



Pepper Pot, Chagford © DNPA

# Annex 1

## Gypsy and traveller transit sites

### Criteria based three phase filter assessment

#### 1. Location, policy and environmental constraints

The Site		
a) Is the site located within the search area?	Yes +1	No 0
b) Does the site exceed 1,500m <sup>2</sup> as a minimum size	Yes +1	No 0
c) Current Land use-Brownfield	Yes +1	No 0
d) Site is located within a reasonable walking distance of a Local Centre/ Rural Settlement (centring on separate school site where applicable)	Within 200m + 4 400m + 3 800m + 2 1,200m + 1	
e) Site is located within a reasonable cycle route of a Local Centre/ Rural Settlement (centring on separate school site where applicable)	Within 1000m + 3 4,000m + 2 8,000m + 1	
f) Site is located within reasonable accessibility to main transport corridor junctions	Within 1,500m + 1	
g) Is the site located within an area subject to the following constraints: Flood Zone 2 or 3 Minerals Consultation Area HSE safeguarding zone Protected woodland or moorland Conservation Area Scheduled Monument Special Area of Conservation/ SSSI	Yes 0	No + 2
h) Has the site been the subject of a negative planning history, and there has been no material change in circumstances since?	Yes 0	No +1
i) Is the principle of a gypsy and traveller development acceptable on this site by reference to the relevant criteria of Policy COR1 (Core Strategy sustainable development policy) in the DNPA Core Strategy DPD 2006 – 2026	Yes +1	No 0

**MINIMUM SCORE  
9 TO PROGRESS  
TO 2ND PHASE**

## 2. Access and infrastructure

The Site		
a) Basic infrastructure (water, electricity) is available on site or within a reasonable distance from the site to enable practical connection	Yes +1	No 0
b) The site can be served by an independent vehicular access point, which adheres to reasonable highway standards	Yes +1	No 0
c) Access avoids unsuitable routes so that existing highway network is therefore capable of accommodating proposed traffic movements	Yes +1	No 0
d) The site has a safe pedestrian and/or cycle route to the nearest Local Centre or Rural Settlement	Yes +1	No 0
e) The site has good and reasonably direct access to key routes out of the nearest Local Centre/ Rural Settlement onto main trunk roads	Yes +1	No 0
f) Access to transport interchange is available via a safe walking route	Within 200m + 3 400m + 2 800m + 1	
g) The nearest public transport interchange provides the following services	Hourly services + 2 Daily services + 1	
h) Access (walking distances) to at least one of the following key local facilities: primary school, food shops, doctor's surgery, children's play area	Within 200m + 3 400m + 2 800m + 1	
i) Access (walking distance) to at least one of the following district services/amenities: secondary school or further education college, medical centre or hospital, dentist, leisure/recreation centre, community centre (Not village hall)	Within 500m + 3 1,000m + 2 2,000m + 1	
j) Access (safe cycle route) to local services/amenities, as above	Within 1,000m + 3 4,000m + 2 8,000m + 1	
k) Is the site located within 1,000m of other gypsy and traveller sites?	Yes 0	No + 1
l) Would there be an unacceptable impact to local physical/social infrastructure should additional pitches be permitted?	Yes 0	No + 1

**MINIMUM SCORE  
12 TO PROGRESS  
TO 3RD PHASE**

### 3. Deliverability, design and impact

The Site	Acceptable	Neutral	Poor
a) Natural and logical boundary – sensitive to character/appearance of surroundings	+ 2	+ 1	0
b) Relationship to services/amenities, including emergency response times	+ 2	+ 1	0
c) Is the site visually intrusive?	+ 2	+ 1	0
d) Impact on existing local residential amenity	+ 2	+ 1	0
e) Impact on recognised environmental designations	+ 2	+ 1	0
f) Impact on protected species/habitat/forage areas	+ 2	+ 1	0
g) Impact on the overall landscape character and appearance of the area	+ 2	+ 1	0
h) Where neutral or poor scores are recorded above can mitigation measures address concerns?	Yes + 1	No 0	
i) Are there air quality concerns?	Yes 0	No + 1	
j) Are there potential light nuisance concerns?	Yes 0	No + 1	
k) Are there potential noise issues?	Yes 0	No + 1	
l) On balance is the candidate site suitable as a Transit site?	Yes + 1	No 0	
m) Site ownership	Local authority + 3 Gypsy/Traveller + 2 Other public body + 1 Other 0		
n) Available for purchase	Yes +1	No 0	
o) Notional weighted costs	Existing	Minor works	Significant
- Utility connection	+ 2	+ 1	0
- Road infrastructure	+ 2	+ 1	0
- Landscaping	+ 2	+ 1	0
- Mitigation	+ 2	+ 1	0

**POTENTIAL  
ALLOCATION SCORE  
MINIMUM 19**