

Site Selection Objectives, Criteria and Measures

Goring Neighbourhood Plan

ABSTRACT

This document summarises the Goring Neighbourhood Plan Site Selection Objectives, Criteria and Measures (SSOCM's). The SSOCM's are designed to be used in the Site Selection Process (SSP) to assess and prioritise the identified physical sites for new dwellings in Goring

Authors: M Stares & T Rothwell

Version 1.2

Status: Approved

Date: 14/11/2016

Change History

Version	Changes since last version	Status & Date
1.0	Draft for comment	Draft 23/10/2016
1.1	Final update	Approved 24/10/2016
1.2	Updated with Measures for Criteria 9 and 10	Approved 14/11
1.3		
1.4		
1.5		

Introduction

This document summarises the Goring Neighbourhood Plan Site Selection Objectives, Criteria and Measures (SSOCM's) for the Site Selection Process (SSP). The SSOCM's will be used to assess the suitability of the available sites for development. Site selection will be evidence based and driven by a methodology which is as independent as possible from personal opinion and preference.

The Goring on Thames Neighbourhood Plan (GNP) is required to identify sites capable of supporting the development of Goring's allocation in the SODC local plan 2011 (at the SODC standard housing density of 25 dwellings per hectare). However, since the establishment of the Neighbourhood Plan project SODC has published a consultation version of its 2032 Local Plan. As a result of the SODC shortfall in 5-year housing supply, the 2032 local plan (consultation) proposes a significant increase in numbers for large villages such as Goring.

Goring is however in a unique geographic position on the river Thames and in and between two protected AONB's. This has a fundamental impact on the strategy for new housing development in the village. There are also significant infrastructure issues in Goring which are limiting factors.

The SSP will therefore identify ALL sites, from those submitted for consideration, that are potentially suitable for residential development.

During the period from September 2015 to July 2016, there has been extensive consultation with the community of Goring, land owners and developers, statutory and other interested bodies and local councils. From these consultations, key information has been identified including:

- the key issues facing Goring from the perspective of the people living in the village
- current and future housing needs in Goring
- prioritised criteria identified by Goring residents for the location and size of new housing sites and for the design of these sites and dwellings
- the land available in Goring Parish for new developments
- a set of Sustainability objectives for future developments in the village

In addition, an independent Landscape and Visual Impact appraisal has been commissioned to consider the impact of developing the available sites with particular reference to the AONB.

There will be three types of Objectives and Policies in the GNP:

- GNP top level Objectives and Policies that reflect regulatory and village priorities and underpin the vision and priorities for Goring
- Objectives, Criteria and Measures that will be used for site selection. These will be a set which reflect both sustainability and village priorities. Discussions have been held with SODC to identify which objectives can be used to assess our site selection. Not all preferences identified by the village can be used as SSOCM's as they are not valid planning decision factors
- Site specific Objectives and Policies that are appropriate for an individual site to ensure that any residential development meets the requirements of the village and is sustainable

The above is at different stages of production and will be released into the public domain at an appropriate time.

In addition, there will be a Goring Neighbourhood Plan Design Guide (closely based on the recently published SODC Design Guide,) which will identify the fundamental design principles that are required for all sites that are selected for development as part of the GNP.

Site Selection Process and Policies

Sites will be assessed by the Site Selection Management Group (SSMG – Terms of Reference on the GNP Website) in accordance with the Site Selection Methodology (Site Selection Methodology – Description, Version 1.5, Status Approved, 28/9/2016 on the GNP Website). In addition, Goring Parish Council has appointed an independent Site Selection Overview Group (SSOG – Terms of Reference on the GNP Website) to ensure that the Site Selection Methodology is carried out with integrity and not influenced by the personal preference of anybody working on the SSMG.

Sites will be rigorously appraised (by the SSMG) against the SSOCM's. The SSMG must agree the assessment given to each site against each Criterion and a matrix produced summarising the full assessment of each site. This matrix will be used to determine sites which are acceptable for development, to prioritise the sites from most to least desirable, and to record required mitigation and further actions.

All sites will be assessed against all SSOCM's.

The SSOCM's will be prioritised to reflect their relative importance to Goring as evidenced from the extensive consultations and surveys and from a sustainability perspective.

There will be an opportunity for all site appraisals to be reviewed with its Developer or Landowner. Based on this review, changes may be made to the site appraisal by the SSMG and the final assessment matrix will be confirmed.

Site Selection Objectives, Criteria and Measures

Objectives

Each Site Selection Objective will be allocated to one of three categories:

Category 1 – Must Have: these Objectives are viewed as critical to the achievement of the objectives of the Plan. Except in exceptional circumstances, this Objective must be complied with or the site will not be recommended for development. Where the assessment identifies mitigation that could make the site acceptable for selection, the site will be taken forward subject to the Developer agreeing such mitigations or proposing alternative acceptable mitigations

Category 2 – Should Have: these Objectives are viewed as very important to the village as a whole or are very important for sustainability. Sites should comply with these Objectives and will be prioritised depending on their level of compliance. Sites that fail to comply with a significant majority of these Objectives may be judged to be of low suitability and may be declared as unacceptable for development. Where the assessment identifies mitigation that could improve the assessment, subject to the Developer agreeing such mitigations or proposing alternative acceptable mitigation, the improved assessment will be carried forward

Category 3 – Could Have: These Objectives are viewed by the village as a whole as desirable but not of the highest priority.

Criteria

For each SSO, a small number of Criteria will be produced to contextualise the Objective for Goring and to subdivide it into measurable components. Each Criterion will inherit the Categorisation (1, 2 or 3) of its parent objective.

Each Criterion will have up to 5 Levels of compliance:

-  – Significantly exceeds
-  - Exceeds
-  - Meets requirement
-  - Does not meet requirement
-  - Significantly fails to meet the requirement

Measures

Each level of compliance will have a Measure associated with it. The Measure is a statement or calculation of the site qualities that will be required to satisfy that level of compliance.

To be considered to have complied with an Objective a site must be able to achieve at least a Level “3 – Meets requirement” for all Criteria allocated to that Objective.

Site Selection Objectives, Criteria and Measures

The following pages show the approved list of Site Selection Objectives, Criteria and Measures ordered according to Category 1, 2 and 3.

Category	Objective Number	SITE SELECTION OBJECTIVE	Criteria Number	CRITERIA	Assessment	Measure of compliance with criteria
1	1	To ensure that the site must be available in the timescale of the Plan.	1	Have the proposers demonstrated clear Title to the entire site?	↑	Registered title to all parts of site in the name of the developer / owner
					↗	Adequate documentary evidence of the right to acquire, linked to the proposed development, in relation to the entire site.
					→	Current registered title to part of site, clear basis for acquiring title to the rest within the required timescale.
					↘	Title claimed, incomplete information provided
					↓	No information provided on title, or information provided suggests problems
			2	Is the boundary of the site, or if proposed a part of the site, clear and enforceable?	→	Extent and precise location have been clearly set out on the plan submitted and reflects a result achievable and enforceable on the ground.
					↘	Extent and precise location have been set out but require minor clarifications
					↓	Not sufficiently defined or enforceable and require more than minor clarification.
			3	Are there any factors (including but not limited to archaeological and environmental) which are likely to render the site unavailable within the timescale?	→	No known factors
					↘	There are one or more factors which have potential to retard development beyond 2027
					↓	There are one or more factors which are highly likely to retard development beyond 2027
			4	Is the site available for development by 2027?	↗	The site is clearly available by 2027 without leasehold complications
					→	The site is available by 2027 provided leases / tenancies terminate in accordance with current documented dates.
↓	The site has not been demonstrated to be available for development by 2027					

	2	To conserve and enhance the natural beauty of Goring's countryside and river setting, and the AONB in particular, when viewed from the immediate locality, the medium distance and from further away in longer views.	5	Is the site considered appropriate for development in all or in part by the Bramhill Landscape Consultants' conclusions?	↗	The independent evaluation conducted by Bramhill Associates (October 2016), with particular reference to the AONB, recommends that the whole site is suitable for development with no major mitigation required
					→	The independent evaluation conducted by Bramhill Associates (October 2016), with particular reference to the AONB, recommends that the site is suitable for development but only with mitigation or that only part of the site is suitable with or without mitigation
					↓	The independent evaluation conducted by Bramhill Associates (October 2016), with particular reference to the AONB, recommends that this site is not suitable for development in whole or in part with or without mitigation
	3	To ensure that there are no insurmountable infrastructure constraints that would prevent this site being accepted for development.	6	Have any of the relevant agencies advised that the site should not be used for the type of development proposed?	→	No agencies have advised against development or the developer has confirmed that the particular mitigation required by an agency will be carried out
					↘	One or more agencies have stated that development should not go ahead on this site without sufficient mitigation and the developer has not confirmed that the particular mitigation required by an agency will be carried out
					↓	One or more agencies have stated that development should not go ahead on this site
2	4	To preserve undeveloped, wherever possible, land with soil quality of grade 3a and above.	7	Does the site include any significant part with soil of grade 3a or above?	↑	The site clearly has no significant part with soil of grade 3a or above
					→	There is a minimal risk that at least some part of the site has soil of grade 3a or above, but it is unlikely.
					↘	There is a moderate risk that at least some part of the site has soil of grade 3a or above.
					↓	There is a substantial risk that at least some part of the site has soil of grade 3a or above.

	5	To prioritise the use of brownfield sites.	8	Is the majority of the site brownfield?	↑	The site contains buildings which may be viewed as currently having a detrimental impact on the village.
					→	Yes
					↓	No
	6	To minimise the volume of additional traffic through congested areas.	9	Does the location and size of the site minimise the number of journeys through existing congestion points to access village amenities?	↑	Journeys from this site to amenities using a simple modelling process will not exceed 30
					↗	Journeys from this site to amenities using a simple modelling process will be greater than 30 and not exceed 60
					→	Journeys from this site to amenities using a simple modelling process will be greater than 60 and not exceed 120
					↓	Journeys from this site to amenities using a simple modelling process will exceed 120
					↓	Not applicable

			<p>10</p> <p>Does the location and size of the site minimise the number of journeys through existing congestion points to leave or enter the village?</p>	↑	Journeys from this site in and out of the village during peak hours using a simple modelling process will not exceed 50
				↗	Journeys from this site in and out of the village during peak hours using a simple modelling process will be greater than 50 and not exceed 100
				→	Journeys from this site in and out of the village during peak hours using a simple modelling process will be greater than 100 and not exceed 150
				↘	Journeys from this site in and out of the village during peak hours using a simple modelling process will exceed 150
				↓	Not applicable

			11	Would development of this site have an impact on vehicular movement on existing residential roads?	<p>↑ Short road, small site</p> <p>↗ Medium site / short road; or small site / medium road</p> <p>→ Long road / small site; or medium road / medium site; or short road / large site.</p> <p>↘ Large site / medium road; or medium site / long road;</p> <p>↓ Large site / long road.</p>
	7	To maintain and enhance biodiversity by, (i) protecting and improving existing wildlife habitats; (ii) safeguarding relevant landscape features; and (iii) conserving and enhancing wildlife corridors.	12	Does the site interfere with existing wildlife habitat, including landscape features important to biodiversity?	<p>↑ There is no evidence that the site is used to any significant extent by wildlife, and it is unlikely to be so used. There are no relevant landscape features (mature trees, hedgerows, ponds, grass banks, dry-stone walls etc.).</p> <p>↗ There is some evidence that the site is used to a limited extent by wildlife, but not by any rare or unusual species and not in a way which differs from adjacent land not offered for development OR there is a small number of relevant landscape features (mature trees, hedgerows, ponds, grass banks, dry-stone walls etc.) but a good prospect that the site could be developed without significantly harming such features.</p> <p>→ There is some evidence that the site is used at least to a limited extent by wildlife, but not by any rare or unusual species and not in a way which differs from adjacent land not offered for development AND there is a small number of relevant landscape features (mature trees, hedgerows, ponds, grass banks, dry-stone walls etc.) but a good prospect that the site could be developed without significantly harming such features.</p> <p>↘ (1) The site appears to be used by wildlife to a moderate extent; OR (2) There is a real risk that the site is used to at least a limited extent by at least one rare or unusual species; OR (3) there is a small number of relevant landscape features (mature trees, hedgerows, ponds, grass banks, dry-stone walls etc.) which would probably be harmed by the development of the site</p>

					<p>↓</p> <p>(1) The site appears to be used by wildlife to a substantial extent; OR (2) The site appears to be used to at least a limited extent by at least one rare or unusual species; OR (3) The site appears to be used to at least a limited extent by more than one rare or unusual species; OR (4) there is a significant number of relevant landscape features (mature trees, hedgerows, ponds, grass banks, dry-stone walls etc.) which would probably be harmed by the development of the site; OR (5) more than one of the factors listed as alternatives in this measure or the one above are present</p>
			13	Does the site impede existing wildlife corridors?	<p>↑</p> <p>There is no evidence that the site is used to any significant extent by wildlife as a link between areas of habitat, and it is unlikely to be so used.</p>
					<p>→</p> <p>There is no evidence that the site is used to any significant extent by wildlife as a link between areas of habitat, but there is a minimal risk that it is so used OR there is some evidence of occasional use of this sort by wildlife AND, in either case, there are alternative wildlife corridors available</p>
					<p>↘</p> <p>There is evidence of use of this site by wildlife as a link between areas of habitat which is more than occasional.</p>
					<p>↓</p> <p>There is evidence of frequent and/or extensive use of this site by wildlife as a link between areas of habitat</p>
	8	To maintain and enhance existing community facilities.	14	Does the development of this site have a detrimental impact on the enjoyment of any existing facility by the residents of Goring?	<p>↑</p> <p>There is no detrimental impact AND there is genuine and realistic potential to enhance one or more community facilities in accordance with the detailed site proposal from the developer.</p>
					<p>↗</p> <p>There has been no detrimental impact identified</p>
					<p>→</p> <p>The site has a potential detrimental impact but one which the developer has confirmed will be adequately mitigated</p>

					↘	Development of the site has a potential detrimental impact which the developer has not confirmed will be adequately mitigated.
					↓	Development of the site would involve the irrevocable loss of an existing amenity
			15	Does the development of this site have a detrimental impact on existing parking facilities within the village?	↑	Significant positive impact
					↗	Small positive impact
					→	No net impact
					↘	Small negative net impact
					↓	Significant net negative impact
	9	To ensure that new housing developments can be effectively integrated into the existing community.	16	To what degree is the site bordered by land that is currently occupied by houses?	↑	Bordered on all sides by existing developments within the village built form boundary
					↗	Bordered on three sides by existing developments within the village built form boundary
					→	Bordered on two sides by existing developments within the village built form boundary
					↘	Bordered on one side by existing developments within the village built form boundary
					↓	Not bordered on any side by existing developments within the village built form boundary
			17	Is the site sufficiently close to existing facilities?	↑	The site is central to the village and its facilities. Measurement of shortest safe road/pathway distance from site entrance to main amenities is less than 400m (<5 mins walk).
					↗	The site is within desirable walking distance of ALL of the main village amenities. This is defined as 800m when measured using Google Maps walking directions.
					→	The site is within reasonable walking distance of ANY of the main amenities. This is defined as 800m when measured using Google Maps walking directions.

					↘	The site is at the preferred maximum walking distance to the main village amenities This is defined as 2000m when measured using Google Maps walking directions.
					↓	The site is outside an acceptable walking distance to the main village amenities for most people.
			18	Is the site of a size which can be absorbed into the area of the village in which it is located without undue impact?	↗	The site size is not greater than small (which is defined as less than or equal to 1 hectare AND has a maximum number of 20 dwellings) AND would not substantially impact upon the character of its immediate surroundings.
					→	The site size is not greater than medium (which is defined as equal to or greater than 1 hectare and less than 2.5 hectares AND has a maximum number of 40 dwellings) AND would not substantially impact upon the character of its immediate surroundings.
					↘	The site size is greater than medium (which is defined as equal to or greater than 1 hectare and less than 2.5 hectares OR has more than 40 dwellings) OR would substantially impact upon the character of its immediate surroundings.
					↓	The site size is greater than medium (which is defined as equal to or greater than 1 hectare and less than 2.5 hectares AND has more than 40 dwellings) AND would substantially impact upon the character of its immediate surroundings.

3	10	To ensure that the site is considered capable of development by environmental, utilities and infrastructure agencies (including but not limited to the environmental agency for flood plain development, gas, water, electricity and telecoms utilities, police, railway and highways).	19	Have any of the relevant agencies advised of any specific constraints that would apply to the site?	↑	All relevant agencies have been consulted and none have advised of constraints
					→	All relevant agencies have been consulted and some have advised of constraints, all of which are capable of mitigation
					↓	All relevant agencies have been consulted and one or more have advised against development due to constraints which are not capable of mitigation or constraints which the developer is not prepared to mitigate
	11	To ensure that new and existing developments are well connected to the village centre, the school and other amenities (including access to the countryside) by a network of safe and accessible footways and cycle paths which maintain and enhance existing rights of way.	20	Are there existing accessible footways which connect to this site, or is it feasible to provide this by connecting to existing footways?	↑	Potential access points onto multiple existing footway(s).
					→	At least one access points onto existing footway or could be constructed within the site
					↓	No possible access points could be constructed within the site to existing footways
			21	Are there safe accessible existing cycle routes which connect to this site, or is it feasible to provide this by connecting to existing cycle routes?	↑	Potential access points onto multiple existing cycle routes or minor roads.
					→	At least one access points onto existing cycle routes or minor roads or could be constructed within the site
					↓	No possible access points could be constructed within the site to existing cycle routes or minor roads.
			22	Does the proposal interfere with any existing public rights of way?	→	No interference
					↘	Interference would occur but could be mitigated
					↓	Significant interference would occur which could not be mitigated

	12	To protect open green spaces, green infrastructure, sporting and recreational facilities.	23	Does the site remove or reduce any existing such facility?	➔	No reduction of or damage to any existing open green spaces, green infrastructure, sporting and recreational facilities.
					➡	Some damage or removal of open green spaces, green infrastructure (trees, hedges etc.), sporting or recreational facilities
					⬇	Irrevocable- Removal of open green spaces, green infrastructure (trees, hedges etc.), sporting or recreational facilities
	13	To ensure the preservation of archaeologically sensitive areas.	24	Would the development of this site involve the risk of loss or disturbance of an archeologically sensitive area?	⬆	There is no evidence of any archaeological sensitivity on this site or in the surrounding area
					➡	The site itself does not appear to be archaeologically sensitive but there is some evidence to suggest such sensitivity in the surrounding area. There are good grounds to believe that the development could and would be undertaken without risking the loss or disturbance of any archaeology.
					➔	There is some evidence that the site is archaeologically sensitive BUT good grounds to believe that development could and would be undertaken without risking the loss or disturbance of any archaeology
					➡	There is some evidence that the site and/or the surrounding area is archaeologically sensitive and the panel is not satisfied that development could and would be undertaken without risking the loss or disturbance of any archaeology. Further information required.
					⬇	There is good evidence that the site and/or the surrounding area is archaeologically sensitive AND that development would risk the loss or disturbance of that archaeology

	14	To reduce harm to the environment by seeking to minimise pollution of all kinds, especially water, air, soil, light and noise pollution.	25	Would the development of this site have a positive or negative impact for neighbouring residents on pollution levels in each category?	↑	Development of the site would probably have a positive impact for neighbouring residents in at least one category AND would probably not have a negative impact in any category
					↗	Development of the site would probably have a positive impact for neighbouring residents in at least one category which would outweigh a probable minor negative impact
					→	Development of this site would probably not have any positive or negative impact on pollution levels for neighbouring residents OR would probably have positive and negative impacts which would cancel one another out
					↘	Development of the site would probably have a negative impact for neighbouring residents in at least one category which would probably outweigh a minor positive impact
					↓	Development of the site would probably have a negative impact for neighbouring residents in at least one category AND would probably not have a positive impact in any category