

To

Mr Timothy Jones

Examiner, Goring Neighbourhood Plan

From

Mr Thomas Rothwell

Programme Manager

Goring Neighbourhood Plan

13/07/2018

Site Rankings Table

Dear Sir,

At the examination on Wednesday you asked for the rankings of the sites resulting from our site assessment process. Please find below the final site assessment undertaken by the Site Selection Management Group (this is the group of volunteers set up to undertake the site assessment, comprising the members of the steering group and the leaders or representatives from the working groups).

Site Ranking	pass cat 1 - MUST	pass cat 2 - SHOULD	pass cat 3 - COULD	simple credit cat 2	simple credit cat 3	Conclusion
GNP10	7	11	7	9	5	Accepted - all MUST DO achieved
GNP2	7	10	7	5	2	Accepted - all MUST DO achieved
GNP3	7	10	6	2	2	Accepted - all MUST DO achieved
GNP6	7	10	5	4	1	Accepted - all MUST DO achieved
GNP7	6	9	7	3	2	Not accepted, one or more MUST DO not achieved
GNP13	6	9	6	4	2	Not accepted, one or more MUST DO not achieved
GNP8	6	9	5	3	0	Not accepted, one or more MUST DO not achieved
GNP5	6	8	5	0	-1	Not accepted, one or more MUST DO not achieved
GNP4	6	8	4	0	-3	Not accepted, one or more MUST DO not achieved
GNP1	6	6	5	-5	0	Not accepted, one or more MUST DO not achieved
GNP9	6	6	4	-2	-3	Not accepted, one or more MUST DO not achieved
GNP11	4	6	5	-2	-1	Not accepted, one or more MUST DO not achieved
GNP14	4	6	3	-5	-2	Not accepted, one or more MUST DO not achieved
GNP12	4	3	5	-8	-1	Not accepted, one or more MUST DO not achieved

A word of explanation may be helpful.

1. The table and its methodology were introduced to support the selection of sites. Should there have been a surplus of sites that achieved all the MUST DO site selection criteria i.e. more sites than would have been needed to meet the 86 dwellings needed to be compliant with the core strategy allocation, it was our intention to simply select sites based on the ranking in the table. It was also our intention that we would apply a “contiguous development” test i.e. whether the allocation of a site based on the rank in the table would leave a gap between the built form of the village, which might then subsequently be classified as infill (as for instance would have been the case with GNP4 or GNP9). In practice with the sites allocated, this issue did not arise.
2. The sites are ordered in the table above by their level of fit with the site selection criteria, from high to low.

3. They are ordered by number of passes of MUST do, then by number of passes of SHOULD DO, then by number of passes of COULD DO, then by simple credit for SHOULD DO, then by simple credit of COULD DO.
4. The “simple credit” columns were introduced to avoid any sites having the same ranking and was based on sites being given a credit equal to the number of times they exceeded a pass level minus the number of times they failed a pass level. In practice these were necessary during the initial assessment that took place before the interim site assessments were presented to the village in December 2016 but were superfluous in the final assessment.

The Site Selection Management Group undertook a final assessment of all criteria for all sites on the 3rd August 2017 to take into account the inclusion of a specific flood risk test as a MUST DO site selection criterion and to reflect (for every site) any mitigation specified in the final site selection criteria and / or proposed by or agreed with the relevant developer. The table above reflects this final assessment.

The table quoted by Mr Turnbull at the Hearing was an out of date version that was the one presented at the public consultation in December 2016. I have included it on the next page for completeness but the correct version is as shown above.

Yours Sincerely

Tom Rothwell

Programme Manager

Goring Neighbourhood Plan

Site Selection and Ranking

Site	Rank	Number of passes of "MUST DO" Criteria	Number of passes of "SHOULD DO" Criteria	Number of passes of "COULD DO" Criteria	Net debits and credits for "SHOULD DO" Criteria	Net debits and credits for "COULD DO" Criteria	Flood Sequential Test
GNP10	1	6	11	7	9	5	Accepted
GNP2	2	6	10	7	5	2	Accepted
GNP3	3	6	10	6	2	2	Accepted with mitigation
GNP6	4	6	10	5	4	1	Accepted
GNP13	5	6	9	6	4	2	NOT Accepted
GNP7	6	5	9	7	3	2	Not a reasonable site
GNP8	7	5	9	5	3	0	Not a reasonable site
GNP5	8	5	8	5	0	-1	Not a reasonable site
GNP4	9	5	8	4	0	-3	Not a reasonable site
GNP1	10	5	6	5	-5	0	Not a reasonable site
GNP9	11	5	6	4	-2	-3	Not a reasonable site
GNP11	12	3	6	5	-2	-1	Not a reasonable site
GNP14	13	3	6	3	-5	-2	Not a reasonable site
GNP12	14	3	3	5	-8	-1	Not a reasonable site

Erratum: GNP1 changed from "Must = 3, Should = 3, Could = 3, Net debit Should = -6" to "Must = 3, Should = 6, Could = 3, Net debit Should = -3" moving it above GNP9. GNP3 Net debit Should changed from -1 to 0, no change in rank.