

From: **Gordon and Yvonne** <[REDACTED]>  
Date: Sun, Mar 15, 2015 at 9:29 AM  
Subject: Re: Maldon Local Plan - Travellers - Policy H6  
To: Andrea Copsey <[copseyandrea@gmail.com](mailto:copseyandrea@gmail.com)>

Hi Andrea

I, and the Parish Council, have reviewed the circumstances of the High Court decision, and our response is as follows:-

*"The recent High Court decision circulated by the Inspector would appear to have been decided upon whether the planning policy imposed was contrary to the applicant's human rights, in as much as any application from a gypsy/traveller was going to be delayed by virtue of referral to the Secretary of State.*

*On this understanding, Maldon District Council's policy towards gypsy and travellers would equally be contrary to an applicant's human rights, as no specific sites for new pitches are identified in the draft local plan – there is merely a list of existing sites. This is discriminatory because, for "settled" housing, the local plan identifies specific sites where development will be permitted.*

*That this approach has failed to deliver sufficient pitches previously is clear because in the draft local plan the District Council is seeking to regularise five existing unlawful pitches which have been refused, either by the District Council or at appeal. In Great Braxted ALL the recent applications for additional traveller sites have gone to appeal, and I would expect all future applications to be similarly treated.*

*Mrs Hopkins argued that, in larger-scale developments, the District Council should echo the policy of Chelmsford City Council in seeking the provision of gypsy/traveller sites through a S106 agreement, and this would appear to be both a sensible, and equitable way forward."*

On this basis, combined with the reluctance of Maldon District Council to move from a sequential test for gypsy/traveller sites, this aspect of the Local Plan is deeply flawed.

**Gordon and Yvonne Mussett**