

Site assessments 2017 - why green, amber and red? - some explanations:

Following site visits all prospective sites were scored by the Neighbourhood Plan group against criteria that had been drawn up to reflect the wishes of the Village, as voiced on previous consultations. These were:

1. Would there be good access both by vehicle, not just domestic but commercial (deliveries and collections) and on foot?
2. Would development affect the surroundings in that location, would it be seen as part of one of the hamlets, without diminishing an important gap or adversely affecting local features of landscape or historic importance?
3. Might the development be detrimental to green spaces, biodiversity, etc?
4. Would any properties be likely to have a negative impact on surroundings / neighbours, or be adversely affected by flooding, local business (noise, etc.) or for instance bad odours (sewage works)?
5. Was the development likely to be supportive in the way of helping to retain community facilities, work opportunities, etc?

Each group member individually scored each site, based on the following rating:

✓✓ = strong positive, ✓ = positive, 0 = neutral, ✗ = negative, ✗✗ = strong negative

The group then met to consider the scores (looking at the range and average of the independent scores and seeking to understand why some scores differed considerably), to agree a final score for each criteria for each site, reflecting the consensus of the group as shown in the table below. (Where a group member had declared a potential conflict of interest, they took no part in scoring or discussing the scores for that site.)

The scores then formed the basis for deciding which sites should be ranked as “green”, “amber” and “red”.

Given the subjective nature of the scoring and possible weightings that might be applied, it was not considered appropriate to ‘rank’ the sites within each category or publish these scores as part of the consultation, other than to explain the rejection of the “red” sites (where the overall negatives appeared to outweigh the positives). The Strategic Environmental Assessment scores were published.

Site ID (see map)	A safe and walkable village	Built form and character	Important green spaces	Possible harm to occupants	A working, active village
4	0	✓✓	✓	✓	✓
7	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
8 or 506	✓✓	✗	0	✓	✓✓
11	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓
12	✗	✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
13	✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
18	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
20	✓	✗	0	✓✓	✓✓
2	✓✓	✗	✗	✗	✓
10	✓	✓	0	✗	0
14	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓
15	✓✓	✗	0	✗✗	✓✓
16	✓✓	0	0	✓	0
21	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
601	0	✓	✓	✗	✗
1	✗✗	✗	0	0	✗
3 or 605	✗	✓	✗	0	✗
5	✗	✓	0	0	✗
6	✓✓	✗	✗✗	✗✗	✗
9	✗	✗✗	✗	✗	✗
17	✗	✗✗	0	✓	✗
19	✗	✗	✗✗	✓	✗✗
22	✗✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
23	✓	✗	✗	0	0
24	✓	✗✗	✗	✗	✗
602	0	✗	✗	✗	✓