

Gypsy & Travellers Development Plan Provision in Epping Forest District

– Consultation on Options Questionnaire

Objectives

Q1 Do you agree with the draft objectives?

Yes

No

Q2 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 north east of the district?

Yes

No

Phasing of Sites

Q3 Do you agree with this proposed phasing of pitch provision?

Yes

No

Scale of Sites

Q4 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 5 additional sites)

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

Concentration in Roydon and Nazeing Area

Q5 Which option do you prefer? (this is a compulsory question)

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

The Main Possible Strategies

Q6 Which option do you prefer? This question refers to pages 15 to 16 (this is a compulsory question)

Option one - Edge of Urban Areas/Urban Extensions Option

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

Option three - Wider distribution throughout the district

Site Search Sequence

Q7 Do you agree with the above proposed site search sequence?

Yes

No

Large Urban Sites

Q8 A) Should large brownfield sites (1 hectare+) in the urban areas outside the Green Belt be required to provide 20% of their land area for Travellers pitches?

Yes

No

B) Should the alternative of off-site provision be allowed even if this were in the Green Belt?

Yes

No

Q9 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 extension to the north east of Harlow?

Yes

No

Sites as part of Harlow Urban Extensions

Q10 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 15 pitches?

Yes

No

Potential for Expansion of Two Existing Sites

Q11 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

Potential for Expansion of Other Existing Authorised Sites

Q12 Do you agree with the assessment of the unsuitability for extension of these sites?

Yes

No

Tolerated Sites

Q13 Do you agree with the assessment that the listed four tolerated sites should be allocated permanently?

Yes

No

Potential Extension of Tolerated Site - Bournebridge Lane, Stapleford Abbots

Q14 Should this site be expanded by around five pitches?

Yes

No

Unauthorised Sites

Q15 Do you agree that the unauthorised sites are unsuitable?

Yes

No

Q16 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 extension to Harlow if these do not come forward within five years)?

Yes

No

Rural Brownfield Sites at North Weald - Merlin Way

Q17 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

Potential 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 of 137-167 Lindsey Street, Epping

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 Road to the rear of Forest House

Yes

No

Site 18h - 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 Bassett

Yes

No

Potential sites in the Waltham Abbey, Roydon and Nazeing Areas

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

Q19 Site 19a - Yard/Car 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 tell us whether or not any of these sites should be taken forward

Q20 Site 20a - Site next to Victory Hall, Chigwell

Yes

No

Site 20b - Paddock east of Theydon Garnon - Coopersale

Yes

No

Site 20c - Paddock east of Theydon Bois - Abridge Road

Yes

No

Site 20d - Paddock east of Abridge

Yes

No

Site 20e - Crowther Nursery, Abridge

Yes

No

Criteria for Windfall Sites

Q21 Do you agree with the wording of the suggested policy?

Yes

No

Q22 Do you agree with the initial assessment that the need for transit sites is very low in the district?

Yes

No

Travelling Showpeople

Q23 Do you agree with adding two extra yards to the site at Moreton?

Yes

No

Site Delivery

Q24 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 give reasons for your answer*

Indicators

Q25 Do you agree with the proposed suite of indicators?

Yes

No