

E1.6 Stage 5 Assessment

E1.6.1 Results of Identifying Sites for Further Testing

Spatial options for accommodating traveller needs

| Spatial option | Suitability | Justification for suitability |
|--|------------------------------|---|
| Distribute pitches across the District. | More suitable spatial option | This option balances the preferences of the travelling community with not placing undue pressure on services in a single location |
| Focus pitches in parts of the District traditionally favoured by the traveling community. | Less suitable spatial option | The majority of newly arising housing need will be from the expansion of existing households. Whilst this option is understood to be favoured by the travelling community it was felt that this option would place undue pressure on local infrastructure and services and therefore did not represent the most sustainable option for accommodating traveller needs. |
| Focus pitches in parts of the District traditionally not favoured by the travelling community. | Less suitable spatial option | This option was not considered to be deliverable since it would not be realistic to expect all additional households to form within the parts of the District not currently favoured by the travelling community. |

Site size options for accommodating traveller needs

| Spatial option | Suitability | Justification for suitability |
|--|--------------------------------|--|
| Traveller needs accommodated in new sites with a proposed capacity of no more than five units. | More suitable strategic option | Feedback from the local traveller community indicates that whilst there is no one ideal site size (in terms of number of pitches) generally smaller sites are preferred. This reflects the experience of the Council which considers that smaller sites (five pitches or below) tend to be more successful. |
| Traveller needs accommodated in new sites with a proposed capacity of over five units | Less suitable strategic option | Feedback from the local traveller community indicates that whilst there is no one ideal site size (in terms of number of pitches) generally smaller sites are preferred. Historically larger sites for traveller accommodation within the District have not tended to integrate as effectively with the settled community, have generated more site management issues and have had a significant adverse impact on the character of an area. |

Site suitability assessment

| Site reference | Address | Site Category | Parish | Size (Ha) | Number of pitches | Existing Site Status | Spatial options for accommodating traveller growth | Site size threshold | Site suitability | Justification for suitability |
|----------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|------------------|--|
| E 12 | South of Standards Hill, north-west of Epping rail line | New traveller site | Epping | 0.59 | 6 | Not currently a traveller site | Distribute traveller sites across the District | New traveller site with more than 5 pitches | Not suitable | Given a judgement was made about site sizes, the suitability of the site has been appraised for no more than five pitches. This site scores poorly against a number of criteria, including the level of harm to the landscape character. It was judged that this constraint could not be overcome and therefore it should not be considered further. |
| GRT-E_04 | Moore's Estate, Roydon | Extension of existing traveller site | Roydon | 0.4 | 4 | Permanent | Distribute traveller sites across the District | Existing traveller site with no more than 10 pitches | Not suitable | This site scores poorly against a number of criteria. It has access constraints which would be challenging to overcome. Specifically, Little Brook Road would be unlikely to support the additional traffic generated by the extended site and cannot be upgraded. It should not be considered further. |
| GRT-E_07 | Stoneshot View, Nazeing | Extension of existing traveller site | Nazeing | 0.5 | 5 | Permanent | Distribute traveller sites across the District | Existing traveller site with no more than 10 pitches | Suitable | This site scores poorly against some criteria, including the level of harm to the Green Belt. However, it is adjacent to an existing traveller site and given the lack of other constraints, it should be considered further. |
| GRT-E_09 | Pond View, Stapleford Abbots | Extension of existing traveller site | Stapleford Abbots | 0.4 | 4 | Permanent | Distribute traveller sites across the District | Existing traveller site with no more than 10 pitches | Not suitable | This site scores poorly against a number of criteria. It has access constraints since it is served by a single track. It should not be considered further. |
| GRT-I_01 | Moore's Estate, Roydon | Intensification of existing traveller site | Roydon | 0.97 | 2 | Permanent | Distribute traveller sites across the District | Existing traveller site with no more than 10 pitches | Suitable | This site scores poorly against some criteria, including the level of harm to the Green Belt and landscape character. However, it is an existing site and given the lack of other constraints it should be considered further. The existing access off Little Brook Road could support the scale of intensification proposed. |
| GRT-I_03 | Small Meadow, Thornwood | Intensification of existing traveller site | North Weald Bassett | 0.39 | 2 | Permanent | Distribute traveller sites across the District | Existing traveller site with no more than 10 pitches | Not suitable | This site scores poorly against a number of criteria, including the impact of air quality. It was judged that it was unlikely that this constraint could be mitigated and due to the proximity to the M11, the site should not be considered further. |
| GRT-I_05 | Pond View, Stapleford Abbots | Intensification of existing traveller site | Stapleford Abbots | 0.42 | 2 | Permanent | Distribute traveller sites across the District | Existing traveller site with no more than 10 pitches | Not suitable | This site is served by a single track and therefore access is not considered to be suitable to support an intensification of the site. It should not be considered further. |
| GRT-I_08 | Sons Nursery, Hamlet Hill | Regularisation of a temporary traveller site | Roydon | 0.13 | 1 | Temporary | Distribute traveller sites across the District | Existing traveller site with no more than 10 pitches | Suitable | This site scores poorly against some criteria, including the level of harm to the Green Belt. However, it is an existing site and given the lack of other constraints it should be considered further. |
| GRT-I_09 | Lakeview, Moreton | Intensification of existing travelling showpeople site | Moreton, Bobbingworth and the Lavers | 3.03 | 1 (yard) | Permanent | Distribute traveller sites across the District | Existing traveller site with no more than 10 yards | Suitable | The site scores well against most criteria and it should be considered further. |
| GRT-N_01 | Paradise Farm, Hamlet Hill | New traveller site | Roydon | 2.5 | 10 | Not currently a traveller site | Distribute traveller sites across the District | New traveller site with more than 10 pitches | Not suitable | The site scores well against a number of criteria. However, it was felt that the new site would result in an over intensification of traveller accommodation in this area. A judgement was made not to appraise the site for 5 or less pitches given the concerns regarding over intensification in this area. It should not be considered further. |

| Site reference | Address | Site Category | Parish | Size (Ha) | Number of pitches | Existing Site Status | Spatial options for accommodating traveller growth | Site size threshold | Site suitability | Justification for suitability |
|----------------|---|--|---------------------|-----------|-------------------|--|--|---|------------------|---|
| GRT-N_06 | West of Tylers Green, North Weald Bassett | New traveller site | North Weald Bassett | 3 | 15 | Not currently a traveller site | Distribute traveller sites across the District | New traveller site with more than 10 pitches | Suitable | Given a judgement was made about site sizes, the suitability of the site has been appraised for no more than 5 pitches. This site is in a sustainable location in North Weald Bassett and scores well against most criteria. It is considered that the impact on trees with Tree Preservation Orders could be mitigated. The site should continue to be considered. |
| GRT-N_07 | Yard/car park at rear Lea Valley Nursery, Crooked Mile, Waltham Abbey | New traveller site | Waltham Abbey | 4.4 | 15 | Not currently a traveller site | Distribute traveller sites across the District | New traveller site with more than 5 pitches | Suitable | Given a judgement was made about site sizes, the suitability of the site has been appraised for no more than 5 pitches. This site is in a sustainable location in Waltham Abbey and scores well against most criteria. It should continue to be considered. |
| GRT-N_12 | Abridge Road, Theydon Garnon | New traveller site | Theydon Bois | 1.48 | 14 | Not currently a traveller site | Distribute traveller sites across the District | New traveller site with more than 5 pitches | Suitable | Given a judgement was made about site sizes, the suitability of the site has been appraised for no more than 5 pitches. This site is in a sustainable location at the edge of Theydon Bois. It scores poorly against some criteria, including impact on trees with Tree Preservation Orders, although this could be mitigated. There is potential contamination on the site which should inform the siting of the development. It should continue to be considered. |
| NWB 209 | South of Weald Hall Lane, east of M11 | New traveller site | North Weald Bassett | 0.50 | 5 | Not currently a traveller site | Distribute traveller sites across the District | New traveller site with five or fewer pitches | Not suitable | This site scores poorly against a number of criteria, including the impact of air quality. It was felt that it was unlikely that this constraint could be mitigated and due to the proximity to the M11, the site should not be considered further. |
| SR-0168 | Green Leaves Nursery | Intensification of existing traveller site | Nazeing | 2.111063 | 15 | Current location for traveller sites | Distribute traveller sites across the District | Existing traveller site with more than 10 pitches | Not suitable | The number of pitches proposed does not align with the Council's strategic decision that for intensification sites any additional provision should not exceed 10 pitches. The site scores poorly against a number of criteria, including impact on trees with Tree Preservation Orders, although this could be mitigated. |
| WA 42 | South-west side of Avey Lane, opposite the Pynest Green Lane junction | New traveller site | Waltham Abbey | 1.42 | 14 | Not currently a traveller site | Distribute traveller sites across the District | New traveller site with more than five pitches | Not suitable | Given a judgement was made about site sizes, the suitability of the site has been appraised for no more than five pitches. This site scores poorly against a number of criteria. It has access constraints which would be challenging to overcome and would require upgrade of the existing road. It should not be considered further. |
| WA 81 | West of Galleyhill Road | New traveller site | Waltham Abbey | 1.050278 | 10 | Not current location for traveller sites | Distribute traveller sites across the District | New traveller site with more than 5 pitches | Suitable | Given a judgement was made about site sizes, the suitability of the site has been appraised for no more than 5 pitches. The site is in a sustainable location in Waltham Abbey. It scores poorly against some criteria, including access to the site, but it was felt that this could be overcome. The site is located adjacent to a skip hire business and it was felt that a buffer would be required along this adjacent site to mitigate any negative impacts on the amenity of future occupiers of the traveller site. |

E1.7 Stage 6 Assessment

E1.7.1 Land promoter/developer survey

Epping Forest District Council is preparing a new Local Plan, which will set out the policies that will guide development in the District up to 2033. A key part of the plan is the identification of a portfolio of sites and/or broad locations which are most appropriate for development. This includes identifying sites to accommodate the District's traveller community.

To identify sites which may be potentially suitable to accommodate traveller accommodation, the Council opened a public 'Call for Sites' between 2008 and 2016. Sites have also been identified through a range of other technical studies, withdrawn or refused planning applications, schemes at the pre-application stage and through considering whether existing traveller sites may have the potential to accommodate further pitches. Consideration is also being given to existing sites with temporary permissions and currently unauthorised sites with a view to considering whether any of these sites might be suitable for regularisation and then if so potentially able to accommodate additional traveller accommodation.

The Council is now undertaking more detailed assessment of the potentially suitable sites to identify the most appropriate sites within the District. As part of this assessment, the Council wishes to better understand the intentions of landowners for their sites and to clarify if the land in question is available for development or intensification and can be identified as such in the Local Plan.

Please note that if you have more than one site you will need to complete a survey for each site.

Any data provided in response to this survey will be used to inform the development of the forthcoming Local Plan. Subject to the provisions made under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998, the Council will be entitled to publish and/or release the contents of any documents and/or information submitted as it sees fit.

Please answer accurately, to the best of your knowledge and in as much detail as possible. To assist in completing the survey you may wish to seek independent professional planning advice.

You may wish to provide additional documents to support your response. There is an option to upload documents at the end of the survey. Alternatively, supporting documents can be emailed to epping.forest.sites@arup.com, quoting the site reference number in the email subject. Supporting documents should include the Site Reference Number in the filename.

Please complete the survey and provide any accompanying information as soon as possible, and ideally before Thursday 02 September 2016. If you do not reply to our request by this time, the Council will assume that you are not

interested in the site being considered for this purpose and the site will be removed from future consideration.

For any queries regarding this survey, or any other queries regarding the Council's Local Plan process, please contact, please contact the Planning Policy team:
+44 1992 564517
ldfconsult@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

1: Site information and contact details

1a. Please provide the following details.

Site Reference No:
Site Name and Address:
Name:
Organisation:
Position :
Address:
Postcode:
Telephone:
Email:

1b. Are you an agent acting on behalf of the site owner?

[Choose one of the following answers]

Yes / No

[If No, proceed to 2a.]

1c. Please provide details for the site owner

Name / Organisation:
Address:
Postcode:
Telephone number:

2: Site to be considered in the development of the Local Plan

2a. Please confirm that you wish the identified site to be considered for inclusion in the Local Plan.

[Choose one of the following answers]

Yes / Potentially, depending on other factors / No

[If Yes, proceed to 3a.]

[If Potentially, depending on other factors, proceed to 2b. then 3a.]

[If No, proceed to 2c. then]

2b. Please provide further details.

2c. Please provide details of why you wish the site to be withdrawn.

3: Ownership and Availability

3a. I (or my client) is:

[Choose one of the following answers]
Sole freehold owner / Part freehold owner

[If Sole freehold owner, proceed to 3d.]

3b. Do you know who owns the remainder of the site? Please provide as much detail as possible.

[Free entry field]

3c. Are you collaborating with adjacent landowners? Please confirm by what methods.

[Choose one of the following answers]
Yes - Formal collaboration agreement / Yes - Memorandum of understanding
/ Yes – Informal Agreement / No – Adjacent landowner pursuing
development independently / No – Adjacent landowner opposes development
/ No – Position unknown

3d. Please provide details of the existing uses on the site (tick all applicable):

[Check any that apply]

| | Tick |
|---|------|
| A1 / A2 / A3 / A5 Retail, Restaurants and Cafes, Hot Food Takeaways | |
| A4 Drinking Establishments | |
| B1 Business | |
| B2 General Industrial | |
| B8 Storage and Distribution | |
| Agricultural Buildings | |
| Other (Please State) | |

3e. If the site is considered to be suitable for Traveller accommodation, would all or part of the existing uses remain in occupation?

[Choose one of the following answers]
Yes (all) / Yes (part) / No / Not applicable (site undeveloped)

[If No or Not applicable, proceed to 3i.]

3f. What would be the timescale for the existing use to cease?

[Choose one of the following answers]

Up to 6 months / 6 months to 1 year / 1 year to 2 years / 2 years to 5 years /
More than 5 years / More than 10 years / Unknown

3g. Would there be any compensation or cost implication for removing this use within the timescale stated?

[Choose one of the following answers]

Yes / No

[If NO, proceed to 3i]

3h. Please provide further details:

[Free entry field]

3i. Are any of the following land use restrictions relevant to the site?

| | Yes | No | Unsure |
|---|-----|----|--------|
| i. Legal constraints (e.g. restrictive covenants, easements, wayleaves, legal agreements) | | | |
| ii. ‘Ransom strips’ (including requirement for off-site land assembly) | | | |
| iii. Public rights of way | | | |
| iv. Reliant on development of other land | | | |
| v. Other (please confirm) | | | |

3j. What other land use restrictions are relevant to the site?

[Free entry field]

3k. Please provide further details where you have answered Yes to any restrictions in the question above.

[Free entry field]

3l. Please provide an indication of when the site would be available for development, if it were to be identified in the forthcoming Local Plan:

[Choose one of the following answers]

Immediately / Within 5 Years / 5-10 Years / 10-15 Years / Beyond 15 Years

3m. Has interest previously been shown to make the site available to Traveller accommodation? Please give details.

[Free entry field]

4: Achievability

4a. Are any of the following constraining factors relevant to the site? If so, please comment on how you believe they could be overcome/mitigated. If possible, please upload a plan illustrating key constraints.

| | Tick | Comments |
|---------------------------------|------|----------|
| i. Flood risk / drainage | | |
| ii. Contamination | | |
| iii. Topography | | |
| iv. Mains Water Supply | | |
| v. Mains Sewerage | | |
| vi. Electricity Supply | | |
| vii. Gas Supply | | |
| viii. Access to public highways | | |
| ix. Telecoms | | |
| x. Waste storage / management | | |

5: Land Use, Masterplanning and Infrastructure

5a. Has any conceptual masterplanning been undertaken for the site?

[Choose one of the following answers]

YES / NO

[If NO, survey skips to question 5c.]

5b. Please provide detail any work undertaken.

[Free entry field]

5c. Has work been undertaken to date on on-site and off-site infrastructure provision?

[Choose one of the following answers]

YES / NO

[If NO, survey skips to question 6a]

5l. Please provide further details. Key infrastructure might include:

- **Physical (utilities, transport)**
- **Social (education, health, community)**
- **Green (communal open space, play space)**

[Free entry]

6: Site Management

6a. Please provide details of any proposed long-term management and/or maintenance arrangements for the site.

[Free entry]

7: Close

7a. Please upload any documents which support your responses. Documents should include the Site Reference Number in the filename.

Alternatively, please email supporting documents to epping.forest.sites@arup.com, quoting the Site Reference Number in the email subject.

7b. As part of the on-going Local Plan process there will be further opportunities to engage with us. Please confirm if you would be interested in any of the following with regard to your site(s).

[Check any that apply]

Follow-up telephone discussion / Face to face discussion / Workshop with other promoters/landowners / I am not interested in any further engagement

Thank you for taking the time to complete our survey. If you have expressed interest in any follow-up engagement, we will be back in touch shortly.