## **NEW SITE OPTIONS**

SITES	<b>COST</b> Weight 5 Score	<b>ABNORMALS</b> Weight 4 Score	SITUATION Weight 3 Score	TOTAL SCORE
Option 1	1 <b>5</b>	5 <b>2</b>		6 28
Option 2	3 <b>15</b>	5 <b>20</b>	2	6 41 3rd
Option 3*	1 5	5 <b>2</b> 0	5 1	5 40
Option 4	3 <b>15</b>	5 <b>2</b> 0	) 4 <b>1</b>	2 47 1st
Option 5**	2 <b>10</b>	3 12	2 4 <b>1</b>	2 34
Option 6	1 5	4 10	3	9 30
Option 7***	5 <b>25</b>	3 12	3	9 46 2nd
Option 8	3 <b>15</b>	2 8	2	6 29
Option 9	2 10	3 12	3	9 31
Option 10	1 5	4 10	i 4 1	2 33
Option 11	1 5	3 12	2 2	6 23

## Weighting 5 to 3. All scored 1 to 5

\***Option 3** is the best situated, but costs of temporary accommodation are very high.

\*\* **Option 5** shows a poor scoring against cost in part because the land includes the driving range on the local golf course, therefore substantial business compensation issues.

\*\*\* **Option 7** is land in the control of WBC (?). This site could deliver if utilising land Option 8 for playing fields, however, overhead power lines are viewed as unacceptable.

Abnormals include issues like ground conditions and noise which will contribute extra delivery costs

Situation covers access / relationship to village / 'without prejudice' view of Planning