

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SITE ALLOCATION SCORING

Scoring Method

Each site was allocated a score based on the following:

+3	Major benefit
+1	Minor benefit
0	Neutral
-1	Minor harm
-3	Major harm

This combines both aspects of the normal scoring method of a weighting of the question with a score. In this way, a minor feature can attract scores in the range +1 to -1, whereas more serious features can use the full range of +3 to -3. There is another aspect where there is a skewed range of scores, such as for flooding, where flood risk is seen as a major or minor harm, but freedom from flooding does have a benefit and is scored as 0.

Statistics

The range of scores is shown as an arithmetic mean and a standard deviation of the sample about that mean. The mean scores are ranked from highest to lowest.

The main question is how to deal with missing values. Several people did not vote at all, and one person scored only some categories. The options are to treat the missing values as missing or to give them a neutral score of 0. This does not affect the rank. Using a neutral score of 0 tends to improve the standard deviation through having more results, but brings the mean value closer to 0. There can be anomalies, e.g. if 4 people score a site as 12, then the mean will be 12 and the sd 0. Adding in 7 missing scores as being 0 changes the mean to 4.4 and the sd to 6.1. I have used only scored results, but a couple are scored 0 rather than missing.

The standard deviation gives an indication of the spread of results. For an evenly distributed range of scores, 68% of results will fall within 1 standard deviation (sd) either side of the mean, 95% within 2 sd, and over 99% within 3sd. The graph at the end of this report shows the scores from highest to lowest, with 2 sd showing the range where we would expect 95% of the entire scores to be.

Summary

Including Nigel, there were 11 people involved in scoring. Results were received from 5 people, although several categories were omitted by one person, and one category by another. Nigel scored on land allocations where some were slightly different to those scored by the rest of the group.

SITES

The description and score for each site follow. The sites are ordered as they were on the scoring spreadsheet, which were arranged from north to south then west to east, based on the Kendal-Bowston road and the River Kent being the dividing lines.

SITE 20: Bowston Road NW

Residential, 0.5 ha.

Mean Score: -0.2
Standard Deviation: 2.9
Rank: 14

Should it be allocated?

Yes 1
No 1

Comments:

JH: The physical separation between B and K is significant if this site can be developed. It is readily accessible due to the adjacent residences and amenities. Although the current site is visually attractive and used for agric practices it lies adjacent to the railway and would provide open views to the east of the far reaching landscape of Potter Fell and beyond. To the west the hillside above obscures any far reaching rural views. This is a strong argument for developing sites to the west side of the Bowston Rd. It provides scope for mixed housing and onsite parking. Access from the road would be good.

JAMcC: The site should be developed only if Bowston Road SW precedes it.

TH: Negative response, especially from large contingent of surrounding houses. Will be seen as a step too far, north of the village.

SITE 19: Bowston Road SW

Residential, 0.75 ha.

Mean Score: 1.0
Standard Deviation: 4.8
Rank: 11

Should it be allocated?

Yes 1
No 1

Comments:

JH: As for BRd NW there are open views to the west of railways line but the hillside above obscures any far reaching views. There is scope for a mix of housing with excellent access to the village including any displaced station access. Sporting facilities could be moved to the east side of Bowston Rd further north.
TH: Negative response, especially from large contingent of surrounding houses. Will be seen as a step too far, north of the village.

SITE 17: Bowling Green

Residential, 0.15 ha.

Mean Score: 3.5

Standard Deviation: 3.2

Rank: 8

Should it be allocated?

Yes 2

No 0

Comments:

TH: Could be viewed positive, especially if an alternative better site is developed, whilst Bowling Green is still used.

SITE 5: Melmore Gardens

Residential, 0.14 ha.

Mean Score: 8.3

Standard Deviation: 7.1

Rank: 5

Should it be allocated?

Yes 2

No 0

Comments:

JAMcC: Should be considered as part of a block that comprises Engine Sheds, Station Yard, Melmore Gardens, and Gowan Lea (but the last is unlikely to be a recommended site).

TH: Positive, especially if it forms part of a wider development, including Station Yard, Engine Sheds etc.

SITE 4: Station Yard

Mixed, 0.32 ha.

Mean Score: 10.8

Standard Deviation: 6.7

Rank: 2

Should it be allocated?

Yes 2

No 0

Comments:

TH: Positive, if development allied to surrounding development.

SITE 6: Gowan Lea

Residential, 0.51 ha.

Mean Score: -1.0

Standard Deviation: 4.1

Rank: 17

Should it be allocated?

Yes 0

No 2

Comments:

JH: Site ownership Impact Housing, so all 25 properties are rental. Mix of 1/2 bed flats and bungalows with Mobility Standards, for over 55s. Communal garden at rear, and good car parking on site for residents, carers and visitors. Excellent access to facilities in centre of village and public transport. Any change in residential use would mean alternative accommodation would have to be provided for this vulnerable community of over 55s with mobility issues.

TH: Very negative response. Very unsettling for residents and their families.

SITE 1: Church Car Park

Mixed, 0.10 ha.

Mean Score: 12.7

Standard Deviation: 5.6

Rank: 1

Should it be allocated?

Yes 2

No 0

Comments:

JH: This is a central position and some well designed properties are needed to enhance the 'heritage' aspects of the buildings in the centre of the village. Landscaped plots would be good too.

TH: Positive if promoted in the right way, showing advantages.

SITE 3: Engine Sheds

Residential, 0.37 ha.

Mean Score: 8.8

Standard Deviation: 8.3

Rank: 3

Should it be allocated?

Yes 1

No 0

Comments:

TH: Positive, if development allied to surrounding development.

SITE 2: Playground

Residential, 0.17 ha.

Mean Score: -2.7

Standard Deviation: 3.1

Rank: 18

Should it be allocated?

Yes 0

No 2

Comments:

TH: Very negative response likely. It should form part of a wider development of sports and recreational facilities. A policy should reflect this need.

SITE 7: School

Mixed, 0.80 ha.

Mean Score: -3.8

Standard Deviation: 2.8

Rank: 19

Should it be allocated?

Yes 0

No 2

Comments:

JH: The school and its grounds lend themselves to further development on site if the community wishes. It also lends itself to further community facilities to bring together multi generations of learners and participants. Access to the site with extended parking on site is also a plus.

TH: Very negative response, especially from the school itself, the governors, parents and teachers. An action for the future, if there is a need and consensus.

SITE 23: Carling Steps Corner

Residential, 0.64 ha.

Mean Score: -7.2

Standard Deviation: 3.8

Rank: 22

Should it be allocated?

Yes 0

No 2

Comments:

JH: Access difficult from narrow part of Hollins Lane near railway. Could this site be used to extend leisure facilities and be accessed by a bridge say across the railway line from the football ground?

TH: This is in a flood plain. The NP should not be promoting development in a flood area.

SITE 22: Bowston Road NE

Residential, 0.42 ha.

Mean Score: -0.5

Standard Deviation: 2.0

Rank: 15

Should it be allocated?

Yes 1

No 1

Comments:

JH: The score of +3 for heritage is based on the rural landscape and far reaching views to the N and E. If low lying bungalows on big plots, or even better, relocated sporting facilities such as the tennis, bowling and football grounds could be taken here, then the rural aspects would be retained for all. If not, then this score would have to be 0, giving an overall score of +1.

JAMcC: The site should be developed only if Bowston Road SE precedes it.

TH: Negative response, especially from large contingent of surrounding houses. Will be seen as a step too far, north of the village.

SITE 21: Bowston Road SE

Residential, 0.34 ha.

Mean Score: 0.7

Standard Deviation: 3.5

Rank: 12

Should it be allocated?

Yes 1

No 0

Comments:

JH: The site is an attractive site with the far reaching views shielded by the small land mass behind (with the river beyond). New residential housing within this shield to complement the existing semi-detached housing immediately to the south is possible without too much impact on rural heritage/views. Any residential development to the north of the shield should be restricted so the land mass forms a natural line for this proposed development. ?Access should be maintained from the road as a possible entry to the rear of the Mill.

TH: Negative response, especially from large contingent of surrounding houses. Will be seen as a step too far, north of the village.

SITE 18: Behind Holme Houses

Residential, 0.22 ha.

Mean Score: -0.5
Standard Deviation: 2.7
Rank: 15

Should it be allocated?

Yes 1
No 0

Comments:

JH: It is an obvious place for additional properties if the development to the N of the village is to happen.

JAMcC: Awkward and potentially dangerous proposed access opposite Bryce. It would score better with access from north of Holme Houses, but that would raise the possibility of pressure for extra properties to be built.

TH: Probably negative from surrounding houses. However, although it scores low, I see merit in this. Especially if it forms a link across the River and around the Mill.

SITE 10: Behind Churchyard

Commercial, 0.17 ha.

Mean Score: -4.8
Standard Deviation: 3.9
Rank: 21

Should it be allocated?

Yes 0
No 0

Comments:

JAMcC: The proposal was for a row of small, probably craft, shops with accommodation above, and possibly on stilts to avoid flooding issues. There would be problems for delivery vehicles.

TH: In a flood area. Very negative response.

SITE 9: Steele's Row

Commercial / Residential, 0.21 ha.

Mean Score: 0.6
Standard Deviation: 5.1
Rank: 13

Should it be allocated?

Yes 0
No 0

Comments:

TH: In a flood area. Negative response. However, part of the Row could and should be developed to enhance the village core.

SITE 16: North of Mill

Commercial or Residential, 0.95 ha.

Mean Score: 2.0
Standard Deviation: 2.3
Rank: 10

Should it be allocated?

Yes 0
No 0

Comments:

TH: Positive, by and large. Appropriate commercial expansion.

SITE 11: Roger Row

Commercial, 0.50 ha.

Mean Score: 8.6
Standard Deviation: 3.3
Rank: 4

Should it be allocated?

Yes 0
No 0

Comments:

TH: Positive, if viewed as a commercial site with employment, tourism and facilities.

SITE 13: Hall Park NW

Residential, 0.17 ha.

Mean Score: 3.0
Standard Deviation: 5.6
Rank: 9

Should it be allocated?

Yes 0
No 1

Comments:

TH: Probably a negative response. An important green space for local residents.

SITE 12: Settling tanks frontage

Industrial / commercial, 0.03 ha.

Mean Score: 5.3
Standard Deviation: 7.1
Rank: 6

Should it be allocated?

Yes 0
No 1

Comments:

TH: A puzzled response. What could be developed here in the short to medium term?

SITE 14: Settling tanks

Industrial, 0.61 ha.

Mean Score: 4.0
Standard Deviation: 3.5
Rank: 7

Should it be allocated?

Yes 0
No 1

Comments:

TH: Still a lot of work before this could be achieved. Also in a flood risk area. Probably negative response.

SITE 15: Hall Park Extension SE+

Residential, 0.89 ha.

Mean Score: -4.6
Standard Deviation: 0.9
Rank: 20

Should it be allocated?

Yes 0

No 1

Comments:

TH: A negative response. It protrudes too far on to green space. It goes beyond a natural boundary and spoils an otherwise large expanse of green space, extending from Carus Green.

RESULTS

As listed above

Site	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Rank
Bowston Road NW	-0.2	2.9	14
Bowston Road SW	1.0	4.8	11
Bowling Green	3.5	3.2	8
Melmore Gardens	8.3	7.1	5
Station Yard	10.8	6.7	2
Gowan Lea	-1.0	4.1	17
Church Car Park	12.7	5.6	1
Engine Sheds	8.8	8.3	3
Playground	-2.7	3.1	18
School	-3.8	2.8	19
Carling Steps Corner	-7.2	3.8	22
Bowston Road NE	-0.5	2.0	15
Bowston Road SE	0.7	3.5	12
Behind Holme Houses	-0.5	2.7	15
Behind Churchyard	-4.8	3.9	21
Steele's Row	0.6	5.1	13
North of Mill	2.0	2.3	10
Roger Row	8.6	3.3	4
Hall Park NW	3.0	5.6	9
Settling Tanks frontage	5.3	7.1	6
Settling Tanks	4.0	3.5	7
Hall Park Extension SE +	-4.6	0.9	20

Ordered by score

Site	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Church Car Park	12.7	5.6
Station Yard	10.8	6.7
Engine Sheds	8.8	8.3
Roger Row	8.6	3.3
Melmore Gardens	8.3	7.1
Settling Tanks frontage	5.3	4.7
Settling Tanks	4.0	3.5
Bowling Green	3.5	3.2
Hall Park NW	3.0	5.6
North of Mill	2.0	2.3
Bowston Road SW	1.0	4.8
Bowston Road SE	0.7	3.5
Steele's Row	0.6	5.1
Bowston Road NW	-0.2	2.9
Bowston Road NE	-0.5	2.0
Behind Holme Houses	-0.5	2.7
Gowan Lea	-1.0	4.1
Playground	-2.7	3.1
School	-3.8	2.8
Hall Park Extension SE +	-4.6	0.9
Behind Churchyard	-4.8	3.9
Carling Steps Corner	-7.2	3.8

Land Allocation Scores

Red dots are mean values
Blue bars show range for 2 standard deviations

