

MULL CAMPUS SITE SELECTION CRITERIA (v5)

| Criteria Category | Weighting | | Factors to consider | Site 1 Existing Tobermory site | | Site 2 Craignure (001) | | Site 3 Garmony (005) | | Site 4 Tobermory South (013) | | Notes/ rationale |
|---------------------------|---|------------|--|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---|
| | Category | Individual | | Score | Weighted Score | Score | Weighted Score | Score | Weighted Score | Score | Weighted Score | |
| Deliverability | 15 | 3 | Utility infrastructure - capacity and need for any diversions | 7 | 21 | 5 | 15 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 15 | Existing utilities considered, minimal diversions, opportunities for future heat network connections. Distance of running utilities. |
| | | 3 | Ground conditions | 6 | 18 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 15 | 7 | 21 | Potential for contamination at Site 1. Poorer ground conditions at Site 2/Site 3 marine deposits etc. |
| | | 2 | Topography | 3 | 6 | 8 | 16 | 9 | 18 | 5 | 10 | Existing school site constrained. Site 2/3 both more developable level wise |
| | | 2 | Flood risk & Drainage Assessment | 4 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 18 | Next steps would involve flood modelling/assessment. SEPA engagement key |
| | | 3 | Site abnormals | 3 | 9 | 8 | 24 | 7 | 21 | 5 | 15 | |
| | | 2 | Habitat constraints | 8 | 16 | 9 | 18 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 14 | |
| Impact | 53 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Education | 32 | 10 | Is the site capable of accommodating the brief in full? | 4 | 40 | 9 | 90 | 9 | 90 | 5 | 50 | South tob can be used better than existing, due to constraints. More space in Craignure/Garmony sites. |
| | | 5 | Quality of external environment to support outside learning, sports activities etc | 3 | 15 | 9 | 45 | 10 | 50 | 6 | 30 | |
| | | 2 | Does the site provide capacity for future expansion? | 4 | 8 | 9 | 18 | 9 | 18 | 5 | 10 | |
| | | 8 | Travel times for ELC and primary school pupils | 9 | 72 | 4 | 32 | 4 | 32 | 8 | 64 | Systra report |
| | | 2 | Travel times for staff and secondary school pupils | 9 | 18 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 8 | 16 | Systra report |
| 5 | Access and connectivity to good community facilities and services | 9 | 45 | 4 | 20 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 40 | Ryder place report | | |
| Community and Place | 8 | 2 | Impact on family life | 4 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 8 | Refer to Stantec report. Impact on families if their child is away from home during the week was felt to be the greatest (sites 1 & 4). Increased travel time affects a greater number of families (sites 2 & 3).Travel time increase has a bigger impact for families with young children compared to older children |
| | | 2 | Equitable - unites north & south of island | 4 | 8 | 7 | 14 | 6 | 12 | 4 | 8 | Criteria re-defined to be around uniting north/south island, as it was felt that better reflects community feedback |
| | | 2 | Sustain and support local economy | 7 | 14 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 14 | Stantec report |
| | | 2 | Impact of construction activities on existing school/ residential areas | 3 | 6 | 7 | 14 | 6 | 12 | 7 | 14 | |
| Accessibility & Transport | 8 | 1 | Good public transport links to site and location | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | Existing public transport links. Craignure slightly higher score due to ferry terminal and better links to north & south |
| | | 2 | Existing safe active travel links to site | 4 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 12 | Improvements in scoring could be seen as a result of future development at sites |
| | | 1 | Number of user journeys - bus, car, pedestrian (Pupil/ staff mode split) | 8 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 | |
| | | 1 | Potential impact on public transport network | 9 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | Scoring for sites 2 & 3 assumes school bus from Dervaig would travel via Tobermory |
| | | 2 | Ability of existing (wider) roads infrastructure to service site | 3 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 14 | New access roads required for both Craignure/Garmony. Tob South limitations. Existing site challenging/constrained, not much space for adjustment - one way in/out. Single track roads on Mull have an impact |
| | | 1 | Trips with complex dependencies/ multiple stages and modes of travel | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Sustainability | 5 | 2 | Potential for re-use of existing infrastructure and buildings (embodied carbon) | 4 | 8 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | |
| | | 3 | Carbon impact of travel (travel distances and mode of transport) | 8 | 24 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 12 | 8 | 24 | Personal decisions to drive could impact actual carbon impact |
| Affordability | 25 | 15 | Costs associated with construction abnormals | 9 | 135 | 8 | 120 | 5 | 75 | 7 | 105 | Thomson Gray report. Assume demolition included in scope regardless. Based on assumptions and known information, site investigations not completed at this early stage |
| | | 5 | Potential acquisition/ disposal costs | 4 | 20 | 7 | 35 | 10 | 50 | 3 | 15 | Market value of each site. Updated 28/1/25 to reflect existing site value excluding common good land, and cumulative value of Tobermory South site (2 separate land transactions) |

MULL CAMPUS SITE SELECTION CRITERIA (v5)

| Criteria Category | Weighting | | Factors to consider | Site 1 Existing Tobermory site | | Site 2 Craignure (001) | | Site 3 Garmony (005) | | Site 4 Tobermory South (013) | | Notes/ rationale |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--|
| | Category | Individual | | Score | Weighted Score | Score | Weighted Score | Score | Weighted Score | Score | Weighted Score | |
| | | 5 | Other (revenue) cost implications e.g. pupil transport | 9 | 45 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 45 | 4 additional buses for site 2 & 3 (£1,385 per week for 40 weeks = £222k per annum) plus additional cost for staff travel for change of base (over 4 years). Any hostel savings, assuming catchment area change, negligible as staff shortages already. Main difference would be cost of food |
| Risk | 7 | 3 | Wayleaves, legal restrictions and site acquisition risk | 6 | 18 | 7 | 21 | 7 | 21 | 7 | 21 | Common good land risk on site 1 Sites 2-4 have site acquisition risk |
| | | 2 | Construction Programme risk | 3 | 6 | 8 | 16 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 14 | Likely to be a prolonged programme on site 1 due to need for staged construction and decant. Greater enabling works required for site 3 |
| | | 2 | Planning designation and sensitive receptors | 8 | 16 | 7 | 14 | 6 | 12 | 8 | 16 | Site 2 - consider risk with housing development next door. Countryside zone, but already some development. Site 3 - also countryside zone, flooding considerations, cat 1 peat land. Site 4 - Housing allocation, amendment needed to LDP. |
| TOTAL | | 100 | | | 625 | 628 | 546 | 645 | | | | |

| | |
|----------------|----|
| Impact | 53 |
| Deliverability | 15 |
| Affordability | 25 |
| Risk | 7 |