	None identified	No	-	-
Test Valley Borough Council	10	2012	2027	4	Yes	2012	2017
Thanet District Council	0	2014	2027	0	N/A	2014	2019

Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council	21	2012	2028	4	No	2012	2017
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	No current GTAA	N/A	N/A	No figure identified	No	-	-
Vale of White Horse District Council	13	2012	2029	3	No	2012	2017
Waverley Borough Council	39	2012	2027	No figure identified	No	-	-
Wealden District Council	53	2013	2033	No figure identified	No	-	-
West Berkshire Council	17	2014	2029	4	Yes	2014	2019
West Oxfordshire District Council	18	2012	2027	6	No	2012	2017
Winchester City Council	26	2013	2027	12	Yes	2013	2017
Windsor and Maidenhead Royal Borough Council	28	2012	2027	18	No	2012	2027
Woking Borough Council	19	2012	2027	6.5	No	2013	2018
Wokingham District Council	52	2014	2029	21	No	2014	2019
Wycombe District Council	21	2013	2028	18	No	2013	2018
Total	1745				10		

Appendix C: 5 year supply data from the East Midlands (NFGLG Research)

Local Authority	Full GTAA Requirement	Beginning of Period Identified for GTAA	End of Period Identified for GTAA	5 Year pitch requirement	Have sites been identified to meet the 5 year requirement?	Start date of relevant 5 year period	End date of relevant 5 year period
Amber Valley Borough Council	10	2014	2034	None identified	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ashfield District Council	1	2014	2029	None identified	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bassetlaw District Council	8	2019	2029	-8.6	Yes	2014	2019
Blaby District Council	86	2012	2031	23.4	No	2016	2021
Bolsover District Council	17	2014	2034	9	No	2014	2019
Boston Borough Council	Does not specify	2012	2027	None identified	N/A	N/A	N/A
Broxtowe Borough Council	2	2014	2029	1	No	2014	2019
Charnwood Borough Council	8	2012	2031	3	No	2012	2017
Chesterfield Borough Council	2	2014	2034	2	No	2014	2019
Corby Borough Council	1	2012	2022	1	Yes	2012	2017
Daventry District Council	24	2012	2033	8	No	2012	2017
Derby City Council	31	2014	2034	20	No	2014	2019
Derbyshire Dales District Council	9	2014	2034	6	No	2014	2019
East Lindsey District Council	13	2016	2021	13	No	2016	2021
East Northamptonshire District Council	7	2012	2022	7	Yes	2017	2022
Erewash Borough Council	1	2014	2019	1	No	2014	2019
Gedling Borough Council	3	2014	2029	None identified	N/A	N/A	N/A
Harborough District Council	80	2012	2031	32	No	2015	2020
High Peak Borough Council	0	2014	2034	0	N/A	2016	2021
Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council	42	2011	2016	42	No	2012	2017
Kettering Borough Council	25	2011	2021	7	Yes	2016	2021
Leicester City Council	97	2012	2031	35	No	2012	2017
Lincoln City Council	7	2013	2033	-4	Yes	2013	2018
Mansfield District Council	0	2014	2029	0	N/A	2014	2019

Melton Borough Council	3	2016	2026	2	Yes	2016	2021
Newark and Sherwood District Council	40	2013	2028	14	No	2013	2018
North East Derbyshire District Council	15	2014	2034	6	No	2014	2019
North Kesteven District Council	22	2013	2033	7	No	2013	2018
North West Leicestershire District Council	68	2012	2031	27	No	2012	2017
Nottingham City Council	2	2014	2029	None identified	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oadby & Wigston Borough Council	0	2012	2031	0	N/A	2012	2017
Peak District National Park Authority	0	2014	2034	0	N/A	2014	2019
Rushcliffe Borough Council	4	2014	2029	3	No	2014	2019
Rutland County Council	13	2016	2036	8	No	2016	2021
South Derbyshire District Council	38	2014	2034	14	No	2014	2019
South Holland District Council	Does not specify	2012	2027	None identified	N/A	N/A	N/A
South Kesteven District Council	32	2016	2036	16	No	2016	2021
South Northamptonshire District Council	19	2012	2032	6	No	2012	2017
Wellingborough Borough Council	9	2012	2022	4	Yes	2012	2017
West Lindsey District Council	43	2013	2033	13	No	2013	2018
Total	782						

Appendix D: 5 year supply data from the West Midlands (NFGLG research)

Local Authority	Full GTAA Requirement	Beginning of Period Identified for GTAA	End of Period Identified for GTAA	5 Year pitch requirement	Have sites been identified to meet the 5 year requirement?	Start date of relevant 5 year period	End date of relevant 5 year period
Birmingham City Council	8	2014	2031	4	Yes	2014	2019
Bromsgrove District Council	9	2014	2034	0	N/A	2014	2019
Cannock Chase District Council	41	2012	2028	22	No	2012	2018
Coventry City Council	6	2014	2031	None identified	N/A	N/A	N/A
Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council	21	2008	2018	21	Yes	2013	2018
East Staffordshire Borough Council	11	2014	2034	5	No	2016	2021
Herefordshire Council	66	2014	2031	19	No	2014	2019
Lichfield District Council	19	2008	2026	4.5	No	2016	2021
Malvern Hills District Council	24	2014	2033/34	4	No	2014/15	2018/19
Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council	7	2014	2034	1	No	2014	2019
North Warwickshire Borough Council	9	2012	2028	9	Yes	2016	2021
Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council	35	2012	2028	None identified	N/A	N/A	N/A
Redditch Borough Council	0	2012	2034	0	N/A	2014	2019
Rugby Borough Council	65	2014	2034	30.2	No	2016	2021
Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council	2	2008	2018	2	Yes	2015	2020
Shropshire Council	0	2014	2026	0	N/A	2014	2019
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council	38	2012	2027	26	Yes	2012	2017
South Staffordshire Council	85	2007	2028	17	Yes	2016	2021
Stafford Borough Council	43	2012	2027	19	Yes	2012	2017
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council	8	2014	2034	6	No	2014	2019
Stoke on Trent City Council	38	2014	2034	22	No	2014	2019
Stratford on Avon District Council	71	2014	2031	41	No	2014	2019
Tamworth Borough Council	1	2012	2028	None identified	N/A	N/A	N/A

Telford and Wrekin Council	32	2014	2031	4	Yes	2014	2018
Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council	39	2008	2018	None identified	N/A	N/A	N/A
Warwick District Council	31	2012	2031	25	No	2011	2016
Wolverhampton City Council	36	2008	2018	36	No	2013	2018
Worcester City Council	13	2014	2033/34	0	N/A	2014	2018/19
Wychavon District Council	106	2014	2033/34	31	No	2014	2018/19
Wyre Forest District Council	29	2014	2034	0	N/A	2014	2019
Total	893						