

# Traveller Local Plan 2020-2041

## Technical Note

Arc4 on behalf of LBE

April 2025

## Enfield GTAA technical note 17 Apr 25

- **What is the required need for our 5 year supply. If we intent to adopt in 2026 (towards the end of the year), how many pitches are requires. Is it 19, 20 or 21? If you could confirm this figure ASAP (i.e. this week) via email, that helps me with the capacity work – thanks.**

Starting point for this calculation is:

Period	Pitch need	Annualised need
<b>5yr Authorised Pitch Shortfall (2020/21 to 2024/25) (A)</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>3.2</b>
<b>Longer-term need</b>		
Over period 2025/26 to 2029/30 (B)	3	0.6
Over period 2030/31 to 2034/35(C)	4	0.8
Over period 2035/36 to 2040/41 (D)	7	1.4
Longer-term need TOTAL to 2040/41 (21 years) E=(B+C+D)	<b>14</b>	
<b>NET SHORTFALL 2020/21 to 2040/41 (A+E) (26 years)</b>	<b>30</b>	

Source: Table ES1 GTAA 2024

As we have absolute data for 5 year periods the data can be readily adjusted.

Assuming adoption in 2026, the required need for 5 year supply would be 16 (shortfall 2021/22 to 2024/25 not yet provided for) **plus** 0.6 for each year 2025/26 to 2029/30.

Assuming the point of adoption is in 2026, this is taken as the financial year 2026/27. Therefore the 5 year supply at the point of adoption would be 16 plus 0.6 for 2025/26 and 0.6 for 2026/27 meaning a need for 17.2 pitches pragmatically rounded to 17.

As a five year supply is needed at the point of adoption, this means we need to consider need for the financial years 2027/28 to 2031/32. The annual pitch needs over this period is as follows: 2027/28 0.6, 2028/29 0.6 2030/31 0.8, 2031/32 0.8. Therefore the overall 5 year need for the period 2027/28 to 2031/32 is 2.8 pitches pragmatically rounded to 3.

- **Breakdown of the GRT need in terms of the 15 families interviewed. Why are they located in Edmonton at present, is this where they want to be, or are they there by circumstance, and where do they want to be? How does, or could, this relate to our 2 proposed site allocations of circa 21 pitches? We can chat through this.**

In terms of location at time of interview:

14 were in Enfield (12 in a house or flat; 2 roadside)

1 was out of area with connections with Enfield

Not all of the households interviewed wanted to move to a site. A total of 8 wanted to move from bricks and mortar to a site and 1 was planning to move back into Enfield from another London Borough. There were also 7 emerging households identified who lived in bricks and mortar who wanted to move to a site. This provided the basis for the 16 households needing pitches in the short-term 2020/21 to 2024/25

- **Clarify what we need in relation to private and public pitches. How does the 30 pitches break down?. Also note that we questioned the type of sites to be delivered as part of our initial Issues and Options consultation, so ideally the output from your note should align with our direction of travel. Happy to review something in draft and discuss first.**

The GTAA asked households what they would prefer in terms of site. All 15 just stated 'site in Enfield'. It should be noted that the 2021 census reported that most Gypsies and Travellers rented their home. A considered conclusion here is that any pitch would need to be affordable – either provided by the council or privately funded, with tenants likely to need housing benefit/universal credit to cover the cost of renting.

- **Whether the GTAA is up to date (given the age of the household surveys, and that they were undertaken during lockdown (i.e. interviews of Brick and mortar families only, so lockdown made little to no difference)). What is the extent of the household survey data? Where does our own internal need come from – confirm it is bricks and mortar families only. Also, how the needs of families outside of the borough were considered. I know more of this is covered in the GTAA, but if you have any further info, that would be helpful.**

I would also say that that Enfield Council continues to engage extensively with Traveller communities (I'd actually go as far as saying it's probably one of the best at engagement through the lead taken by Karen Maguire). Therefore, the council has a good understanding of need. The reality is that the need evidenced in 2020 is likely to represent a minimum need.

The needs of families from out of borough who have connections with Enfield were considered in the 2020 study through the links established by Karen.