

# Site Assessment and Selection Processes

---

Updated 26th July 2018

## Summary of Activities

- We called for sites using a range of media to publicise the process
- We assessed each site for its location, character and features
- We developed a set of criteria linked to our objectives so Working Group members could rate each site
- We showed the sites and our scores to the residents at several open meetings, and residents broadly agreed that some sites were better for housing than others
- We reviewed their responses to both number and locations of the sites they indicated and ranked the sites according to this feedback. We checked again that the chosen sites were not likely to give rise to environmental harm, before deciding on the chosen sites

## Site Assessment

The Working Group's 'Call for Sites' in 2016 elicited 24 sites for consideration as appropriate for residential (or other) development. This included one site, owned by Magna Housing Association, to be considered as a rural exception site for affordable housing. With this number of sites to consider, the Group reviewed the formal processes required to undertake the assessment and selection tasks involved.

1. Working Group members prepared a **Site Assessment form** to be used by those visiting the sites to collect information about them. The assessments covered areas such as existing use, character of site / immediate area visibility / prominence from surrounding areas, site features including wildlife and natural features, possible constraints, accessibility, and gave an overall assessment regarding whether all, part or none of the site was suitable for development and what mitigation measures, if any, may be required. A copy of the Site Assessment form used is included in the Consultation Process document

Visits to the sites to complete the assessments took place on 14th, 21st and 28th March, 13th April, 30th June and 3rd August 2017 (due to late call for site submissions) and involved different volunteer members of the Working Group, and the independent consultant (for the first three site visits). Completed Site Assessment forms, maps, site submission forms and photos were then shared with all members of the Working Group using a Drop Box folder so that everyone could review all the information on each site. Where a declaration of interest was declared, that person was not involved in the assessment of that site.

2. Group members considered how they would assess each site in order to rate or rank each site. The key areas that the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group focussed on were drawn from public consultation feedback received.

This included the following from our Scoping meetings in April 2016 as follows

- Significant feedback in favour of selective infill development - no backfill

- Affordable/starter homes for local and younger families
- Sheltered housing
- Limited proposals for small developments - between 3 and 10 units
- Maintain "village" feel and open countryside
- Query sustainability / lack of amenities / infrastructure

It also including information from the Household Questionnaire, issued in September/October 2016 from which we obtained the following information

- Most people (about three quarters of those responding to the questionnaire) agreed that we should have some housing, but there wasn't a strong consensus on how many homes, though it is safe to say that only a few (less than 20%) wanted more than 10 homes. Small-scale (1 or 2 dwellings) on infill sites within the village would seem to be an option worth exploring further.
  - When asked what type of development would be acceptable, the highest % responses were for single dwellings in controlled locations, small groups of 5 or less, and infilling.
3. The Working Group members with the support of the independent consultant then used this information to develop criteria to use when assessing each site to identify those sites likely to be able to contribute positively towards sustainable development, in a manner that would align with the wishes of local residents. This led to the development of the **Site Assessment Matrix form** which was used to measure each site against the 7 objectives below.

- 1. Ensure development is appropriate to the area within which it is placed**  
(is the site well related to the built-up area of the village and not notably prominent in the wider landscape?)
- 2. Ensure development is complementary to neighbouring properties**  
(would housing development at this site fit in with neighbouring development?)
- 3. Ensure development reinforces the settlement area within which it is placed**  
(would housing development at this site enhance the surroundings?)
- 4. Retain green spaces and key views**  
(would the site avoid the loss of an important view or local landscape feature?)
- 5. Minimise the impact of traffic flow**  
(would the site avoid causing or adding to existing traffic problems, and could it provide solutions to reduce existing problems?)
- 6. Preserve the long term future of community assets (Church, village hall and nursery school)**  
(would the development of the site support the improvement or continued use of key community facilities?)
- 7. Retain the "village" feel and open nature of Holwell**  
(Could the site be developed to contribute positively to the character of the village and avoid overlooking/backfill affecting properties?)

## Selection Process

- Members of the Working Group were asked to review all the information on each of the 19 sites and individuals scored each site against the criteria using the Site Assessment Matrix form. A copy of the Site Assessment Matrix used for this work is included in the Consultation Process document. The Group members had previously agreed that all sites would be assessed for housing based on one house or bungalow per site, with an assumption that hedgerows and trees would be retained where possible. Scores from each sheet were consolidated with average and median scores calculated for each site. An anonymized version of a completed Site Assessment Matrix is shown below.

ASSESSMENT TABLE														
SITE NAME		4. SITE NAME							Additional sustainability checks					TOTAL
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7						
DoI*	Assessor	Ensure development is appropriate to the area within which it is placed	Ensure development is complementary to neighbouring properties	Ensure development reinforces the settlement area within which it is placed	Retain green spaces and key views	Minimise the impact of traffic flow	Preserve the long term future of community assets (Church, village hall and nursery school)	Retain the "village" feel and open nature of Holwell	Biodiversity	Landscape	Cultural Heritage	Soil, water and air	Climatic factors	
	NPWG MEMBER 1	2	2	2	0	0	1	2						9
	NPWG MEMBER 2	2	2	2	1	1	0	2						10
	NPWG MEMBER 3	2	2	2	1	-1	0	2						8
	NPWG MEMBER 3	1	2	2	-1	0	1	1						6
	NPWG MEMBER 5 (L)	2	2	2	0	0	1	1						8
	NPWG MEMBER 6	2	1	1	1	1	2	1						9
	NPWG MEMBER 7	0	1	2	1	1	1	1						7
	NPWG MEMBER 8	2	2	2	2	1	0	2						11
	NPWG MEMBER 9 (L)	2	1	2	2	1	2	2						12
	NPWG MEMBER 9 (L)	2	2	1	2	1	2	2						12
	Mode	2	2	2	1	1	0	2						8
	Average	2	2	2	1	1	1	2						9
	Median	2	2	2	1	1	1	2						9
	SD	1	0	0	1	1	1	0						2
	<b>MODERATED ASSESSMENT</b>													

L - Landowner

Non scoring NPWG members

Rodney Antell (L) Steve  
 Atchison  
 Peter McFarlane

2. These scores were then reviewed by site by Working Group members at two meetings of the Working Group held in May 2016, chaired by an independent consultant, and with Declarations of Interest clearly stated. Working Group members reviewed each other's scores as they were projected on a screen, were able to raise comments or matters of concern before arriving at a single set of scores – these scores were then equated to a rating of Red, Amber or Green for each site where 'green' sites were those that scored highest against the selection criteria, 'amber' sites were those scoring less well but still broadly positive or neutral, and "red" sites deemed the least suitable with possible adverse impacts, The overall appropriateness of the final ratings was then agreed by the chair of these meetings with all non-site holders.

Median score ranges for each category were as follows

Green sites	5 to 12
Amber sites	-1 to 3
Red sites	-10 to -1

Five additional sites were put forward after these initial meetings were held, one of which was a site where planning approval had been recently been turned down so, to ensure consistency of process, a further meeting was held in July 2016, chaired by a Parish Councillor from the Working Group, for those present to score and rate the additional sites. Notes kept of all the discussions are available for review.

3. Details of the site options reviewed were sent to the officers at West Dorset District Council (WDDC) in August 2017 for their review and feedback. At a meeting in November 2017 the lack of any response from WDDC was highlighted and WDDC officers indicated that they would ask for landscape and heritage feedback to be provided but this may not be possible due to staff shortages and workload.
4. **Site Profiles** were produced for each site from the information supplied by the site owner, from the Site Assessment form, from comments received from Transport Development Liaison officers and any other available information. A copy of a Site Profile is included in the Consultation pack. Copies of individual Site Profiles were sent to each landowner prior to the Open Sessions with residents, stating that any comments they wished to make up to 200 words would be displayed alongside the information prepared by the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group.

All information on each site was displayed during three Open Sessions for residents held in July, August and September 2017 together with the suggested rating given by the Working Group and any comments received from landowners. Residents were asked to give feedback on a **Site Options Consultation Questionnaire** dated July 2017, a copy of which is included in the Consultation Process document. A total of 55 completed questionnaire forms were received from residents that were on the Electoral Roll and the responses were collated and reviewed by the Working Group members.

6. Technical checks were undertaken in respect of potential environmental and infrastructure constraints. This included contact with the Transport Development Management Team at Dorset County Council regarding any potential highway / access issues, and a desk-top review of each site's proximity to Listed Buildings, flood risk areas (as mapped for river and surface water flooding) and designated wildlife sites – see Table 1 below – supplemented by observations from the site visits. Ecology walkover surveys would be undertaken at a later point in the process for sites proposed for inclusion in the plan (rather than all sites).

Description	Biodiversity			Notes	Cultural Heritage			Notes	Flood Risk	
	On site	Within 50m	Within 200m		On site	Within 50m	Within 200m		On site	Notes
A: Plot between Hillanddale & Meadow Cottage	N	N	N		N	Y	Y	within approx 50m of Strawberry Cottage Grade II, but unlikely to impinge on setting	N	
B: Land by Plot belonging to Magna	N	N	N		N	N	Y	within approx 150m of Church Hill Farmhouse Grade II, unlikely to impinge on setting	N	
C: Plot adj The Rectory, Pulham Road	N	N	N		N	N	Y	within approx 80m of Church Hill Farmhouse Grade II, unlikely to impinge on setting	N	
D: Site adj Gunville House	N	N	N		N	N	Y	within approx 100m of Elm Tree Farm Grade II, unlikely to impinge on setting	N	
E: Site at Random Harvest, Stony Lane	N	N	N		N	N	N		N	
F: Site between Naishlea & Trims Grnd, Stony Ln	N	N	N		N	N	Y	within approx 190m of Naish Farm Grade II*, unlikely to impinge on setting	N	
G: Site between Roseacre & Newhaven, Fosters Hill	N	N	N		N	N	N		N	
H: Westbourne	N	N	N		N	N	N		N	
J: Site at Barnes Cross Cottage	N	Y	Y	Verges of wildlife value	N	Y	Y	Pillar box Listed Grade II*, development potentially impacting on setting	N	
K: Land at Crouch Hill/The Drove	N	N	N		N	Y	Y	Church Hill Farmhouse Grade II on opposite side of Holwell Drove, may impact on setting	N	
L: Barn at Holborough, The Borough	N	Y	Y	Churchyard of wildlife value	N	Y	Y	Old Rectory, Church and Holwell Farm etc all Listed and site likely to form part of setting	Part	part of field adjoining river within FRZ
M: Site at Crouch Lane, opp School	N	N	Y	Land opposite side of Crouch Lane - local designation	N	N	Y	within approx 150m of Church Hill Farmhouse Grade II, unlikely to impinge on setting	Part	very small areas within site prone to surface water flood risk
N: Site The Smithy, adj Random Harvest, Stony Ln	N	N	N		N	N	N		N	access may be impacted
P: Barns at Naish Farm	N	N	N		N	Y	Y	within curtilage of Naish Farm Grade II*, likely to impact on setting	N	
Q: Land with road frontage Vale View Farmhouse	N	N	N		N	N	N		N	
R: Elm Tree Farm	N	N	N		N	Y	Y	adjoins Elm Tree Farm Grade II, likely to impact on setting	N	
S: Adj Coombe House	N	N	N		N	N	Y	within approx 60m of Strawberry Cottage Grade II, but unlikely to impinge on setting	N	
T: Field adj. Barton Farm, Stony Lane	N	N	N		N	Y	Y	site adjoins Naish Farm Grade II*, however depending on location of development may not impact on setting	N	
U: Site adj Nightingale Cottage	N	N	Y	Land opposite side of Crouch Lane - local designation	N	N	N		Part	very small areas within site prone to surface water flood risk
V: Land, rear of Lotmead	N	N	N		N	N	N		Part	part of field (to SE)
W: Land on Holwell Rd	N	N	N		N	N	N	rear of site is within 200m of Middle Piccadilly	N	
X: Village Hall site	N	N	N		N	N	Y	approx 80m from Elm Tree Farm Grade II on opposite side of road, may impact on setting	N	
Y: Crouch Lane (behind Stonewater site)	N	N	Y	Field approx 80m to N - local designation	N	N	N		N	
Z: Roselawn, Stony Lane	N	N	N		N	N	N		Y	large area at risk

**TABLE 1: Site Review With Respect To Biodiversity, Cultural Heritage and Flood Risk.**

7. At the Group's November 2017 meeting, the **Site Options questionnaire feedback** data was reviewed and two key results were derived from the data:

- A ranking of the sites in terms of their perceived suitability.
- A value for the acceptable number of houses to be built over the next 15 years.

It was agreed that the responses received were sufficiently comprehensive to justify using them as the basis of assessing site suitability and number of houses, focussing on the Green and Amber sites for the site selection data (as the consultation feedback had indicated that none of the 'red' sites should be re-considered, the highest request being to re-consider the village school site which was suggested by 10% of responses). Members of the Group were aware that the varied

responses may reflect individuals' personal relationships with some site owners so methods of reviewing all data fairly were sought using the independent consultant and professional skills from amongst the Group.

8. Members reviewed the responses for Question 4 regarding the **amount of housing** that respondents wanted to see in Holwell as part of the Neighbourhood Plan. As we had received a range of responses, we reviewed various ways of assessing the data and the methods available to us to reach a conclusion that was fair and unbiased. The method discussed and ultimately used by the Group is detailed below and was shown in Appendix A to the Notes of NPWG Meeting No 33.
9. Members also reviewed various methods of assessing the site scores. Three ways were used to assess the ranking of the sites, using the results to Question 1 in the feedback questionnaire, on Green, Amber and Red sites:
  - A Mean has been calculated, using +2, +1, 0, -1, and -2 for the scores rated as from 5 to 1, to obtain a result.
  - A Median has been calculated, based on all scores.
  - The percentage of the combining of the results rated as 5 and 4 and taking into account the percentage of those rated as 1 and 2.

After discussions regarding these methods and which would give the most objective outcome, it was agreed that the Mean would be the most reliable method and that we would use a weighted mean (or weighted average) to analyse the proposed housing number figures. This is like a simple average except that an appropriate value was given to represent the 'range' suggested in the question. The Group were taken through a set of anonymised data to explain the process and demonstrate the result that we may get, with anonymous names for the sites, and agreed this was a good idea, and avoided introducing bias, given the Group's awareness of respondents' possible relationships with site owners. Examples were used to promote understanding and these were shown as Appendix B to the notes of Meeting 33 and below.

10. Questions had been raised during the process by two members of the Working Group about some of the wording used on the Site Options documents and, in response to this, it was agreed that prior to publication of any results, each Working Group member be invited to revisit the information for each site and identify any proposed changes to any Site Profile document or any proposed changes to references in the Site Profile document relating to listed buildings or heritage assets. Responses were received from eight Working Group members and these were sent in confidence to the Parish Clerk who consolidated them prior to review during a Working Group meeting on 4th January 2018. Following the discussion., some amendments to wording were made to Site Profiles; however none of the changes was deemed by the meeting to be major enough to warrant further consultation on any site. Notes made at this meeting can be viewed.
11. At the Group's meeting on 18th January 2018, after all checks had been finalised, Working Group members reviewed the scores and selected the sites that would form the allocations to be included in the Plan.
12. At a meeting with WDDC officers to get feedback on the draft plan in May 2018, they confirmed that heritage officers were satisfied that there would be no substantial harm to any Listed Buildings. Landscape feedback was not yet available due to limited staff resources.

**Appendix A**

**How we used your answers to Question 4**

**to decide how many houses you think should be built in Holwell over the next 15 years**

- Question 4 allowed one of four options to be chosen; the options were:  
Option 1 = Only conversions or rural exception sites.  
Option 2 = As 1 but with up to 3 custom build houses.  
Option 3 = As 2 but with up to 6 custom build houses.  
Option 4 = As 3 but with up to 10 custom build houses.
- We used a weighted mean<sup>1</sup> calculation to help us - this is a mean calculation where some values contribute more than others.
- The weighted mean was calculated twice, each time with a different set of values for a, b, c, and d; this way we made a calculation looking at the highest votes received as well as the mid number of votes received for each option.

• Details of the calculations

A weighted mean, or weighted average, was obtained using the following equation for the results for Question 1:

$$\text{Weighted Mean} = \frac{[(\text{Option 1 Score}) \cdot (\text{a}) + (\text{Option 2 Score}) \cdot (\text{b}) + (\text{Option 3 Score}) \cdot (\text{c}) + (\text{Option 4 Score}) \cdot (\text{d})]}{[(\text{Option 1 Score}) + (\text{Option 2 Score}) + (\text{Option 3 Score}) + (\text{Option 4 Score})]} \quad (1)$$

Where: "a" is the weighting for Option 1.  
"b" is the weighting for Option 2  
"c" is the weighting for Option 3.  
"d" is the weighting for Option 4.

- One set was based on taking the maximum value from the Option ranges:  
so a = 0, b = 3, c = 6 and d = 10.

If, in this worked example with dummy numbers (shown in red), the results were:

Option 1 (Only conversions or rural exception sites) = 20  
Option 2 (As 1 but with up to 3 custom build houses) = 10  
Option 3 (As 2 but with up to 6 custom build houses) = 5  
Option 4 (As 3 but with up to 10 custom build houses) = 2

Then, using Equation (1), this gives:

$$\text{Weighted Mean} = \frac{(20) \cdot (0) + (10) \cdot (3) + (5) \cdot (6) + (2) \cdot (10)}{(20) + (10) + (5) + (2)} = \frac{30 + 30 + 20}{37} = \frac{80}{37} = 2.2$$

- The other set was based on taking a mid-point value from the Option ranges:  
so a = 0, b = (1+3)/2 = 2, c = (4+6)/2 = 5 and d = (7+10)/2 = 8.5.

Using Equation (2), with the same dummy numbers, this gives:

$$\text{Weighted Mean} = \frac{(20) \cdot (0) + (10) \cdot (2) + (5) \cdot (5) + (2) \cdot (8.5)}{(20) + (10) + (5) + (2)} = \frac{20 + 25 + 17}{37} = \frac{62}{37} = 1.7$$

- Thus, the mid-point method gives a lower result.
- The actual scores gave 3.1 using the mid-point method and 3.8 using the maximum method.

A **weighted mean** (or weighted average) is like a simple average except that, instead of assuming that all of the values being averaged are equally important (and so have equal weight), some of the values are more important (so have more weight) than others

**Appendix B**

**How we used your answers to Questions 1 to calculate your top selection of sites**

- A weighted mean<sup>1</sup>, or weighted average, was obtained using the following equation:

$$\text{Weighted Mean} = \frac{[(\text{No. of 5s}) \cdot (+2) + (\text{No. of 4s}) \cdot (+1) + (\text{No. of 3s}) \cdot (0) + (\text{No. of 2s}) \cdot (-1) + (\text{No. of 1s}) \cdot (-2)]}{[(\text{No. of 5s}) + (\text{No. of 4s}) + (\text{No. of 3s}) + (\text{No. of 2s}) + (\text{No. of 1s})]} \quad (2)$$

Where: The weighting for the number of 5s = +2  
The weighting for the number of 4s = +1  
The weighting for the number of 3s = 0  
The weighting for the number of 2s = -1  
The weighting for the number of 1s = -2

So, in the following worked example with dummy numbers (shown in red), if we had the scores shown below from Question 1 results:

Question	Highly Suitable / Acceptable 5	Suitable / Acceptable 4	Neutral 3	Unsuitable / Unacceptable 2	Highly Unsuitable / Unacceptable 1
Weighting	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
Score	10	20	10	6	2

Equation (2) would give:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Weighted Mean} &= \frac{[(10) \cdot (+2) + (20) \cdot (+1) + (10) \cdot (0) + (6) \cdot (-1) + (2) \cdot (-2)]}{[(10) + (20) + (10) + (6) + (2)]} = \frac{[(20) + (20) + (0) - (6) - (4)]}{48} \\ &= \frac{40 - 10}{48} = \frac{30}{48} = 0.63 \end{aligned}$$

- And so, with the dummy scores in this example, the Weighted Mean would be 0.63.

		Highly Suitable / Acceptable	Suitable / Acceptable	Neutral	Unsuitable / Unacceptable	Highly Unsuitable / Unacceptable	No View – Don't Know	Highly Suitable / Acceptable	Suitable / Acceptable	Neutral	Unsuitable / Unacceptable	Highly Unsuitable / Unacceptable						EXCEL RANK calculation, based on "Mean (VOTED)":		
GREEN & AMBER Sites	QUESTION 1	5	4	3	2	1		5	4	3	2	1	Mean (VOTED)	Median (VOTED)	5+4	1+2	RANK.EQ	RANK.AVG	RANK	
A: Plot between Hillanddale & Meadow Cottage (55)	RAND-7	10	21	12	7	4	1	18.5%	38.9%	22.2%	13.0%	7.4%	0.48	1	57.4%	20.4%	5	5	5	
B: Land by Plot belonging to Magna (53)	RAND-4	10	14	15	5	5	4	20.4%	28.6%	30.6%	10.2%	10.2%	0.39	0	49.0%	20.4%	6	6	6	
C: Plot adj The Rectory, Pulham Road (55)	RAND-2	25	10	11	3	6	0	45.5%	18.2%	20.0%	5.5%	10.9%	0.82	1	63.6%	16.4%	2	2	2	
D: Site adj Gunville House (53)	RAND-3	15	10	22	2	4	0	28.3%	18.9%	41.5%	3.8%	7.5%	0.57	0	47.2%	11.3%	4	4	4	
E: Site at Random Harvest, Stony Lane (52)	RAND-6	12	11	17	5	7	0	23.1%	21.2%	32.7%	9.6%	13.5%	0.31	0	44.2%	23.1%	8	8	8	
F: Site between Naishlea & Trims Grnd, Stony Ln (53)	RAND-5	7	17	19	8	2	0	13.2%	32.1%	35.8%	15.1%	3.8%	0.36	0	45.3%	18.9%	7	7	7	
G: Site between Roseacre & Newhaven, Fosters Hill (51)	RAND-12	22	15	11	0	3	0	43.1%	29.4%	21.6%	0.0%	5.9%	1.04	1	72.5%	5.9%	1	1	1	
H: Westbourne (37)	RAND-14	10	10	10	6	1	0	27.0%	27.0%	27.0%	16.2%	2.7%	0.59	1	54.1%	18.9%	3	3	3	
J: Site at Barnes Cross Cottage (55)	RAND-15	0	4	13	19	17	2	0.0%	7.5%	24.5%	35.8%	32.1%	-0.92	-1	7.5%	67.9%	15	15	15	
K: Land at Crouch Hill/The Drove (51)	RAND-17	0	5	7	14	24	1	0.0%	10.0%	14.0%	28.0%	48.0%	-1.14	-1	10.0%	76.0%	17	17	17	
L: Barn at Holborough, The Borough (53)	RAND-1	3	4	21	6	18	1	5.8%	7.7%	40.4%	11.5%	34.6%	-0.62	0	13.5%	46.2%	12	12	12	
M: Site at Crouch Lane, opp School (55)	RAND-8	1	4	14	15	21	0	1.8%	7.3%	25.5%	27.3%	38.2%	-0.93	-1	9.1%	65.5%	16	16	16	
N: Site The Smithy,adj Random Harvest, Stony Ln (53)	RAND-11	3	11	12	9	17	1	5.8%	21.2%	23.1%	17.3%	32.7%	-0.50	-1	26.9%	50.0%	10	10.5	10	
P: Barns at Naish Farm (53)	RAND-9	1	8	20	10	13	1	1.9%	15.4%	38.5%	19.2%	25.0%	-0.50	0	17.3%	44.2%	10	10.5	10	
Q: Land with road frontage Vale View Farmhouse (55)	RAND-16	1	7	16	11	16	4	2.0%	13.7%	31.4%	21.6%	31.4%	-0.67	-1	15.7%	52.9%	13	13	13	
R: Elm Tree Farm (33)	RAND-10	1	3	11	5	13	0	3.0%	9.1%	33.3%	15.2%	39.4%	-0.79	-1	12.1%	54.5%	14	14	14	
S: Adj Coombe House (33)	RAND-13	1	1	1	1	1	1	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	0.00	-1	40.0%	40.0%	9	9	9	

**TABLE 2: Site Assessment Data for “Green” and “Amber” Sites.**



## Consultation comments

During consultation, we received feedback from an officer in the Design and Conservation Team for North and West Dorset councils offering feedback on the suitability of sites we had reviewed. His comments and the coding he used to identify the sites are shown below

Site A – A single building on this site is unlikely to harm the setting of Strawberry Cottage (Grade II)  
 Site B – Development on this site is unlikely to harm the setting of Church Hill Farmhouse (Grade II)  
 Site C – A single building on this site is unlikely to harm the setting of Church Hill Farmhouse (Grade II)  
 Site D – A single building or two buildings on this site is unlikely to harm the setting of Elm Tree Farmhouse (Grade II)  
 Site F – Development on this site is unlikely to harm the setting of Naish Farm (Grade II\*)  
 Site J – A single building on this site is unlikely to harm the setting of listed Pillar Box (Grade II\*)  
 Site K – This site forms part off the setting of Church Hill Farmhouse (Grade II). Given the openness of the proposed site and the fact that the farmhouse looks out over it, it is likely that development on this site will harm the setting of the farm building.  
 Site L – Development on this site or conversion of the barn is likely to harm the setting of the Grade I church.  
 Site M – Development on this site is unlikely to harm the setting of Church Hill Farmhouse (Grade II)  
 Site P – This site forms part off the setting of Naish Farm (Grade II\*). It is likely that development on this site will harm the setting of the farm building.  
 Site R – Development would need to be a single building and situated adjacent to Fosters Hill to avoid unacceptable harm to the setting of Elm Tree Farm. Woodland between new house and farm would need to be retained.  
 Site S – Development on this site is unlikely to harm the setting of Strawberry Cottage (Grade II)  
 Site T – This site forms part off the setting of Naish Farm (Grade II\*). Development would need to be a single (or possibly two) buildings and situated adjacent to Stony Lane to avoid unacceptable harm to the setting.  
 Site X – There is limited development along the southern side of Fosters Hill in this area and development to replace the village hall would impact upon the character of the settlement and may cause harm to the setting of Elm Tree Farm.

A	Site between Hillanddale and New Goose
B	Land adjacent to The Plot
C	Plot adj Rectory
D	Site adj Gunville House
E	Site at Random Harvest Stony Lane
F	Site at Stony Lane, between Naishlea & Trims Ground
G	Site at Fosters Hill
H	Westbourne, Fosters Bridge
J	Site at Barnes Cross Cottages
K	Land at Crouch Hill/The Drove
L	Barn at Holborough, The Borough
M	Site at Crouch Lane, opp School
N	Site at The Smithy, Random Harvest Stony Lane
P	Barns x 2 at Naish Farm
Q	Land with road frontage at Vale View Farmhouse
R	Adj Elm Tree Farm
S	Land adj Coombe House
T	Site at Stony Lane, Barton Farm
U	Site adjacent to Nightingale, Crouch Lane
V	Site - field behind Lot Mead house
W	Land fronting Holwell Road
X	Village Hall Site
Y	Land at Crouch Lane (rear of Stonewater site)
Z	Roselawn, Stony Lane

### NOTES

1. Letters for each site are for ease of reference only
2. All sites were assessed for housing only at this stage
3. One house/bungalow on each site
4. Maximum effort would be made to retain trees and hedgerow