

Subject: Land at Loxwood Place Farm, Loxwood, West Sussex  
Date: Friday, 28 November 2014 15:31  
From: Oli Milne [REDACTED]  
To: Hamish Robbie [REDACTED]  
Cc: Phil Bell [REDACTED]  
Conversation: Land at Loxwood Place Farm, Loxwood, West Sussex

Hamish,

I have been working with Phil Bell in regards to Land at Loxwood Place Farm. Following your email dated 26th November, and your phone call with Phil today, please find below our review of the Allocated Site Assessment Table.

Amongst the evidence on which the original Loxwood Neighbourhood Plan was based is the Allocated Site Assessment Table. Having reviewed this table, with specific attention given to those aspects relating to highways and transportation, it is clear that the table contains some fundamental errors. These errors are outlined below.

Sites are assessed against a series of criteria which warrant an answer of "Yes", "Unknown" or "No". Each of these three answers correspond to a numerical value, i.e. Yes = 3, Unknown = 2 and No = 1. Sites are then awarded a total score based on the addition of these numerical values for all the criteria. The lower the total score, the more appropriate the site is for development. Given this, a score of 1 (No) corresponds to a positive attribute whilst a score of 3 (Yes) corresponds to a negative attribute/constraint. For instance, if a site falls within Flood Zone 2 it is given a score of 3 (Yes), whilst if the site does not fall within Flood Zone 2 it is awarded a score of 1 (No).

However, the above methodology does not work for the criteria of relevance to highways and transportation; Does the site have suitable vehicle and pedestrian access points or could access points be created. As outlined above, a score of 1 (No) indicates a positive attribute of a given site, however, in this instance a score of 1 (No) is a negative attribute i.e. a site does not have suitable access or points where access could be created. Likewise, a score of 3 (Yes) should indicate a negative attribute/constraint, yet for this criteria an answer of 3 (Yes) corresponds to a positive attribute i.e. the site does have suitable access or points where access could be created. As with the brown field or commercial site criteria, the scores should have been inverted. This oversight has resulted in unrepresentative Total Scores.

This oversight is especially noteworthy with regard to Conifer Nursery which does not have suitable access points or the potential for access points to be created. With regard to the criteria relating to access, the Nursery was assigned a value of 1 (No). However, the lack of access is clearly a negative attribute and as such should be awarded a value of 3 in line with the above methodology. Furthermore, the Total

Score for Conifer Nursery has been added up incorrectly. The current Total Score should read 21 rather than 20. However, with the correction to the access criteria, the revised Total Score is 23.

Of further note is the Total Score assigned to Land South of Loxwood Place Farm. With regard to the criteria relating to access, Loxwood Place Farm has been assigned a score of 2 (Unknown). However, it has been established through a Planning Application at the site that suitable access can be achieved. As such, and given the previous failure to invert the associated scores, Land South of Loxwood Plane Farm should be assigned a value of 1 for this criteria. This would make the Total Score for the site 23 rather than 24.

I trust the above is of help. If you need any further clarification or information please don't hesitate to get in contact with either myself or Phil.

Kind Regards,

Oli Milne  
Assistant Transport Planner  
Motion  
232 High Street  
Guildford  
Surrey  
GU1 3JF

T 01483 531300  
F 01483 531333  
E [omilne@motion-uk.co.uk](mailto:omilne@motion-uk.co.uk) <<mailto:omilne@motion-uk.co.uk>>  
W [www.motion-uk.co.uk](http://www.motion-uk.co.uk) <<http://www.motion-uk.co.uk/>>

The information in this email is confidential and is intended solely for the addressee(s). Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorised. If you are not an intended recipient, you must not read, use or disseminate the information contained in this email. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, except where the sender specifically states them to be the views of Motion.

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---