

Gypsies and Travellers Development Plan Provision in Epping Forest District Consultation on Options Questionnaire

This is the questionnaire for the accompanying options paper for consultation on how to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers in Epping Forest District.

The consultation will formally begin on the 4th November 2008.

The consultation will end at 5pm on the 6th February 2009.

Please complete the form, preferably online at
www.eppingforestdc.gov.uk

or emailed to

ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

However if you are unable to use the online form then paper representation forms are also accepted and should be sent to:

**Epping Forest District Council
Forward Planning - Gypsies and
Travellers Consultation
Civic Offices, High Street
FREEPOST CL 3360
Epping
Essex CM16 4YA**

Photocopies of this comments form are also accepted, but these must be individually completed. Providing we have a full list of individual names, addresses and contact

details and signed agreement a single form can also be completed for a group, or by an agent or professional expert.

Please read the whole paper. You do not have to respond to every question only those on which you have a view. Please do try to respond to questions five and six however as these are central to what sites are chosen. The options paper will only have a limited lifespan and will be replaced by a submitted plan. For this reason a line by line commentary is not necessary. Please focus your comments on the questions.

It would not be appropriate to comment on the form without sight of the paper, For this reason the forms are only issued alongside the options paper. We will need individual names and addresses for those requesting copies so we can include them on our consultation database.

You should try to back-up your comments by evidence showing why a particular option should or should not be considered.

Responses cannot be treated as confidential. They must be made in a lawful and decent manner - e.g. avoiding racist comments. No such comments will appear in published documents. Any such comments received may be copied, passed to the police if neces-

sary, and returned and may not be considered.

If you make a representation through the website you will receive an email notification of each comment received. Once your representation has been checked (after the consultation period closes) you will receive a further email to let you know it has been validated. If you make a hard copy representation, you will receive an acknowledgement letter as soon as we can send them.

Please ensure hard copy forms are signed and dated otherwise they may not be valid.

All representations will be summarised and placed on the council website in due course. Please indicate in the final question whether or not and how you wish to be informed of publication of the consultation results. A summary and analysis of comments will also be published shortly afterwards.

Part A - Please give the full name and address of the person making the comments. Comments are only valid if your name and address are supplied. If you are representing an organisation please state the full name of the organisation, otherwise leave blank. If you are an agent representing a client, please complete this section as well as the name and address of the person you are representing.

Part B - Please tick the relevant question boxes, some give a choice of several options and you should only tick one. Please give reasons wherever you can. Such comments with strong planning arguments will carry much greater weight. If you run out of space please use a clearly marked separate piece of paper. If you are elderly or have special needs please call us on the **hotline** at **01992 564517** and we will make arrangements to help you fill it in, in Epping or at one of the exhibitions.

Part C - Contains questions on how you wish to be kept informed. At the next stage in 2009 you may wish to make formal representations on the final submitted plan. Looking ahead to this stage it is important to make your comments in terms of how the document can be made 'sound', or how in the light of the evidence on which the options are based it would not be 'sound'.

To be sound the document should be **JUSTIFIED, EFFECTIVE** and consistent with **NATIONAL POLICY**.

"Justified" means that the document must be:

- founded on a robust and credible evidence base
- the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives

"Effective" means that the document must be:

- deliverable
- flexible
- able to be monitored

National Policy on Gypsies and Travellers is contained in circular 1/2006.
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/circulargypsytraveller>

National policy is that provision must be made in line with regional targets. Hence it is not an option not to provide sites. Rather the issue is where they should go. Looking ahead if you wish to object to or propose sites the independent inspector who will write a binding report will be looking for evidence of whether there is an alternative locational strategy and why alternative sites in Epping Forest District should be preferred.

If you wish to make representations in favour of a previously unconsidered site please complete the 'Call for Sites' form.

Part A**About you - this is a compulsory section****Your Details**

Name	
Address	
Postcode	
email	
Telephone	

Your Agents Details**Only complete if you have an agent acting on your behalf - in which case they will receive correspondence**

Name	
Company	
Address	
Postcode	
Email	
Telephone	

Part B**The questions****Question 1****Objectives**

Do you agree with the draft objectives?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 2

Focus of Search for Sites

Do you agree that the search for sites should be broadly confined to the west and south of the district closest to the main urban areas, rather than the more rural northeast of the district?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 3

Phasing of Sites

Do you agree with the proposed phasing of pitch provision?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 4

Scale of Sites

Which option do you prefer for the typical scale of gypsy and traveller sites?

Option one - sites of 1-5 pitches, with potential for expansion to 2-7 pitches (requiring at least 15 additional sites)

Option two - sites of 5-10 pitches, with potential for expansion to 15 pitches (requiring at least 5 additional sites)

Option three - sites of 16-30 pitches, with potential for expansion to 21-45 pitches (requiring 2-3 additional sites)

Please tick only one box

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 5

Concentration in Roydon and Nazeing Area

Which option do you prefer?

Option one - No special restriction, sites in this area considered on their merits

Option two - Restriction on new sites in the Roydon Hamlet/Hamlet Hill, Sedge Green and Bumbles Green/Long Green areas, but authorisation of tolerated sites and expansion of existing suitable sites.

Option three - No further permissions granted in the whole of the Roydon and Nazeing areas.

Please tick only one box

Please give reasons for your answer

This is a compulsory question.

Question 6

The Main Possible Strategies

Option one - Edge of Urban Areas/Urban Extensions Option

Option two - Rural Areas close to Chigwell, Abridge, Waltham Abbey, Epping and Epping Green, Thornwood Common, Theydon Bois and North Weald Bassett

Option three - Wider distribution throughout the district

Please tick only one box

Please give reasons for your answer

This is a compulsory question.

Question 7

Site Search Sequence

Do you agree with the proposed site search sequence?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 8

Large Urban Sites

a) Should large brownfield sites (1 ha +) in the urban areas outside the Green Belt be required to provide 20% of their land area for travellers pitches?

Yes

No

b) If so should the alternative of off-site provision be allowed even if this were in the green belt?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answers

Question 9

Sites as part of Harlow Urban Extensions

a) Do you agree with these proposals for gypsy/traveller sites to be provided as part of urban extensions to the West of Harlow?

Yes

No

b) Do you agree with these proposals for gypsy/traveller sites to be provided as part of urban extensions to the North East of Harlow?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answers

Question 10

Sites as part of other Urban Extensions

Do you agree that one of the urban extensions to the towns in the district that is likely to be required after 2017 should be required to provide a gypsy/travellers site or sites totalling fifteen pitches?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 11

Potential for Expansion of Two Existing Sites

a) Do you agree with the expansion of the site at Little Brook Road Roydon by up to four pitches?

Yes

No

b) Do you agree with the expansion of the site at Greenleaver Hoe Lane Nazeing by a further five pitches?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answers

Question 12

Potential for Expansion of Other Existing Authorised Sites

Do you agree with the assessment of the unsuitability for extension of these sites?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 13

Tolerated Sites

Do you agree with the assessment that the listed four tolerated sites should be allocated permanently?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 14

Potential Extension of Tolerated Site- Bournebridge Lane Stapleford Abbots

Should this site be expanded by around five pitches?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 15

Unauthorised Sites

Do you agree that the unauthorised sites are unsuitable?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 16

Temporary Permission at Holmsfield Nursery Nazeing

Do you agree that this site should not be given temporary permission beyond five years (or the coming on stream of sites secured through urban extensions to Harlow if these do not come forward within five years)?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 17

Rural Brownfield Sites at North Weald - Merlin Way

A) Do you agree that a small permanent travellers site is suitable in this location?

Yes

No

B) Do you agree that this location is suitable for a transit and/or emergency stop over facility?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answers

Question 18

Possible Sites in the Epping and North Weald Bassett Areas

Please tell us whether or not each of these sites should be taken forward:

Site 18a - Former Allotment -Wintry Park Epping

Yes No

Site 18b - Paddock -Wintry Park Epping

Yes No

Site 18c - Land at Rear and side of the Estate Cottages at 137-163 Lindsey Street

Yes No

Site 18d -South West of Epping Green

Yes No

Site 18e - East of Epping Green

Yes No

Site 18f- Duck Lane Woodside, Thornwood Common

Yes No

Site 18g- Woodside to the rear of Forest House, Thornwood Common

Yes

No

Site 18h - Rear of Garage Junction of High Road and Upland Lane, Thornwood Common

Yes

No

Site 18i - Rear of Gulf Garage, Thornwood Common

Yes

No

Site 18j - West of Tylers Green, North Weald Basset

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answers

If you know of other sites in this area that are better and/or also should be considered please state which ones and why

Question 19

Possible Sites in the Waltham Abbey, Roydon and Nazeing Areas

Please tell us whether or not each of these sites should be taken forward:

Site 19a - Yard/Cark park at rear of Lea Valley Nursery, Crooked Mile

Yes No

Site 19b - Smallholding off Crooked Mile

Yes No

Site 19c - Former Kingsfield Nursery, Sewardstone

Yes No

Site 19d - Chandlers Farm Sewardstone

Yes No

Site 19e - Part of Brookfield Nursery Sewardstone

Yes No

Site 19f - Netherhouse Farm and Adjoining Land -Sewardstone

Yes No

Site 19g- Meadows Long Green/Bumbles Green

Yes

No

Site 19h- Spinney Nursery, Hoe Lane Nazeing

Yes

No

Site 19i- Burleigh Nursery Hoe Lane, Nazeing

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answers

If you know of other sites in this area that are better and/or also should be considered please state which ones and why

Question 20

Possible Sites in the Roding Valley Area

Please tell us whether or not each of these sites should be taken forward:

Site 20a - Site next to Victory Hall, Hainault Road Chigwell

Yes No

Site 20b- Paddock, Theydon Garnon - Coopersale Lane

Yes No

Site 20c- Paddock, Theydon Garnon - Abridge Road

Yes No

Site 20d - Paddock east of Abridge

Yes No

Site 20e - Former Crowther Nursery Abridge

Yes No

Please give reasons for your answers

If you know of other sites in this area that are better and/or also should be considered please state which ones and why.

Question 21

Criteria for Windfall Sites

Do you agree with the wording of the suggested policy?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 22

Transit Sites

Do you agree with the initial assessment that the need for transit sites is very low in the district?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 23

Travelling Showpeople

Do you agree with adding two extra yards to the site at Moreton?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 24

Site Delivery

Which option towards ensuring site delivery do you think should be prioritised?

A) Allocating many more sites than are needed on the expectation that some will not come forward

or

B) Purchase of sites using compulsory powers if necessary

Please tick only one.

Please give reasons for your answer

Question 25

Indicators

Do you agree with the proposed suite of indicators?

Yes

No

Please give reasons for your answer

Any Further Comments

Any Further Comments

Do you want your representations acknowledged?

Yes

No

If yes to the above, by what means?

By email or by postcard

Do you wish to see the report and analysis of comments?

Yes

No

If yes to the above, by what means?

By email link to website

by letter (copies will be made available for inspection and purchase)

Do you wish to be informed of when the final plan is published?

Yes

No

If yes to the above, by what means?

By email or by letter

N.B There is a requirement in government regulations to make a reasonable charge for development plans.