**WATLINGTON NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN FORUM**

**Workshop to select preferred development sites**

**Phase 1: 17th October 2016:**

Present: Tony Powell (facilitator), Gill Bindoff, Pauline Harvey, Keith Jackson, Peter Richardson, Tony Williamson, Nick Greaves, Ian Hill, Terry Jackson, Tom Bindoff, Matt Reid.

Apologies: Jeremy Bell, Pepita Bianchi, Norman Perry, Rebecca Broadbent, Robin Wilson

The group comprised members of the NDP Forum Coordination Group and Development Sites Group and the WPC NP Steering Committee.

1. **Introduction:**
   1. TP explained that the purpose of the workshop was to assess each of the sites for development against the available evidence. The site selection process has progressed to the point where all available sites have been assessed against the agreed criteria including sustainability objectives and the aims and objectives of the NP. Descriptions of each site have been produced and a file on each site has been compiled which includes relevant information about fluvial and groundwater flooding and landscape capacity assessments published by SODC in 2015 (referred to as the Kirkham report). The list of available sites includes four small sites which will be assessed as part of the process but which are not intended, at this stage, to be allocated for development within the WNDP. A decision had been made previously to consider small sites within the normal planning process. The list of sites also includes the two sites in Pyrton parish which cannot be allocated in the WNDP.
   2. The workshops held in August and early September had assessed each available site against each of the selection criteria using a traffic light system. This process had produced a working spreadsheet giving the results for all sites. The Forum Development Sites Group had subsequently produced a similar spreadsheet recording assessments against the sustainability objectives and the aims/objectives of the NP (included in Consultation 2 and listed in the document ‘What Watlington Wants’). It was emphasised that the traffic light judgements were intended to be broadly indicative in order to guide the next stage of site assessment: they are not definitive and are not intended to be used for a simple calculation of the total number of reds, ambers or greens given to each site. Many of the judgements are factual, for example ‘Is the site in the Conservation Area?’, while others could be more subjective and open to interpretation – for example ‘does the site have an impact on the Conservation Area and heritage assets?’. It was also recognised that, where constraints are recorded, there may be effective strategies available to mitigate their impact.
   3. Draft summary paragraphs have been produced for each available site giving details of their key features, constraints and characteristics. This information has been extracted from the spreadsheets. Copies of the spreadsheets and the summary paragraphs were circulated at the workshop to each of those attending.
2. **Initial selection of preferred sites:**
   1. Four levels were set with 1 indicating that a site was considered to be the most suitable for development and 4 indicating the least suitable for development.
   2. Using this process each site was considered and discussed against the spreadsheets and summaries and determined on the balance of evidence provided for each site.