

**BRENTWOOD BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT
FRAMEWORK**

**Gypsies and Travellers Development Plan
Document**

**Pre-Submission Draft Plan
Consultation Statement**

December 2009

Brentwood Borough Council, Town Hall, Ingrave Road, Brentwood Essex CM15 8AY

Telephone: 01277 312500

Website: www.brentwood.gov.uk

Email: planning.policy@brentwood.gov.uk

**We can provide this document in other formats,
such as large print, audio tape or a translation.
For more information, please call 01277 312629**

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	2
Background.....	2
The Consultation Process.....	2
2. The Regulation 25 Consultation.....	3
3. Issues and Options Stage 1.....	4
Form and Extent of the Consultation.....	4
The Consultation Response.....	5
4. Issues and Options Stage 2: Suggested Site Options.....	6
Introduction.....	6
Form and Extent of the Consultation.....	6
The Consultation Response.....	7
5. Conclusion.....	10
 Appendices	
Appendix 1: Gypsies and Travellers DPD Stage 1 Comment Form.....	11
Appendix 2: Summary Analysis of Comment Form Responses to the Issues and Options Stage 1 Consultation.....	15
Appendix 3: Gypsies and Travellers DPD Stage 2 Comment Form.....	24
Appendix 4: Summary Analysis of Comment Form Responses to the Issues and Options Stage 2 Consultation – Suggested Sites.....	28
Appendix 5: Summary Analysis of All Responses to the Issues and Options Stage 2 Consultation – Suggested Sites.....	33
Appendix 6: Summary Analysis of Comments on Suggested Sites.....	34
Appendix 7: Summary Analysis of General Comments on the Issues and Options Stage 2 Consultation – Suggested Sites.....	35

1. Introduction

Background

- 1.1 As part of the new Local Development Framework (LDF), which will eventually replace the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan, the Council is required by the government to prepare a Development Plan Document (DPD) dealing with Gypsy and Traveller needs in the Borough.
- 1.2 The planning process for providing for Gypsy and Traveller needs is set out in government Circular 1/2006 'Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Sites'. Councils now have a duty to allocate sufficient land for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs. The overall level of need should be assessed as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). The RSS should identify the number of pitches required (but not their location) for each local authority. The numbers of pitches set out in the RSS must then be translated into specific site allocations in one of the local planning authority's DPD's as part of the LDF.
- 1.3 The current RSS, the East of England Plan, was approved by the Secretary of State in May 2008. However, even before the final adoption of the Plan an immediate review was required to be undertaken of Policy H4 (Provision of Pitches for Gypsy and Traveller Caravans). Following an examination in public in October 2008, the revised policy was approved in July 2009.
- 1.4 The regional policy requires each local authority in the region to provide pitches to meet both an existing need to 2011 (a minimum of 15 pitches in Brentwood) and an on-going need beyond 2011 for future pitch requirements as resident Gypsy and Traveller family circumstances change (3% compound increase per year to 2021, which equates to 9 additional pitches in Brentwood).
- 1.5 The Brentwood Gypsies and Travellers DPD, therefore, is required to provide for the needs of Gypsies and Travellers within Brentwood Borough in terms of sites and numbers of pitches to meet the approved regional policy.

The Consultation Process

- 1.6 In preparing a DPD, the Council is required to notify specific and general consultation bodies, together with residents and businesses within the Borough, and invite comments on the proposals [Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008].
- 1.7 Furthermore, before submitting a DPD to the Secretary of State for approval, the Council must make available the proposed submission document to the same specific and general consultation bodies and invite residents and businesses to make further representations [Regulation 27]. At the same time the Council must publish a Consultation Statement setting out the details of the Regulation 25 consultation process. This document is the Consultation Statement.

2. The Regulation 25 Consultation

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, as amended in 2008, do not specify how to undertake public consultation at the pre-Draft Plan stage under Regulation 25. The details of how the Council consults on the Local Development Framework are set out in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).
- 2.2 The Council's SCI, which sets out how the Council intend to facilitate and encourage public participation in the preparation of Local Development Plan Documents, was approved in [...] and has been used to determine the Gypsy and Traveller DPD consultation process.
- 2.3 Consultation undertaken pursuant to Regulation 25 has had two formal stages of public consultation on "Issues and Options". However prior to these formal stages, the Council wrote informally to a number of Specific and General consultees considered appropriate, together with a list of individual and companies who had requested to be informed of each consultation opportunity on the LDF (the LDF Mailing List), inviting suggestions for the issues and options consultation. This open ended request occurred between December 2006 and May 2007.
- 2.4 During this same period, the Council advertised the opportunity to make suggestions on the Council's website and published an article in the Council's 'Vision' magazine in December 2006, which is delivered to all residents in the Borough.
- 2.5 As a result 13 responses were received from Billericay Town Council, the Brentwood Gypsy Support Group, Brindles Wood Residents Association, Campaign to Protect Rural Essex, Chelmsford Borough Council, Doddinghurst Parish Council, Essex County Council, The East of England Regional Assembly, the Environment Agency, Hutton Preservation Society, Ingatestone & Fryerning Parrish Council, Natural England, and Stapleford Tawney Parish Council.
- 2.6 Comments ranged from general concerns regarding the fairness of any policy; the need for a broad consultation; an appropriate methodology; Green Belt policy; the process of consultation; and sustainability issues to detailed comments regarding the types, size and location of sites needed; environmental concerns and the regional plan review. These were fed into the first of the two formal 'Issues and Options' consultations.

3. Issues and Options Stage 1

Form and Extent of the Consultation

- 3.1 At this first stage of consultation the Council did not seek views on specific sites, but raised questions regarding the assessment and level of need, and, if sites were required, the choices for site locations and the criteria by which the appropriateness of any sites should be assessed. A copy of the questionnaire is attached at Appendix 1.
- 3.2 The Council had deliberately not set out any specific sites itself at this stage in order not to be seen to prejudice the issue of need and site locations before a wider debate on the issues and options had been undertaken. This was considered as being in line with the purpose of the new LDF process to engage with the public and other stakeholders at an early stage and before putting forward draft proposals.
- 3.3 The consultation period ran for six week beginning Friday 27 July and ending on Friday 7 September 2007. A statutory notice with details of the consultation was published in the Brentwood Gazette on Wednesday 25 July.
- 3.4 The document was available free of charge and was sent either in hard copy or as an email attachment to specific and general consultees, including adjacent local authorities, Parish Councils and local interest groups, government departments and national and local agencies (including Gypsy and Traveller representative groups).
- 3.5 Hard copy of the consultation documents were deposited at the Town Hall (Planning Services Reception); the Council Information Centre; and the three local libraries in Brentwood town centre, Shenfield and Ingatestone.
- 3.6 All documents, including an electronic version of the questionnaire, were published on the Council's website.
- 3.7 A summary leaflet was distributed to every residential property and available from Council buildings, local shops, halls and other locations. Copies of the consultation document were distributed to the local media (both newspaper and radio) and press releases were issued. Posters were displayed on Council Notice Boards and distributed to Parish Councils and Local Interest Groups. In addition the letter to Parish Councils and Local Interest Groups included an offer to attend a public meeting if they wish to organise one. Subsequently a meeting was held with Blackmore Parish Council on 16 August 2007 and meeting with the Association of Parish Council on 3 September 2007, which enabled officers to respond to questions raised.
- 3.8 Contact with Gypsies and Travellers representatives through the Brentwood Gypsy Support Group sought their views on the best method of engagement.
- 3.9 All those on LDF mailing list were informed in writing or by email of consultation period and details.

The Consultation Response

- 3.10 A total of 185 responses were received on behalf of 153 individuals and 28 organisations (32 responses).
- 3.11 Of these 89 responses were made using the on-line form (including 6 organisations: Hutton FC, Doddinghurst Parish Council, Navestock Parish Council, Mountnessing Parish Council, South West Essex PCT, and the Campaign to Protect Rural Essex).
- 3.12 A further 50 responses were made on hard copy forms (including 14 organisations: Thorndon Park Golf Club, Brentwood Gypsy Support Group (x 5), Essex County Council School Organisation and Planning, Essex County Council Adult Health & Wellbeing, Ingatestone & Fryerning Parish Council, Navestock Parish Council, Commission for Justice and Social Responsibility, House Builders Federation, Parish Church of St Mary the Virgin, Shenfield, Brindles Wood Residents Association, Brentwood Baptist Church/Brentwood Gypsy Support Group, National Farmers Union East Anglian Region, East of England Regional Assembly, and Friends, Families & Travellers – Planning)
- 3.13 In addition to the comment forms, 28 responses were received by letter or email (including 8 organisations: Environment Agency, Essex Wildlife Trust, Natural England, Highways Agency, Billericay Town Council, East of England Development Agency, English Heritage, and the Government Office for the East of England).
- 3.14 Whilst the overall response was limited, it was wide ranging, with comments from a broad spectrum of groups and individual residents. Whilst it is difficult to be precise, overall some two thirds of responses were generally negative to the issue of providing for Gypsies and Travellers and one third were positive to recognising a level of need and making some form of provision. A summary of the response by question in the comment form is set out at Appendix 2.
- 3.15 An initial report on the overall response and in particular the comments of the Government Office (GO-East), which set out a number of important issues, was presented to the Council's Policy Board on 26 September 2007.
- 3.16 A meeting was subsequently held with representatives of the Brentwood Gypsy Support Group on 19 November 2007, at which the group were able to elaborate on their comments concerning the level of need and their suggested 5 sites for meeting existing needs in the Borough and 5 general locations for meeting future needs. (see the Issues and Options: Stage 2 consultation below).
- 3.17 A further report was made to Policy Board on 28 November 2007, following a meeting with GO-East on 8 November 2007 to discuss their comments. Members resolved at that meeting to undertake the second stage consultation on the sites suggested to the Council. A detailed report on the consultation responses was presented to the Local Development Framework Member Working Group when they approved the Second Stage consultation document on 7 May 2008.

4. Issues and Options Stage 2: Suggested Site Options

Introduction

- 4.1 As part of the responses to the Stage 1 consultation a number of suggested possible sites for permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller sites were put forward. The Council had made clear in the first Issues and Options consultation document that any suggestions put forward as possible sites would be advertised and an opportunity given for wider public consultation and comment be made.

Form and Extent of the Consultation

- 4.2 A second stage consultation, therefore, commenced for a six week period beginning on Friday 30 May and ending on Friday 11 July 2008 (this was subsequently extended to 25 July 2008). The Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document (DPD) Issues and Options Stage 2 consultation sought public comment on 18 sites or general locations that had been suggested to the Council during the earlier Stage 1 consultation as possible additional permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller sites. Of these, 10 suggestions were made by the Brentwood Gypsy Support Group (5 specific sites and 5 general locations). At that stage the Council made no view on the appropriateness of the sites or any support or preference for a site or sites. A copy of the consultation questionnaire is attached at Appendix 3.
- 4.3 A statutory notice with details of the consultation was published in the Brentwood Gazette on Wednesday 28 July 2008.
- 4.4 Again, the document was available free of charge and was sent either in hard copy or as an email attachment to specific and general consultees as for the Stage 1 consultation.
- 4.5 Hard copy of the consultation documents were deposited at the Town Hall (Planning Services Reception); the Council Information Centre; and the three local libraries in Brentwood town centre, Shenfield and Ingatestone.
- 4.6 All documents, including an electronic version of the questionnaire, were published on the Council's website.
- 4.7 A summary leaflet was distributed to every residential property and available from Council buildings, local shops, halls and other locations. Copies of the consultation document were distributed to the local media (both newspaper and radio) and press releases were issued. Posters were displayed on Council Notice Boards and distributed to Parish Councils and Local Interest Groups. In addition the letter to Parish Councils and Local Interest Groups included an offer to attend a public meeting if they wish to organise one. A public meeting was subsequently arranged by Navestock Parish Council on 3 July 2008, which officers attended and responded to questions raised.
- 4.8 All those on LDF mailing list were informed in writing or by email of consultation period and details.

- 4.9 Two presentations were made to the Brentwood Citizens Panel on 14 July 2008 (3 pm and 7 pm with web cast and live email questions)

The Consultation Response

- 4.10 A total of 2259 responses were received within the consultation period as follows:

- 1194 hard copy comment forms
- 934 electronic comment forms
- 131 emails/letters

- 4.11 18 of the comment forms received in electronic format were either not filled in (presumably due to individual errors in sending on-line) and there were 28 duplicates (in some cases forwarding additional comments). 71 of the comment forms were sent in anonymously.

- 4.12 In addition, further responses were received by way of:

- A petition of 1183 signatures objecting to the suggested site at Hutton Country Park
- 326 Proformas objecting to the suggested site at Hutton Country Park, of which 16 also had accompanying letters.

- 4.13 There clearly may also have been some duplication between the hard and electronic comment forms and signatures on the petition and/or proformas.

- 4.14 The vast majority of comments were returned from local residents, with responses also from the following 32 bodies/groups:

Federation of Small Businesses
Great Warley Conservation Society
Essex Wildlife Trust
Hutton Preservation Society
Mountnessing Parish Council
Development Securities plc
Stapleford Tawney Parish Council
Sainsburys Supermarkets Ltd
LRG Acquisition Ltd
Maylands Green Belt Action Group
Herongate and Ingrave Parish Council
Brentwood Chamber of Commerce
Highways Agency
Brentwood Joinery Group
East and West Horndon Environment Group
Thames Water
John Daldry Partnership
East of England Development Agency
Martin Grant Homes
Essex County Council Schools, Children, Families Directorate
Government Office for the East of England
Bentley Golf Club Ltd
London Borough of Havering

Stapleford Abbots Parish Council
Curtis Mill Green Commoners and Residents Committee
Bentley Golf Holdings Ltd
Mizu Restaurant
CPRE Essex
Mount Pleasant Avenue Residents Association
Billericay Town Council
Sport England
Brindles Wood Residents Association

4.15 In addition to the comments returned by the end date there were also 46 late comments:

- 15 electronic comment forms
- 24 hand copy comment forms
- 7 letters/emails (including Natural England)

4.16 At the Policy Board meeting on 24 September 2008, an initial report was presented on the overall level of response to the 'Issues and Options Stage 2 consultation.

4.17 Members noted the content of the report and were advised that a full analysis of the response would take some time to complete and would be considered by the Local Development Framework (LDF) Member Working Group as soon as possible. Members also decided that late representations should be included in the analysis.

4.18 A presentation was subsequently made to a meeting of the Hutton Preservation Society 1 October 2008.

4.19 The full report and analysis, which is attached at Appendices 4 to 7, was presented and discussed at the Local Development Framework Member Working Group on 5 March 2009. Following consideration of the responses to the Issues and Options consultation, together with a report on progress being made with the preparation of the Regional Spatial Strategy single issue review and an update on recent Gypsy and Traveller site planning and enforcement appeals, the Working Group recommended to Policy Board that it is in the best interest of the Borough to accept that 15 additional authorised permanent residential pitches be provided by 2011. It further recommended that it would be preferable to consider meeting that requirement from the existing sites with temporary permission or existing unauthorised sites.

4.20 These recommendations were approved at Policy Board on 11 March 2009 (Min. 610). The Council also resolved to identify the following preferred sites to meet the 15 pitch requirement to 2011:

- Willow Farm, Stock Lane, Ingatestone (5 pitches)
- Roman Triangle, Roman Road, Mountnessing (5 pitches)
- Hope Farm, Horsemanside/Goatswood Lane, Navestock (1 pitch)
- Treetops, Curtis Mill Lane, Navestock (3 pitches)
- Cottage Garden, Beads Hall Lane, Pilgrims Hatch (1 pitch)

4.21 These sites, together with a draft criteria-based policy for considering the appropriateness and suitability of any site for the accommodation of Gypsies and Travellers, are the subject of the pre-Submission Draft Plan (Regulation 27 consultation).

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 It is considered that the Council has consulted widely during the two stages of Issues and Options consultation, and in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement.
- 5.2 The Council has carefully and fully considered all the comments received in determining the content and way forward set out in the Pre-Submission Draft Plan.
- 5.3 The Council is satisfied, therefore, that the consultations undertaken on the Issues and Options for the Gypsies and Travellers DPD, referred to in this Consultation Statement, have been sufficient to comply with the requirements pursuant to Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.

Appendix 1: Gypsies and Travellers DPD Stage 1 Comment Form



Brentwood
Borough Council

Town Hall
Ingrave Road, Brentwood
Essex CM15 8AY

Tel: 01277 312500 Minicom: 01277 312809
Fax: 01277 312743 DX No. 5001
www.brentwood.gov.uk

BRENTWOOD BOROUGH LDF

GYSIES AND TRAVELLERS DPD COMMENT FORM

Please use this form to share with us your views on the issues and options set out in the Gypsies and Travellers consultation document. The Issues and Options identified in the consultation document, together with the associated questions set out in this form, should not be interpreted as reflecting in any way the Council's view on the issues. Nor should the inclusion of a question be taken as prejudging an issue. Your involvement at this early stage of preparation of this policy document will help to draft the subsequent 'Preferred Options' consultation document and thereafter the document to be formally submitted to the Secretary of State for adoption, following an independent examination.

You may have responded at an earlier informal stage of consultation, but please take the time to repeat your views or add to them as part of this wider formal consultation process.

PERSONAL DETAILS

Title	First Name	Surname
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organisation (if applicable)	<input type="text"/>	
Job Title (if applicable)	<input type="text"/>	
Address	<input type="text"/>	
Postcode	<input type="text"/>	Tel No. <input type="text"/>
Email Address	<input type="text"/>	

To help us assess how well we have been able to achieve a representative response across a wide diverse cross-section of the community please provide the following information about yourself (tick the appropriate boxes):

Gender Male Female

Age Under 19 19-24 25-40 41-65 Over 65

Disability Do you consider you have a disability Yes No

ETHNIC ORIGIN How would you describe your ethnic origin?

White

- British
- Irish
- Any other White background

Black or Black British

- Caribbean
- African
- Any other Black background

Mixed

- White & Black Caribbean
- White & Black African
- White & Asian
- Any other Mixed background

Asian or Asian British

- Indian
- Pakistani
- Bangladeshi
- Any other Asian background

Chinese and other ethnic groups

- Chinese
- Other ethnic groups

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

The Consultation Document sets out a number of specific questions to which you are invited to respond. However, you may have other views that you wish to make in addition to these questions and therefore there is a box at the end of this form for additional comments. **In making response to the questions you are strongly advised to read the relevant section in the document to fully understand the context in which the questions are set.**

Comment boxes are provided for each question. However, if necessary, continue your response to any question on to a further sheet, but please ensure that the question number is made clear.

Question 1: Should the Development Plan Document seek to provide for additional residential pitches for the period up to 2011, 2016 or 2021?

Question 2: What do you think is an appropriate and reasonable estimate of the level of need for additional residential pitch provision in the Borough? Please explain as fully and as clearly as possible how that level is derived.

Question 3: Do you agree that consideration of transit pitch provision should await further guidance from the Regional Spatial Strategy review? If not, on what basis should an appropriate level of provision within the Borough be assessed?

Question 4: Should provision be made for Travelling Showpeople in advance of the consideration of this issue through the Regional Spatial Strategy review, and if so, on what basis?

Question 5: Should Brentwood's Green Belt location be a factor in limiting the level of Gypsy and Traveller Pitch provision? Are there other factors that should be taken into account in assessing the appropriate level of provision and, if so, what are they?

Question 6: Should possibilities for Gypsy and Traveller sites being located within existing urban areas be considered before rural sites? Are you able to identify sites within any of the Borough's existing settlements for further consideration?

Question 7: If the level of pitch provision requires sites outside existing settlement boundaries, how and where should these be located? Should they be based on the existing unauthorised sites or should they be new sites, either removed from the Green Belt or identified as 'exception sites' within the Green Belt?

Question 8: Should the Council also adopt a criteria-based policy (in addition to the allocation of specific sites), either to meet any current shortfall in identifying sufficient suitable sites or as a basis for assessing unexpected need and/or the future projected growth in Gypsy and Traveller households?

Question 9: Should the Council seek to provide Gypsy and Traveller sites as part of proposed larger residential developments? If so, how should this be achieved and is there a site threshold that should be adopted?

Question 10: To what extent is it reasonable and appropriate to rely on Gypsies and Travellers delivering the required level of pitch provision through acquiring their own private sites?

Question 11: Should the Council be responsible for acquiring and managing the required level of pitch provision through a Registered Social Landlord, and how should this be funded?

Question 12: How realistic is it to expect the development industry to provide sites as part of larger residential developments and how should such sites be funded?

Question 13: Is there an optimum site size in terms of number of pitches (or range of pitch numbers) and if so what is this?

Question 14: If you have any other comments or views on the Gypsies and Travellers Issues and Options consultation, please add them in the box below.

Please continue as necessary on a separate sheet

THIS COMMENT FORM

Did you find this Comment Form easy to use? Yes No

If not, why and what could be done to improve it?

Please return the completed form by 5pm Friday 7th September 2007 to The Chief Planning Officer, Brentwood Borough Council, Town Hall, Brentwood, Essex CM15 8AY. Alternatively, you can complete the form online at www.brentwood.gov.uk.

For further information, telephone the Policy Section on 01277 312609/312610, or email: planning@brentwood.gov.uk.

*This document is available in alternative languages or audiotape format.
Please contact the Corporate Services Department, Brentwood Borough Council, Town Hall, Ingrave Road, Essex CM15 8AY or telephone: 01277 312749*

Copies of all comments received will be made available for public inspection so that other people may know about them. They cannot be treated as confidential.

Appendix 2: Summary Analysis of Comment Form Responses to the Issues and Options Stage 1 Consultation

Note: The percentage that answered the question is based on the total number of responses. The percentage given for each view is based on the number that answered the question rather than the total number of responses.

This analysis relates only to the responses made on the comment form (on-line and hard copy).

The letters and emails received did not, for the most part, respond to the questions set out in the comment form, and are set out in the accompanying table in relation to Question 14 'Other Comments', although where a comment could be assigned to one of the questions this has been done in the table, but these are not included in the figures below (and would not have any significant affect on the statistics).

Whilst it is difficult to be precise, overall some two thirds of responses were generally negative to the issue of providing for Gypsies and Travellers and one third were positive to recognising a level of need and making some form of provision.

Question 1: Should the Development Plan Document seek to provide for additional pitches for the period up to 2011, 2016 or 2021?

Number that answered this question: 145 (92.4% of all respondents)

Yes:	51 (35.2% of those that answered the question)
No:	70 (48.3%)
None/No pitches:	16 (11.0%)
Undecided/Indeterminate:	4 (2.8%)
Other responses:	4 (2.8%)

Of those answering Yes:

Up to 2011:	10 (6.9%)
Up to 2011 and then as necessary:	6 (4.1%)
As soon as possible, and make provisions beyond 2011:	3 (2.1%)
Up to 2016:	3 (2.1%)
At least 2016, preferably 2021:	1 (0.7%)
2021/All three dates:	20 (13.8%)
Up to 2021 and beyond:	8 (5.5%)

Headlines

86 responses or 59.3% answered "No" to this question or more specifically stated that "No pitches" should be provided.

Of the 51 responses that answered "Yes" (35.2%), the majority (28 responses) stated that the DPD should seek to provide pitches for the period up to 2021 or beyond.

Question 2: What do you think is an appropriate and reasonable estimate of the level of additional residential pitch provision in the Borough? Please explain as fully and as clearly as possible how that level is derived.

Number that answered this question:	138 (87.9%)
Level of need specified:	20 (14.5%)
Less than 15:	5 (3.6%)
15:	5 (3.6%)
More than 15:	10 (7.2%)
Level of need unspecific/indeterminate:	26 (18.8%)
Minimal Limited:	6 (4.3%)
Sites for 2/3 caravans:	1 (0.7%)
Consultation number seems reasonable:	2 (1.4%)
Existing unauthorised developments:	1 (0.7%)
Indeterminate:	16 (11.6%)
No additional need:	71 (51.4%)
Difficult to answer/No idea:	8 (5.8%)
Other comments:	13 (9.4%)

Headlines

71 responses or 51.4% considered there to be no additional need for pitches.

46 responses were of the view that there was a level of need.

The 26 responses that were unspecific varied widely in terms of the level of need e.g. “minimal”; “high level of need”; “the same as other Boroughs accept”; “fair share”; and “average”.

20 responses specified a level of need, of which 15 considered the need to be 15 or more pitches, although 3 unspecific responses considered the “consultation number” or “existing detailed studies” or “existing unauthorised developments” to provide the figure.

Question 3: Do you agree that consideration of transit pitch provision should await further guidance from the Regional Spatial Strategy review? If not, on what basis should an appropriate level of provision within the Borough be assessed?

Number that answered this question:	135 (86%)
Yes:	76 (56.3%)
No:	28 (20.7%)
No transit pitches:	19 (14.1%)
Undecided:	4 (3.0%)
Other Comment:	6 (4.4%)
Unable to comment:	2 (1.5%)

Headlines

76 responses or 56.3% agreed that consideration of transit pitch provision should await the RSS review, but a number of these considered some provision needed before then (6 responses) and that a debate should take place now (7 responses).

28 responses or 20.7% did not agree, but the reasons varied from “existing provision adequate” to “more urgent need for transit sites”. 9 responses considered that there should be a local referendum.

19 responses (14.1%) felt that no transit pitch provision should be made.

Question 4: Should provision be made for Travelling Showpeople in advance of the consideration of this issue through the Regional Spatial Strategy review, and if so, on what basis?

Number that answered this question: 137 (87.3%)

Yes:	26 (19.0%)
No:	79 (57.7%)
Other comments:	19 (13.9%)
Undecided/No view:	5 (3.6%)
No provision needed:	8 (5.8%)

Headlines

79 responses or 57.7% considered that provision for Travelling Showpeople should not be made in advance of the RSS review, and a number of comments referred to “winter quarters” or “temporary” nature of need.

8 responses (5.8%) felt no provision was needed.

Of the 26 responses (19.0%) that considered provision should be made, again 11 responses considered this should be for “shows only” or “temporary at venues” and this was also reflected in some of the ‘other comments’.

Question 5: Should Brentwood’s Green Belt location be a factor in limiting the level of Gypsy and Traveller Pitch provision? Are there other factors that should be taken into account in assessing the appropriate level of provision and, if so, what are they?

Number that answered this question: 146 (93%)

Yes:	116 (79.5%)
No:	16 (11.0%)
Normally:	3 (2.1%)
Other Comments	10 (6.8%)
Green Belt nothing to do with it:	1 (0.7%)

Other Factors: 23 (15.7%)

Headlines

116 responses or 79.5% considered that the Borough's Green Belt location should be a limiting factor. A number of responses made the comment that Green Belt protection should apply equally to everyone (37 responses or 23.6%).

16 responses (11.0%) felt Green Belt should not be a factor for a variety of reasons, including "the boundary drawn too tightly"; "Circular 1/2000 provides for exceptions"; and "special needs".

Other factors were varied, but included "proximity to London"; "impact on schools and surrounding housing"; "impact on local services and infrastructure"; "access to main roads"; and "the number of houses to be built" etc.

Question 6: Should possibilities for Gypsy and Traveller sites being located within existing urban areas be considered before rural sites? Are you able to identify sites within any of the Borough's existing settlements for further consideration?

Number that answered this question:	139 (88.5%)
Yes:	50 (36.0%)
No:	35 (25.2%)
Both Urban and Rural/All possible areas:	5 (3.6%)
Neither Urban or rural/No provision:	21 (15.1%)
Rural Not Urban:	3 (2.2%)
Possibly:	6 (4.3%)
Undecided:	2 (1.4%)
Other views:	17 (12.2%)

Site Suggestions:

- Chep Site on B186/A127
- William Hunter Way
- Land by A12/M25
- Old Holly Trees Playing Field
- Next to CA sites on Coxtie Green Road or Mountnessing
- Old A12 work site heading into Ingatestone
- West Horndon side of Brentwood/Warley
- New road alignment at Shenfield A12

Headlines

50 responses (36.0%) agreed that urban sites should be considered before rural sites with a further 6 responses (4.3%) caveating that as a possibility. Reasons for this view included access to services and infrastructure; use of commercial brown field sites; integration into the settled community.

However, 35 responses (25.2%) disagreed and 3 responses (2.2%) specified rural rather than urban sites.

21 responses (15.1%) considered no provision (neither urban nor rural) should be made whilst 5 responses (3.6%) felt both urban and rural should be considered.

The other views made varied from preference for vacant brown field sites to Travellers having a tradition of rural work.

8 site suggestions were put forward, both urban and rural.

Question 7: If the level of pitch provision requires sites outside existing settlement boundaries, how and where should these be located? Should they be based on the existing unauthorised sites or should they be new sites, either removed from the Green Belt or identified as 'exception sites' within the Green Belt?

Number that answered this question:	138 (87.9%)
Existing Unauthorised Sites - Yes:	15 (10.9%)
Existing Unauthorised Sites – Possibly:	4 (2.9%)
New Sites – Yes:	21 (15.2%)
Existing Authorised and New Sites – Yes:	9 (6.5%)
Existing Unauthorised Sites – No:	10 (7.2%)
New Sites – No:	1 (0.7%)
No exception Sites:	4 (2.9%)
None of these (no more sites):	41 (29.7%)
Undecided:	2 (1.4%)
Other comments:	31 (22.5%)

Site Suggestions:

- Land off Stock Lane
- Land off Mountnessing Road
- Land by Navestock side
- Land at Curtis Mill Green
- Land off Chivers Lane and the Clapgate Estate
- Land off Wenlock Lane
- Land at Swallows Cross
- Land to the North of A127
- Land at Thoby Priory
- Land Adjacent existing Tourist caravan site/caravan site itself
- Hutton Country Park
- Area between road and railway at Mountnessing

Headlines

There was a wide range of views in response to this question.

41 responses (29.7%) were against any more sites being provided, with 10 responses (7.2%) being against the use of existing unauthorised sites, 4 responses (2.9%) against exception sites and 1 response (0.7%) against any new sites.

Of the positive comments, 21 responses (15.2%) were in favour of new sites, whilst 19 responses (13.8%) were in favour of the use of existing unauthorised sites with or without caveats; and 9 responses were in favour of both.

Other comments again included preference for brown field sites, emphasising Green Belt and other planning rules apply to all, suggesting sites outside the Borough, and sites away from existing residential areas.

12 sites were put forward as suggestions (10 of which were suggested by the Brentwood Gypsy Support Group).

Question 8: Should the Council adopt a criteria based policy (in addition to the allocation of specific sites), either to meet any current short fall in identifying sufficient suitable sites or as a basis for assessing unexpected need and/or the future projected growth in Gypsy and Traveller households

Number that answered this question: 135 (86.0%)

Yes:	23 (17.0%)
No:	73 (54.1%)
Possibly:	2 (1.5%)
Shouldn't provide any sites:	12 (8.9%)
Other comments:	23 (17.0%)
Undecided:	1 (0.7%)
Question not understood:	1 (0.7%)

Headlines

73 responses (54.1%) considered the Council should not adopt a criteria based policy whilst 23 responses (17.0%) felt the Council should and 2 responses thought possibly. A number of comments were made regarding a criteria based policy should not delay provision of sites.

Comments were made on the criteria, such as access to essential services, schools, shops etc.

12 responses (8.9%) stated no more sites should be provided and a further 7 response making similar points.

12 responses (8.9%) made positive comments on the need to meet existing and future needs.

Question 9: Should the Council seek to provide Gypsy and Traveller sites as part of proposed larger residential developments? If so, how should this be achieved and is there a site threshold that should be adopted?

Number that answered this question: 143 (91.1%)

Yes:	25 (17.5%)
No:	93 (65.0%)
Possibly:	7 (4.9%)
Undecided:	3 (2.1%)
Other comments:	15 (10.5%)

Headlines

93 responses (65.0%) did not agree that the Council should seek to provide sites as part of larger residential developments. Not many of the responses expanded on this view, but 4 responses considered local housing/affordable housing needs should take priority.

Of the 25 responses (17.5%) in favour, a few comments were made encouraging discussion with Travellers/the local community. 7 responses suggested that the Council should press consideration of the Lea Valley for sites after the Olympics.

Question 10: To what extent is it reasonable and appropriate to rely on Gypsies and Travellers delivering the required level of pitch provision through acquiring their own private sites?

Number that answered this question: 136 (86.6%)

Is reasonable:	63 (46.3%)
Is not reasonable:	40 (29.4%)
Undecided/Not always reasonable:	5 (3.7%)
Other responses:	11 (8.1%)
Don't know:	2 (1.5%)
Other comments:	15 (11.0%)

Headlines

Of the 63 responses (46.3%) that considered this reasonable, the most common caveats were provided the sites had planning permission and/or the residents paid Council Tax (31 responses or 22.8%). [This was a recurring point in a number of responses across many questions.]

40 responses (29.4%) considered this not reasonable, with reasons including the need for the Council to be in control of site provision and management and the Gypsies and Travellers should not be able to acquire sites when other residents cannot. These comments were also included in the general responses.

Question 11: Should the Council be responsible for acquiring and managing the required level of pitch provision through a Registered Social Landlord, and how should this be funded?

Number that answered this question: 134 (85.4%)

Yes:	42 (31.3%)
No:	57 (42.5%)
Possibly:	10 (7.5%)
Other comments:	18 (13.4%)
Undecided/No view:	7 (5.2%)

Headlines

Of the 42 responses (31.3%) who felt the Council should be responsible for acquiring and managing pitches, the most prevalent view was that they should be funded by Gypsies and Travellers paying rent/Council Tax (21 responses) although 10 responses suggested Central or Regional government funding.

57 responses (42.5%), however, felt that the Council should not be responsible, with 3 responses considering that it would mean higher Council Taxes and 2 responses being of this view unless government funding is provided (2 responses).

Of the other comments, 7 responses (5.2%) felt that this may be unnecessary as most urgent need could be met with owner occupied sites and 4 responses (2.9%) considered no further provision should be made.

Question 12: How realistic is it to expect the development industry to provide sites as part of larger residential developments and how should such sites be funded?

Number that answered this question: 127 (80.9%)

Realistic:	18 (14.2%)
Not realistic:	85 (66.9%)
Undecided/No view:	4 (3.1%)
Other comments:	20 (15.7%)

Headlines

Only 18 responses (14.2%) felt this was realistic, whereas 85 responses (66.9%) considered this was not realistic.

7 responses (5.5%) considered that the idea would be unattractive to developers, whilst another 7 responses felt it would be in the longer term.

Views on funding were varied.

Question 13: Is there an optimum site size in terms of number of pitches (or range of pitch numbers) and if so what is this?

Number that answered this question: 129 (82.2%)

Specific Number:

Between 1 and 5:	30 (23.3%)
Between 6 and 10:	6 (4.7%)
Between 11 and 15:	2 (1.6%)
More than 15:	3 (2.3%)
Nil:	21 (16.3%)

Unspecific Number:

Small:	31 (24.0%)
No optimum size/varies:	7 (5.4%)
Not possible to assess:	2 (1.6%)
Consult with Travellers:	3 (2.3%)

Other comments: 13 (10.1%)

Undecided/Don't know: 11 (8.5%)

Headlines

Of those comments expressing a view on a specific site size, the majority, 30 responses (23.3%), suggested a figure between 1 and 5 pitches. Of those comments not expressing a specific size, again the majority, 31 responses (24.0%), suggested “small sites” as preferable.

Of the other comments, there were again a number expressing preference for “small sites”.

21 responses (16.3%) considered no sites should be provided (i.e. nil site size). 3 responses suggested a site size above 15 pitches.

Question 14: Other Comments

Number that answered this question: 119 (75.8%)

Headlines

The comments made were varied and difficult to amalgamate.

Of the 146 comments made on the Comment Forms, 67 are generally negative, 29 positive and 50 neutral (some responses made more than one point).

Of the 38 comments made in letters and emails, 13 are generally negative, 4 positive and 21 neutral.

Appendix 3: Gypsies and Travellers DPD Stage 2 Comment Form



Brentwood
Borough Council

BRENTWOOD BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS DPD
ISSUES AND OPTIONS STAGE 2:
SUGGESTED SITES

COMMENT FORM

Please use this form to share with us your views on the sites that have been suggested to the Council as potential permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller sites. **The inclusion of any of these sites in the consultation document does not reflect in any way the Council's support for or preference in regard to any of the sites or the Council's view as to their appropriateness.** Your involvement at this stage of preparation of this policy document will, together with earlier consultation responses, help to draft the subsequent 'Preferred Options' consultation document and thereafter the document to be formally submitted to the Secretary of State for adoption, following an independent examination. **Copies of all comments will be made available for public inspection. They cannot be treated as confidential.**

We can provide this form in other formats, such as large print, audio tape or a translation. For more information, please call 01277 312629.

PERSONAL DETAILS

Title First Name Last Name

Organisation (if applicable)

Job Title (if applicable)

Address Post Code
Tel No.

Email

To help us assess how well we have been able to achieve a representative response across a wide and diverse cross-section of the community please provide the following information about yourself (tick the appropriate boxes):

Gender Male Female

Age Under 19 19-24 25-40 41-65 Over 65

Disability Do you consider you have a disability? Yes No

Ethnic Origin How would you describe your ethnic origin?

White

- British
- Irish
- Any other White background

Black or Black British

- Caribbean
- African
- Any other Black background

Mixed

- White & Black Caribbean
- White & Black African
- White Asian
- Any other Mixed background

Asian or Asian British

- Indian
- Pakistani
- Bangladeshi
- Any other Asian background

Chinese and other ethnic groups

- Chinese
- Other ethnic groups

SUGGESTED SITES

This form sets out the 18 sites and locations that were suggested as potential permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller sites in various responses to the earlier Issues and Options Stage 1 consultation. A simple Yes/No box is provided against each identified site to indicate support for or against a site, but a comment box is also provided at the end of the form if you wish to expand on your views for any site or sites.

Whilst these sites have been suggested for permanent residential sites, and the Council doesn't intend at this time that the Gypsy and Traveller Document will include transit site provision (i.e. to provide temporary, short stay stopping places for Gypsies and Travellers as they travel for business and pleasure) unless the Regional Plan provides further guidance on need and distribution, views on whether any of these sites would be considered as appropriate as transit sites would be welcome.

Further details and location plans for each site can be found in the consultation document.

Site 1: Land off Stock Lane, Ingatestone

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site Yes No
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site Yes No

Site 2: Land off Roman Road, Mountnessing

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site Yes No
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site Yes No

Site 3: Land by Navestock Side (Hope Farm, Goatswood Lane)

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site Yes No
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site Yes No

Site 4: Land at Curtis Mill Lane

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site Yes No
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site Yes No

Site 5: Land off Chivers Lane and the Claggate Estate

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 6: William Hunter Way Car Park, Brentwood

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 7: Chep Site, Warley Street

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 8: Former Holly Trees School Playing Field, Crescent Road, Warley

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 9: Old A12 Works Site, Ingatestone

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 10: Land off Wenlocks Lane

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 11: Land at Swallows Cross

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 12: Land to the North of the A127/West of the A128

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 13: Land at Thoby Priory, Mountnessing

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 14: Land adjacent the existing caravan site, Bentley

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 15: Land by A12/M25

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 16: Land next to Civic Amenity site, Coxtie Green Road

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 17: Hutton Country Park

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Site 18: Land at Lower Road, Mountnessing

I would support a permanent residential Gypsy and Traveller Site
I would support a transit Gypsy and Traveller Site

Yes
 Yes

No
 No

Additional Comments *(continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

THIS COMMENT FORM

Did you find this Comment Form easy to use?
If not, why and what could be done to improve it?

Yes No

Please return the completed form to The Chief Planning Officer, Brentwood Borough Council, Town Hall, Ingrave Road, Brentwood Essex CM15 8 AY. Alternatively, you can complete the form online at www.brentwood.gov.uk. **For further information**, telephone 01277 312609/312610 or email: planning@brentwood.gov.uk. **All responses need to be received by 5pm on Friday 11th July 2008.**

Appendix 4: Summary Analysis of Comment Form Responses to the Issues and Options Stage 2 Consultation – Suggested Sites

Comments on the 18 Suggested Sites

Detailed analysis of the responses to the 18 suggested sites provided the following break down:

- 841 responses (36.7%) responded 'NO' to all 18 sites suggestions
- 451 responses (19.7%) responded 'NO' to a specific site or sites
- 40 responses (1.7%) responded 'YES' to a specific site or sites
- 855 responses (37.3%) responded 'NO' to some sites and 'YES' to other sites
- 51 responses (2.2%) made no response on the 18 suggested sites (but made other remarks in the 'Comment Box'/letter)
- 66 responses (2.9%) were either blank responses or duplicates

The extent of support or otherwise for each site is set out in the following table:

Extent of Support for Each Site/Location (i.e. 'YES' response)				
Site/Location	Permanent		Transit	
	Number	%age	Number	%age
Site 15: Land by A12/M25	285	12.4	353	15.4
Site 14: Land adj. the existing caravan site, Bentley	258	11.3	278	12.1
Site 9: Old A12 Works Site, Ingatestone	254	11.1	320	14.0
Site 2: Land off Roman Road Mountnessing	247	10.8	177	7.7
Site 12: Land to North of A127/West of A128	241	10.5	260	11.4
Site 16: Land next to CA site, Coxtie Green Road	227	9.9	273	11.9
Site 7: Chep Site, Warley Street	211	9.2	261	11.4
Site 3: Land by Navestock Side (Hope Farm)	182	7.9	176	7.7
Site 1: Land off Stock Lane, Ingatestone	172	7.5	137	6.0
Site 5: Land off Chivers Lane and the Clapgate Estate	166	7.2	176	7.7
Site 4: Land at Curtis Mill Lane	141	6.2	142	6.2
Site 13: Land at Thoby Priory	107	4.7	111	4.8
Site 6: William Hunter Way Car Park	105	4.6	126	5.5
Site 10: Land off Wenlocks Lane	97	4.2	110	4.8
Site 11: Land at Swallows Cross	97	4.2	100	4.4

Site 18: Land at Lower Road, Mountnessing	84	3.7	94	4.1
Site 8: Former Holly Trees School Playing Field, Warley	72	3.1	78	3.4
Site 17: Hutton Country Park	35	1.5	38	1.7

The site which had the highest number of 'YES' responses supporting a permanent residential site was Site 15 'Land adjacent to the A12/M25' (285 or 12.4%), followed by Site 14 'Land adjacent to the existing caravan site, Bentley' (258 or 11.3%) and Site 9 'The Old A12 works Site, Ingatestone' (254 or 11.1%).

Of the existing unauthorised/temporary planning permission sites, the site with the highest 'YES' response was Site 2 'Land off Roman Road, Mountnessing (247 or 10.8).

The site with the lowest number of 'YES' responses was Site 17 'Hutton Country Park' (35 or 1.5%), followed by Site 8 'Former Holly Trees School Playing Field, Warley' (72 or 3.1%).

Site 15 'Land by A12/M25' was also the most 'supported' site for a transit site (353 or 15.4%). Site 9 'Old A12 Works Site, Ingatestone', was the next highest number of 'YES' responses (320 or 14%). As with the response to permanent sites, Site 17 'Hutton Country Park' (38 or 1.7%) and Site 8 'Former Holly Trees School Playing Field, Warley' (78 or 3.4%) were the least supported for a transit site.

Extent of Objection for Each Site/Location (i.e. 'NO' Response)				
Site/Location	Permanent		Transit	
	Number	%age	Number	%age
Site 17: Hutton Country Park	1750	76.4	1724	75.3
Site 18: Land at Lower Road, Mountnessing	1670	72.9	1645	71.8
Site 6: William Hunter Way Car Park	1664	72.7	1621	70.8
Site 8: Former Holly Trees School Playing Field, Warley	1646	71.9	1621	70.8
Site 13: Land at Thoby Priory, Mountnessing	1600	69.9	1581	69.0
Site 1: Land off Stock Lane, Ingatestone	1582	69.1	1588	69.3
Site 2: Land off Roman Road, Mountnessing	1532	66.9	1559	68.1
Site 11: Land at Swallows Cross	1527	66.7	1508	65.9
Site 12: Land to the North of A127/West of A128	1505	65.7	1477	64.5
Site 10: Land off Wenlocks Lane	1499	65.5	1482	64.7
Site 9: Old A12 Works Site, Ingatestone	1483	64.8	1407	61.4
Site 3: Land by Navestock Side (Hope Farm)	1461	63.8	1444	63.1
Site 4: Land at Curtis Mill Lane	1458	63.7	1443	63.0
Site 7: Chep Site, Warley Street	1450	63.3	1381	60.3
Site 16: Land nest to CA Site, Coxtie	1447	63.2	1393	60.8

Green Road				
Site 5: Land off Chivers Lane and the Clapgate Estate	1424	62.2	1396	61.0
Site 15: Land by A12/M25	1419	62.0	1346	58.8
Site 14: Land adj. the existing caravan site, Bentley	1394	60.9	1355	59.2

The highest number of 'NO' responses was to Site 17 'Hutton Country Park' (1750 or 76.4%) followed by Site 18 'Land at Lower Road, Mountnessing (1670 or 72.9%), Site 6 'William Hunter Way Car Park (1664 or 72.7%) and Site 8 'Former Holly Trees School Playing Field, Warley (1646 or 71.9%).

The least number of 'NO' responses was Site 14 'Land adj. the existing caravan site Bentley' (1394 or 60.9%), followed by Site 15 'Land by A12/M25' (1419 or 62.0%). All sites, however, had a 'NO' response in excess of 60% of total responses.

These sites also represented the highest and lowest 'NO' responses to the transit site question.

Whilst the consultation was not a 'competition' to see which site or sites gained most support or not, the responses do provide information as to the public view of the alternative sites.

However, it can not be assumed that 'YES' responses indicated an objective support for a site – it is clear from a sample analysis that in some cases the 'YES' response was made to a site or sites furthest from the respondent, and conversely the 'NO' response was to the closest site. In other instances it was clear, however, that an assessment had been made of the sites' comparative qualities and appropriateness as a gypsy and traveller site.

Equally, it can not be assumed that sites which were not ticked in any way (either 'YES' or 'NO') indicated an implicit support – some responses specifically advised that they had only commented on those they were familiar with.

Other Comments

Other comments, both specific to one or more site suggestions and general views, were set out either in the 'Comment Box' on the form or in letters and emails.

By their very nature, there were a multiplicity of these other comments and views. The majority of comments were specific and individually couched, which were difficult to analyse into a more simplified schedule, as can be seen.

However, some comments were common across a number of responses and the following were most significant in terms of numbers:

(i) General Comments

Negative

- Don't support sites anywhere in the borough

- Don't support sites in the Green Belt (and on Country Parks, Nature Reserves, Open Space, Conservation areas)
- The law/planning legislation should apply equally to everyone/Gypsies and Travellers shouldn't be given sites that others wouldn't
- Wrong for central government to force this on Council/Council should defy government
- Gypsies and Travellers don't pay Council Tax and other costs for services etc./Gypsies and Travellers should pay Council Tax etc.
- Why should tax payers bear the cost of sites/ why should sites be made available to non-tax payers
- Crime rates increase/they are disruptive and intimidating
- Sites lead to damage and destruction/costs to clear up
- Schools, hospitals, doctors etc. wont be able to cope
- Highway problems
- Other counties should provide sites before Essex
- Sites will lead to property values decreasing
- Why do travellers need permanent sites?
- Gypsies and Travellers should buy/rent houses like everyone else
- Against existing unauthorised sites being authorised – would create a precedent
- Council should direct money to be spent on local residents (Housing waiting lists, affordable housing, facilities for young/elderly people)

“Qualified”

- Sites should be located where they don't impact on others/away from residential properties/businesses
- If forced to provide sites, better to have permanent rather than transit sites
- Provision of temporary sites, not permanent sites, for true travellers
- Use existing temporary or unauthorised sites
- Any sites should be limited in size
- Sites should be controlled, managed and regularly inspected, and residents pay Council Tax etc.
- More appropriate to use brown field sites with access to main roads
- Sites should be spread across the Borough

Positive

- Sites should be found in the Borough/Brentwood should take responsibilities seriously
- Would support sites for Romany Gypsies (true travellers)
- Sites should be close to amenities/integrated into existing communities
- Sites should not be close to residential properties

(ii) Site Specific Comments

It is difficult to draw too many conclusions from the site specific comments, because the numbers of responses related to any specific site are relatively small in number. Generally,

however, site specific comments tended to reinforce the responses to the 18 Suggested Sites tick boxes.

Negative

- Too many sites/no more sites in Mountnessing and Ingatestone
- Additional sites in Mountnessing/Ingatestone would cause unacceptable burden on village facilities
- Highest number of negative comments expressed on Site 17 'Hutton Country Park' (important Green Belt, public park, valuable natural resource, next to wildlife sites, access and traffic concerns, increased crime and public safety concerns, already anti-social behaviour problems in area, flood problems, schools capacity)
- Second highest number of negative comments expressed on Site 12 'Land to North of A127/West of A128' (Green Belt, Special Landscape Area, Conservation Area, Site of Special Scientific Interest, next to wildlife sites, close to small villages, lack of amenities nearby, adjacent to country park, visually intrusive, close to listed building, concern with increased crime)
- Third highest number of negative comments expressed on Site 6 'William Hunter Way Car' (Cinema site, loss of car parking, negative impact on shoppers, local businesses, tourism, property values, historic town centre, concern with increased crime)
- Fourth highest number of negative comments expressed on Site 8 'Former Holly Trees School Playing Field' (surrounded by residential, too small, Protected Urban Open Space, eye sore, property prices will fall, surface water run-off concern, traffic congestion, return to allotments, believe land was gifted to school)

“Qualified”

- Site 16 'Land next to CA site, Coxtie Green Road (access to facilities and services)
- Site 15 'Land by A12/M25 (least detrimental effect)
- Site 7, Chep Site, Warley Street (least detrimental)
- Site 9 'Old A12 Works Site (Ingatestone, transit possibilities, screened from view, natural borders would prevent expansion)

Positive

- Site 12 'Land off Roman Road, Mountnessing' (Travellers already there, site not a problem and are part of local community)
- Site 7 'Chep Site, Warley Street (could offer both permanent and temporary sites in one location, next to major junction, in commercial use)
- Site 15 'Land by A12/M25' (next to major road junction, wont cause congestion)

Appendix 5: Summary Analysis of All Responses to the Issues and Options Stage 2 Consultation – Suggested Sites

Gypsy and Traveller DPD: Issues & Options Stage 2 - Suggested Sites			
Consultation Responses		TOTAL	
		Total No.	Total %age
Type of Response	E-form	949	41.4
	Hard Copy Form	1218	53.2
	Letter/email	138	6.0
General Response	No to all sites	841	36.7
	No to specific site(s)	451	19.7
	Yes to Specific site(s)	40	1.7
	Yes/No Response	855	37.3
	New Site(s)	1	0.0
	No Comments	51	2.2
	Non response/Duplicate	66	2.9

Appendix 6: Summary Analysis of Comments on Suggested Sites

Gypsy and Traveller DPD: Issues and Options Stage 2 - Suggested Sites				
Number of Responses to Each Site			TOTAL	
Site Location	Site Type	Support	Total No.	Total %age
Site 1: Land off Stock Lane, Ingatestone	Permanent	Yes	172	7.5
		No	1582	68.6
	Transit	Yes	137	5.9
		No	1588	68.9
Site 2: Land off Roman Road, Mountnessing	Permanent	Yes	247	10.7
		No	1532	66.5
	Transit	Yes	177	7.7
		No	1559	67.6
Site 3: Land by Navestock Side (Hope Farm)	Permanent	Yes	182	7.9
		No	1461	63.4
	Transit	Yes	176	7.6
		No	1444	62.6
Site 4: Land at Curtis Mill Lane	Permanent	Yes	141	6.1
		No	1458	63.3
	Transit	Yes	142	6.2
		No	1443	62.6
Site 5: Land off Chivers Lane and the Clapgate Estate	Permanent	Yes	166	7.2
		No	1424	61.8
	Transit	Yes	176	7.6
		No	1396	60.6
Site 6: William Hunter Way Car Park, Brentwood	Permanent	Yes	105	4.6
		No	1664	72.2
	Transit	Yes	126	5.5
		No	1621	70.3
Site 7: Chep Site, Warley Street	Permanent	Yes	211	9.2
		No	1448	62.8
	Transit	Yes	261	11.3
		No	1381	59.9
Site 8: Former Holly Trees School Playing Field, Warley	Permanent	Yes	72	3.1
		No	1644	71.3
	Transit	Yes	78	3.4
		No	1621	70.3
Site 9: Old A12 Works Site, Ingatestone	Permanent	Yes	254	11.0
		No	1483	64.3
	Transit	Yes	320	13.9
		No	1407	61.0
Site 10: Land off Wenlocks Lane	Permanent	Yes	97	4.2
		No	1499	65.0
	Transit	Yes	110	4.8
		No	1482	64.3
Site 11: Land at Swallows Cross	Permanent	Yes	97	4.2
		No	1527	66.2
	Transit	Yes	100	4.3
		No	1508	65.4
Site 12: Land to the North of the A127/West of the A128	Permanent	Yes	241	10.5
		No	1505	65.3
	Transit	Yes	260	11.3
		No	1477	64.1
Site 13: Land at Thoby Priory, Mountnessing	Permanent	Yes	107	4.6
		No	1600	69.4
	Transit	Yes	111	4.8
		No	1581	68.6
Site 14: Land adjacent the existing caravan site, Bentley	Permanent	Yes	258	11.2
		No	1394	60.5
	Transit	Yes	278	12.1
		No	1355	58.8
Site 15: Land by A12/M25	Permanent	Yes	285	12.4
		No	1419	61.6
	Transit	Yes	353	15.3
		No	1346	58.4
Site 16: Land next to CA site, Coxtie Green Road	Permanent	Yes	227	9.8
		No	1447	62.8
	Transit	Yes	273	11.8
		No	1393	60.4
Site 17: Hutton Country Park	Permanent	Yes	35	1.5
		No	1750	75.9
	Transit	Yes	38	1.6
		No	1724	74.8
Site 18: Land at Lower Road, Mountnessing	Permanent	Yes	84	3.6
		No	1670	72.5
	Transit	Yes	94	4.1
		No	1645	71.4

Appendix 7: Summary Analysis of General Comments to the Issues and Options Stage 2 Consultation – Suggested Sites

Gypsy and Traveller DPD: Issues and Options Stage 2 - Suggested Sites Detailed Comments Analysis	
Total Responses.	Comment
	General
	Negative Response
	Against all sites
214	Don't support any sites within the Borough
8	Prefer not to accommodate them at all.
2	Already adequate provision in the Borough
5	Don't support further sites in Brentwood
1	Brentwood is not the right place for Traveller site
1	No historic association with Brentwood
	Against sites - Green Belt issues
77	Don't support sites in the Green Belt/should prefer non-Green Belt
6	Why include Green Belt land? Others would not get permission.
7	No Green Belt land should be used
30	Don't support sites on Green Belt, Country Parks, Nature Reserves, PUOS, Conservation Areas
6	The use of Green Belt, playing fields and country parks is unacceptable
1	Green Belt land should only be considered if it is already developed
	Against sites - Environmental issues
1	Resent losing open spaces
6	Leave countryside alone
3	Pollution and Wildlife concerns
2	Don't support sites due to closeness to listed buildings or accessibility to services or closeness to special wildlife sites
1	Should be preserving the open areas/green spaces that remain
	Against sites - Built environment issues
1	Would not support any site in the residential area of Brentwood
7	Most of sites are in, or very close to, small village communities in Green Belt and are totally unsuitable
5	Whilst I recognise the dilemma and travellers have a right to their chosen way of life, as we all do, nobody would choose to have a site close by.
	Government to Blame
22	Council should defy government by refusing to make provision
16	Wrong for government to force this on Council
1	Government policy should be reviewed rather than find sites.
176	Planning legislation should apply to all. Gypsies shouldn't be given sites which others wouldn't.
	Council Tax and other financial issues
59	Why should sites be made available to non-tax paying individuals/why should tax payers bear the costs?
52	Gypsies and Travellers don't pay Council Tax etc., should pay taxes
15	Don't see why tax payers should fund (transit) sites - can use camp sites if they travel
30	Who will finance this project? Will they pay Council Tax?
3	Will bring extra cost for tax payers
2	Let them rent land when they pay Council Tax, etc.

1	Travellers can afford to buy a property or land
	Infrastructure and Services Issues
48	Schools, hospitals, doctors etc. wont be able to cope
11	Won't benefit local school, will add to the area's problems
4	Leave Brentwood schools to people of Brentwood, will give schools a bad name
2	Against larger scale provision in rural areas - lack of facilities
4	Infrastructure and resources already overstretched
	Highways Issues
2	Problems of traffic on narrow roads, animals, environmental pollution
5	Problems of congestion and highway safety
6	Would increase traffic/road safety
	Social Issues
99	Any location will cause properties to devalue and other social problems, will we be compensated?
126	Leads to damage and destruction, problems of unrest and costs to clear up sites
7	Sites will become eyesores
118	Crime rates increase, children are disruptive and intimidating.
3	Fairly or not the expectation of crime is generally held
4	Will cause huge problems with the people that live here
8	Travellers have no affinity or sense of responsibility to the local community
3	Feel that trouble will result from bringing people from such diverse backgrounds together.
9	Supporting these sites adds nothing and costs the community
11	Why are Gypsy and Traveller human rights more important?
	Locational Issues
2	Majority of existing sites are in the rural north - should not have to accept more due to impact on communities
2	Too many sites in too small an area
2	Don't believe this area will be able to support this amount of people without serious problems
60	Sites should be located where they don't impact on others/away from residential dwellings.
6	To place Gypsies in high income residential areas would compound their social deprivation. They can't afford the private facilities and in Hutton there is limited community facilities.
1	Any site close to town centres, schools, residential areas unsuitable due to lack of sanitation.
	Permanent Sites & Travellers
100	Confused by the term traveller/ travellers don't need permanent site
5	Why do travellers want permanent sites, they should stay on transit sites
2	Against permanent sites - they are travellers
	Crays Hill concerns
1	I eventually moved away from Crays Hill - definitely not again
3	Don't want another Crays Hill in Brentwood
3	What safeguards would Brentwood Council propose to prevent the same problems as Crays Hill?
14	Have the largest Gypsy in Europe (Crays Hill), other counties should provide before Essex/enough sites in Essex
	Other Issues
1	Use of heavily populated areas is breach of Council's own planning policies
1	Money should be spent on facilities and services for Brentwood people not transients
2	Preferable if no requirement to provide permanent sites - already so many illegal sites that are not adequately controlled
1	Not the proper place to create a traveller site where there is no police station nearby.
1	Believe in helping disadvantaged, those with ill-health or ill-fortune - but travellers don't fall into this needy category
2	Not in my backyard
70	They should buy/rent proper homes.
4	Wont matter what Council decides - Gypsies will decide for themselves and cause usual

	disruption
3	Transit sites are wrong, they will become permanent.
	Qualified Response
	Permanent rather than Transit
11	If forced to provide sites, it would be better to have permanent rather than transit sites (they are clean and tidy).
1	Support permanent but not transit sites, due to waste left behind
1	Any permanent sites should be hard paved and fenced and strictly controlled
8	Permanent sites should be away from residents/businesses with all mains facilities
3	Don't support transit sites
	Transit rather than Permanent
1	If sites have to be found - only transit, limited to 1/2 vans
1	Support properly regulated transit not permanent sites
2	Support transit sites
27	Provision of temporary sites, not permanent (limited stay, controlled), for true travellers
1	Do not want permanent sites
6	Transit sites, not permanent sites, and not in Green Belt, and with access to schools, utility services etc
4	Transit sites away from mass populous
3	Agree official temporary sites need to be provided to prevent unlawful occupation
4	Should temporary site be required it should be in more remote locations, such as beside A127 or M25
4	Only if transit sites are open to any member of the public whilst travelling
3	Transit sites should be upto 5/6 vans, close to main roads
1	Only support a transit site at A12/M25, all other sites could become another 'Crays Hill'
1	Transit sites should not breach Green Belt rules, be near existing homes or be subsidised, and should be controlled
1	Temporary sites should be provided for 6 months and then revert to its former state and another location provided
	Existing Sites
8	Against sites in principle, but if forced to provide sites, use existing temporary or unauthorised sites
1	May be most practical to have existing sites - but only as transit sites
	Site Size
5	Any site should be limited in size, rubbish clearance covered
2	Any site should be no more than 3 caravans, well screened and not near schools.
2	Fairest solution would be to make provision for a small pitch (max. 3 vans) in every ward/Parish
1	Sites should be small (up to 4 pitches) and regulated
2	Any site should be no more than 5 units, to avoid no go areas like Crays Hill
1	Any site should be no more than 6 pitches and Council owned and run.
3	Plots should be small, landscaped and well accessed with realistic ground rents
3	Single family sites would be better neighbours
	Locational Issues
2	Any site should be away from public areas and parkland
1	Any sites should be on landfill, near motorways/railway lines
11	A travellers site should be close to major transport routes i.e. M25 or A12
12	More appropriate to use a brownfield site with access to main roads
1	Much better to use waste or derelict land
2	Ex-work sites rather than virgin countryside
2	If a site must be located, must be in town location close to services and facilities
1	Larger areas of Brentwood in non-village and non-rural areas would be able to adsorb new Gypsies and Travellers better than small villages.
1	If Council must find a site - it would be better at edge of town
3	Preferably as far away from houses as possible

6	If Council is legally required to find sites, should not be near existing residential properties
5	Accept sites need to be put somewhere - but need to be semi-rural
3	Put sites where police near at hand
1	Very special circumstances must apply in the Green Belt
1	Sites should not be on wildlife sanctuaries/SSSI
1	Council should maintain their criteria based policy - therefore not rural locations.
6	Sites should be based on spreading the burden across the borough
1	Need to find a green field site, away from residential properties
	Financial caveats
27	Against any sites unless they pay taxes and abide by local by-laws, and are regularly inspected, managed etc.
13	If they wish to have facilities, they must be prepared to contribute towards it/ not fair that local tax payers subsidise others
1	Although sites required, cannot condone use of Council Tax or government money, which should be better used on amenities and facilities in the borough
13	Only if all planning and building regulations followed, Council Tax, utilities etc. paid for.
	Other Issues
1	Only sites which would get planning permission for housing are suitable
7	Sites would be better managed if owned and controlled by council
3	Sites shouldn't be allowed to grow, and Gypsy Council should be responsible for condition of sites and upkeep
3	CCTV should be employed on all sites - quiet countryside location not appropriate
2	Any site must include environmental impact, permanent utilities provided
2	Understand need to provide sites but not to the detriment of the environment
1	Remain unconvinced of need to support this group - but Site 16 might have least detrimental effect on the community
3	Support for sites based on residents removing rubbish before moving on
4	Support sites if limited numbers and control on rubbish/waste
1	Should not incur disruption to existing roads
1	Whilst gypsies need to be accommodated, Hutton, Warley and the centre of Brentwood would not provide sufficient space for settlements
1	Need to identify resources for health services and education before considering brown field sites
1	If they could distance themselves from less reputable element, more sites could be made available
1	Why can't they use proper caravan sites?
1	Specific designated traveller sites should be set up by government with their own facilities (schools, doctors, policing etc.), more than 5 miles from existing communities
	Positive Response
	Sites should be provided
13	Sites should be found in the Borough
1	Understand a need to provide sites
1	It is clear there is a need in Brentwood
1	These people need somewhere to stop
1	Hope that consultation will find a reasonable solution that meets needs of Travellers and wider population.
3	Gypsies and Travellers have same right to accommodation which suits them as other citizens
1	Consideration should be extended to travellers - civic duty to provide a suitable plot
2	Would like to hear more from Council on how they propose to support Gypsies and Travellers as part of the community
6	Council should be suggesting sites to cooperate with the government
7	Time for Brentwood Council to take responsibilities seriously and provide permanent sites with access to schools, health services.
	Type of Site
1	Need for transit site in Brentwood

1	Would like to see small existing family sites allowed
1	Need for a transit site for those to visit families in the area
1	Site should be of a size to allow schools in vicinity to cope
2	Would support properly laid out sites with access to services, public transport etc. funded by central government and residents paying Council Tax. Should be small sites, integrated into the community and subject to the same laws.
	Site Location
2	Existing sites should be made the most of, not country parks or Green Belt
7	Select sites which are already industrial, not 'country' close to residential properties
5	Sites should be integrated into existing communities, not areas with little or no amenities
3	Sites need to be close to amenities for families
1	Supportive of sites provided investment to minimise nuisance and disruption to neighbours
6	Sites should be spread out across Borough to reduce impact on infrastructure, different groups should be kept apart
5	Sites should be close to police, health, education, employment and similar facilities
3	Sites should not be close to heavily populated areas - would put a strain on public services and make integration more difficult
1	Sites should be located near or with easy access to local schools, but traveller children should not exceed 10% of intake
4	Council should make available ex industrial sites or sites next to major roads, so that they can be observed/avoid traffic problems.
2	All people have a right to a safe living environment - sites shouldn't be adjacent to busy roads, civic amenity sites etc.
1	Site liable to flooding, designated as conservation areas or adjoining two main roads should be avoided
	Site Size
1	All boroughs should make provision, with small sites of 5 units max.
1	Site should be no more than 6 caravans
	Other Issues
2	Sites should be based on criteria agreed in consultation with public and Gypsies
1	Would support the construction of permanent and temporary sites, done in consultation with those who will occupy the sites.
1	Gypsies and Travellers should be encouraged to meet with existing communities to advise on what they can bring to the community.
4	Sites should have strict rules and code of conduct
1	Sites should be provided to meet actual identified local need or statutory requirement
1	Those on authorised sites should pay community charge
8	Would support sites for Romany Gypsies (true travellers) only.
2	Sites shouldn't be anywhere where possible 'conflicts' are possible or likely
1	Council should only consider sites that are not larger than required by 2011, to prevent growth with unauthorised use.
1	Why no proposed sites in Herongate/Shenfield. What about land by Brentwood Police Station or A127 by Half way House
3	Traveller woman residents/owner of Roman Triangle - always worked, always paid taxes and bills. Need permanent site for health services as we get older, education for children, and access to services. We are not criminals. Need a settled environment to ac
1	Majority are law abiding
1	Travellers not as bad as media make out.
2	Too many NIMBYs in Brentwood
1	Plenty of land in Brentwood that isn't serving any purpose
1	Permanently reserved sections on caravan parks
	Specific
	Negative Response
	General Locations

71	Too many/no more sites in Ingatestone and Mountnessing
27	Additional sites in Mountnessing/Ingatestone would cause unacceptable burden on local schools, doctors, utilities and amenities.
1	Traveller site in Ingatestone would put too much pressure on local services, village is small, have 2 sites already
2	Sites around Clements Park would be unwise and unwelcome.
1	Schools around Shenfield and Hutton already over-subscribed
1	Comment on Clapgate Site.
1	Can't see where in Curtis Mill Lane a Gypsy site could be? All land in areas is SSSI
1	Crays Hill should provide enough transit plots to cover the county.
1	Goatswood Lane site has given rise to illegal dumping.
1	Navestock already has its fair share of sites
1	Too many sites along A127
1	Most facilities in Shenfield/Hutton - why no sites?
1	Why no sites near Hutton Mount?
	Groups of Sites
1	Against sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 9 - Green Belt
1	Against sites 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15 and 18 - infrastructure, services and amenities already strained to capacity.
2	Against Sites 1, 2, 9, 13, 17 and 18 for Green Belt, landscape and nature conservation reasons
1	Against sites 1, 2, 9, 13 and 18 due to infrastructure overloaded, congested A12
1	Against sites 1, 2, 12, 17 and 18 - on periphery of Green Belt, much valued countryside
1	Particularly against sites 6, 7, 8 and 12
1	Against sites 12, 14, 16 and 17 - Green Belt or nature reserve
	Individual Sites
21	Site 1, Stock Lane - is unsuitable and illegal, Green Belt, highway safety, has already changed area, eyesore, lack of amenities, potential intensification
12	Site 2, Roman Triangle - shouldn't be considered as either a permanent or transit site. It is unsuitable and illegal, Green Belt, would be a waste of the money spent to remove them, unsightly
9	Site 3, Hope Farm - is farmland, no community facilities, flood problems, other sites in Horsemanside, would create a precedent, eyesore, dangerous access
24	Site 4, Curtis Mill Lane - is farmland, no infrastructure, no amenities, conservation area, flood problems, other sites in Horsemanside, would create a precedent, SSSI, wildlife etc
9	Sites 5, Clapgate - Would create a precedent; Green Belt, unsuitable small country roads, house values would plummet, inadequate drainage
131	Site 6, William Hunter Way - stupid site (historic town, negative impact on tourism, shoppers, local businesses, property values, crime, loss of parking, cinema site)
9	Site 7, Chep Site - rural area, no schools, shops, Green Belt
1	Site 7, Chep Site - On behalf of owners, the site is now fully used by PERI Ltd as part of a national operation network, and cannot be considered for any other purpose
77	Site 8, Former Hollytrees School playing field - live opposite, too small, surrounded by residential, eye sore, property prices will fall, PUOS, traffic congestion, surface water runoff, return it to allotments
4	Site 8, Hollytrees School playing field - believe land was gifted for use as a school
19	Site 9, Old A12 Works site - concerned about highway safety and materials left by works would require this land be a brown field site, Green Belt. Site is too large, would create another Crays Hill. Too close to housing
9	Site 10, Wenlocks Lane - too close to Blackmore village, already an unofficial site on the outskirts, Protected Lane, Green Belt, unsuitable roads, lack of services, schools
17	Site 11, Swallows Cross - highway safety, not close to amenities, unspoilt countryside, on or next to Wildlife Sites
210	Site 12, A127/A128 - very close to Ingrave, Herongate and West Horndon - crime rates would shoot up, adj. to country park, listed building, no shops, schools amenities nearby; Green Belt, SLA, bordered by Country Park, conservation area, SSSI; sloping site, visually intrusive, on or next to Wildlife Sites
7	Site 13, Land at Thoby Priory - no footpaths, no amenities, public transport etc.

17	Site 14, adj. existing camp site, Bentley - would have adverse impact on golf course and caravan club site and local schools, Green Belt land, local roads not suitable, prone to flooding
32	Site 15, A12/M25 - not safe for children, main entry point and Green Belt break between Brentwood and London, flood zone, highway safety, school facilities, noise and pollution, on or next to Wildlife Sites
28	Site 16, Land next to CA site, Coxtie Green Road - too close to educational site, Weald Park and residential area, Green Belt, could be toxic - not a healthy site for anyone, on or next to Wildlife Sites, impact on hotel and other commercial businesses
154	Site 17, Hutton Country Park - is a public park and valuable natural resource, important Green Belt gap, access concerns, traffic congestion, increased crime and public safety concerns, flood problems, doubtful schools could cope, on or next to Wildlife Sites, already anti-social behaviour problems in area
14	Site 18, Lower Road , Mountnessing - should be for a hotel, will destroy entrance to village
	Qualified Responses
	General Locations
1	Any site proposed between Brentwood and West Horndon preferred
1	Why all majority of sites situated in north of the Borough?
	Individual Sites
6	Site 6, William Hunter Way Car park - to stop such a large development, will be overlooked
5	Site 7, Chep Site - may be worth looking in to, least detrimental effect
2	Sites 7 offers transit site possibilities.
7	Site 9, offers transit site possibilities, screened from view and natural borders would prevent expansion, least detrimental effect
3	Site 12, A127/A128 - if they pay taxes, well behaved, have jobs etc, least detrimental effect
1	Site 13, Thoby Priory - best of choices offered, if planned and regulated
4	Site 14, Adj caravan site, Bentley - to extend the caravan site would cause least amount of disruption and anguish
5	Site 15, A12/M25 - if Brentwood has to have a site, least detrimental effect
1	Site 15, A12/M25 - only if land lying between A12 and A1023
1	Preferred site would be Site15, A12/M25
3	Site 16, Coxtie Green Road - accessible to facilities and services
4	Site 16, Next to CA site, Coxtie Green Road - if any site is suitable it is this one.
	Positive
	General Locations
1	Support sites in Ingatestone/Mountnessing as experienced in dealing with sites
	Groups of Sites
1	Sites 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16 and 18, already have facilities and local amenities and would speed along the development plan and reduce costs.
2	Sites 3, 7, 12 and 15 have access to main roads
1	Sites 3, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 18 are more suitable due to be away from residents and not on Green Belt land.
1	Sites 6 and 12 as transit sites
1	Sites 9, 12 and 16 are least damaging
	Individual Sites
3	Site 1, Stock Lane - this is the least unacceptable of the 5 sites in Mountnessing/Ingatestone, but only as a permanent site because of poor access; is already legal and should remain
3	Site 2, Roman Triangle - is ok but do not want to see it increase in size
16	Site 2, Roman Triangle - would support permanent site, travellers already there
17	Site 2, Roman Triangle - Travellers on this site are not a problem and are a big part of the community, they pay tax etc.
2	Site 3, Navestock Side - travellers already there
1	Site 4, Curtis Mill Lane - not a problem apart from drainage

2	Site 5, Land off Chivers Lane - support current owners application for permanent occupation, but not a travelling site
9	Site 6, William Hunter Way - would be an option if not for roads leading to it (roundabouts, tight turns), less of a problem for a permanent site, visible site, has access to services and amenities
1	Site 6, William Hunter Way - Transit site, no more than 3 caravans, 2 days maximum stay
20	Site 7, Chep Site - probably best as it could offer both permanent and temporary sites in one location and some limited development; next to major road junctions; big enough to allow all illegal sites to be vacated and returned to their original state, has been in commercial use, transit only
6	Site 9, Old A12 works site - most suitable, enclosed by railway, old A12 and CA site
5	Site 9, Old A12 works - transit site only, wont cause congestion
1	Site 10, Wenlocks Lane
2	Site 11, Swallows Cross
3	Site 12, A127/A128 - better site, plenty of room, most of sites are small rural villages schools would not have capacity
5	Site 13, Land at Thoby Priory - existing industrial site, well screened
5	Site 14, Adj. caravan site, Bentley - only permanent site to be considered, although possible health issues?
1	Site 14, Adj. caravan site, Bentley - transit site only
10	Site 15, A12/M25 - next to major road junction, wont cause congestion
6	Site 16, Coxtie Green Road
1	Site 16, Coxtie Green Road - transit site only
1	Two sites missed off consultation - Lizvale and Orchard View, Horsemanside
	General
	Equity of process
21	Why are Gypsies and Travellers getting preferential treatment? Young people cannot afford to live in Brentwood and have to move away. Further accommodation should be for those on the waiting list.
27	Against any existing unauthorised sites - would create a precedent
1	Gypsies and travellers should buy land themselves
2	Any authorised sites should only be granted to 'proper gypsies'
9	Money should be spent on local residents, facilities for young/elderly people
2	This is discrimination against resident tax payers
	Financial issues
10	Travellers must pay rent in advance and large deposit
4	Trust they will pay to use sites, water, electricity etc.
1	If authorised sites provided, law should be properly enforces against unauthorised sites.
1	Don't need the unpleasantness/issues that this gives rise to
1	Help them to conform not fight
2	Approval of traveller sites should not lead to permanent housing
1	Would the sites be subject to planning permission?
	The Consultation
1	Whilst trying to realise the need for transit sites to stop problems of unauthorised encampments, impossible to ask people to welcome sites in and around their villages
2	Rather than pick an area not near me we should encourage them to move on
2	Inappropriate to comment on sites not near to you
5	Wouldn't want to vote for sites that effect other residents
1	Little option than to state what will be the least problematic - doesn't mean support for further mobile homes
1	Prefer to comment on Council's proposals
1	Should have excluded sites flagged in SA process
1	General locations too vague
1	Needs to adequate and direct consultation with local Gypsy and Traveller community
1	Would have been more helpful if Council had set a range of options
1	Not enough forms delivered to Victoria Court

1	Why should we state ethnic origin? Can't see any relevance
4	Object to questions on gender, age, ethnicity - no bearing on issue
4	More information needed
2	Matters seems to be dealt with very underhand
1	Regret that the consultation lacks information and its 'anti-Gypsy' campaign, such that it lacks credibility. No need for local authority site, just same respect and consideration to Green Belt applications
1	What happened to Stage 1?
1	Consultation is an expensive sham
	Other Comments
1	Whilst no objection in principle, do object to when way of life has adverse effect on others/the environment
1	Travelling people not popular due to a few, not all, upsetting residents
1	Site within reach of Brentwood - active Police service area
1	Upset by maltreatment of travellers' animals
1	Facilities should be made available for anyone to live in a caravan - for people on low incomes not just travellers
1	Pitches will need to vary in size and accommodate visitors
1	No realistic chance of travellers moving from present sites, more sensible to concentrate on preventing further illegal settlements
1	Could we buy a caravan and have a site provided?
2	Would be more acceptance if Gypsies/Travellers left sites in clean and tidy state
1	Should be a criminal offence
2	Send them back to country of ethnic origins
2	Wherever you put a site you must give a massive rate reduction
1	This would be the thin edge of the wedge
1	Should have to provide sites for what is a declining way of life - many own houses
	Statutory Consultees
1	Highway Agency would need to be consulted on Sites 2, 7, 9 and 15
1	Water Authority identify need for adequate capacity to be provided
1	EEDA supports provision of pitches where need arises to assist the economic aims of the region etc.
1	ECC Schools - Sites 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12 and 14 are or likely to be more than 3 miles from any Essex secondary school and would incur transport costs
1	GO-East comments on robustness of existing consultations and advice on taking the document forward
1	Natural England advises that the DPD should reflect policies in PPS7 and PPS9
	New Site Suggestion
1	Land between lower Road and railway line
1	Hutton Mount, Highwood Hospital, Hunters Walk Car Park, Shenfield Common, Brentwood Town Hall Car Park
1	Near tip in Stondon Massey
1	Land opposite land off Stock Lane, Ingatestone
1	Three Oak Meadow, Hanging Hill Lane
57	Duplicates/No Response
621	No Comment