

<b>Key Decision</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Listed on Forward Plan</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Within Policy</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Policy Document</b>	<b>Milton Keynes Core Strategy</b>

## STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT- UPDATE

Accountable Cabinet Member: Councillor Galloway

Contact Officer: Mark Harris, Senior Planning Officer

Bob Wilson, Development Plans Manager

### 1. Purpose

- 1.1 This report recaps the purpose of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), which was previously introduced at the Local Development Framework (LDF) Advisory Group meeting in December 2008.
- 1.2 The report also outlines the key findings from the draft SHLAA and sets out the how the assessment fits into the work on the Core Strategy and future LDF documents.

### 2. Recommendations

- 2.1 a) That the findings of the draft SHLAA report are noted.
- b) That arrangements for the documents publication are noted.

### 3. Issues

#### The requirement for and purpose of the SHLAA

- 3.1 Every Local Authority needs to undertake a SHLAA as a key piece of technical evidence underpinning work on the LDF. The SHLAA is required to look at the supply of suitable deliverable and developable housing sites across the whole of the borough, irrespective of where Local Authorities or local communities feel development should take place.
- 3.2 The requirement to undertake a SHLAA is set out in Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing, and there is Practice Guidance Document, published by the

Department for Communities and Local Government, which sets out the standard methodology for undertaking a SHLAA. The recent review of Planning Delivery Grant allocations now also provides financial incentives for having a SHLAA in place each year.

- 3.3 Ideally, a SHLAA would be prepared in advance of work on developing a strategy for growth or identifying settlements for development, allowing the findings of the assessment to inform decisions made. In Milton Keynes work on MK2031 and the Core Strategy had already commenced prior to the need for a SHLAA to be undertaken, meaning the findings have not been used to influence decisions on growth, but simply to back-up established strategy position.
- 3.4 The SHLAA is required to identify as many suitable sites as possible that could be available for development at some point in the next 15 years and to investigate their availability. This process should show that there are sufficient suitable and available sites to meet the SEP requirements. This includes investigating existing unimplemented planning permissions, but also identifying unallocated sites with housing potential. These could be greenfield developments or potential brownfield redevelopment opportunities.
- 3.5 The SHLAA does not allocate sites. It should not be assumed that all of the sites identified in the SHLAA will ever actually be developed. The allocation of sites remains the role of the LDF process and specifically the Site Allocations Development Plan Document, production of which is due to start in late 2009.
- 3.6 This is particularly important to remember in the rural area where sites have been identified in villages which currently lie outside the strategy for the rural area. Such sites, although being technically suitable for housing (i.e. housing would fit in with the surrounding uses, there are no physical or legal constraints to its development etc...), would not be areas where the Council will look to allocate sites.
- 3.7 The SHLAA is not a one off piece of work. It needs to be updated on an annual basis and reported through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The ongoing nature of the SHLAA means that any sites identified now will remain in the assessment and provide an overview of land availability if housing sites need to be found in other areas in future years.

#### **Initial findings of the SHLAA**

- 3.8 The SHLAA has been prepared in light of the housing requirements set out in the approved South East Plan (SEP). Between 2006-2009, within Milton Keynes the SEP requires:
  - 34,160 homes in the urban area
  - 2,400 in the rural area
  - 4,800 homes in the SE SDA
- 3.9 There have already been significant completions in the period April 2006-March 2009.

- 5,220 in the urban area
  - 582 in the rural area
- 3.10 This means on average 1,702 homes in the urban area and 107 per year in the rural area need to be delivered over the next 17 years to meet the SEP requirements. The SHLAA is, however only concerned with the next 15 years meaning there is a requirement to show that there is available land to deliver:
- 25,530 home in the urban area
  - 1,605 in the rural area
  - 4,245 in the SE SDA
- 3.11 The draft SHLAA (**Annex**) shows that there is available land for:
- 29,218 potentially deliverable homes in the urban area
  - 3,042 in the rural area (1,546 on sites in/around the defined key settlements/selected village and within other development boundaries)
  - 21,159 in the growth areas (3,750 in the established SE SDA)
  - A further 419 homes, where land availability is currently 'uncertain'.
- 3.12 This clearly shows that there are sufficient deliverable sites in the urban area to meet the requirement for the urban area. The potential in the rural area and the SE SDA, when taking into account the strategy for growth in the emerging Core Strategy, is however just short of the requirement.
- 3.13 For the SE SDA this is justified as the requirement set out in para 3.10 is based on an annual average of 283 homes over the next 15 years. In reality, the homes are programmed to be delivered from 2016 at a much higher annual average, meaning there is potential for the full 4,800 to be delivered by 2026.
- 3.14 In the rural area, the shortfall can be made up by an allowance for windfall development (i.e. unplanned, additional sites). On average over the last 10 years 44.94% of all rural housing completions have been from windfall development. Over 15 years this would equate to 720 homes. The SHLAA guidance only allows for windfall development to be taken into account in the last 5 years of land supply. Therefore, based on previous rates of delivery, an additional allowance of 240 homes can be added for windfall development. This gives a total of 1746 potentially deliverable homes in the rural area, sufficient to meet the rural requirement.
- 3.15 As set out in para 3.5 the fact that those sites identified only just meets the rural requirement does not mean that all of these sites will need to be allocated and developed. The Council is due to begin production of a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) later this year. Through this process, additional sites may be identified that are more suitable than those identified in the SHLAA. As part of this process the Council will also have to assess the level of new allocations needed to meet the SEP requirement, given the previous history of windfall completions.

- 3.16 When looking at when land is expected to be developed (or in the case of 'new sites *could* be developed), the SHLAA has clarified that there is a shortfall in the immediate 5 year land supply. This is primarily down to the economic slow down and not the supply of land. However, the short supply of sites in the rural area does makes it imperative that new site allocations are made as soon as possible to continue to ensure a supply of sites to the market over the next 10 years.

### **Consultation**

- 3.17 There is no requirement to formally consult on the SHLAA as it is simply a factual technical report. Consultation was previously held on the methodology for undertaking the assessment and the process has subsequently involved developer input, to help support the assessments robustness.
- 3.18 However, the Council will informally invite comments on the assessment over a six week period to draw out any issues that stakeholders would like to raise. This will hopefully help prevent these issues being raised in the future, potentially at the examination of the Core Strategy.
- 3.19 Officers will also write to each Parish Council (and Ward members) to clarify which sites have been identified/put forward in their areas. Each letter will explain what happens next with regards to site allocations and will clarify for those rural Parishes with smaller villages that the identification of sites in their areas does not necessarily mean that the sites will actually be allocated or developed. This however will not be an opportunity to object or support sites. This opportunity will come through the Site Allocation DPD process.
- 3.20 Officers will publish the SHLAA report (along with maps of each site) on the Councils website. Stakeholders on the LDF database who have an interest in housing issues will be written to individually to inform them that the SHLAA is available to view.
- 3.21 The SHLAA has already been reviewed by the Planning Advisory Service, who wrote the DCLG Practice Guidance. They have confirmed that they are happy with how the SHLAA has been undertaken and how the findings are presented (subject to some minor amendments). They have suggested seeking some additional developer input, which Officers will be addressing over the next couple of weeks.

## **4. Implications**

### **4.1 Policy**

The Core Strategy is a key policy document in the planning framework for Milton Keynes. Once adopted, it will replace the strategic elements of the Local Plan and be the basis for the production of future Local Development Documents. The SHLAA is a key piece of evidence supporting the Core Strategy.

## 4.2 Resources and Risk

The preparation of the SHLAA has been/will be undertaken entirely by Milton Keynes Council Development Plans staff with input from colleagues in other departments where necessary.

N	Capital	N	Revenue	N	Accommodation
N	IT	N	Medium Term Plan	N	Asset Management

## 4.3 Carbon and Energy Management

Whilst not having an impact on the Council's carbon footprint, the SHLAA considers sustainable patterns of development which will help to cut per capita carbon dioxide emissions.

## 4.4 Legal

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 has changed the statutory basis for drawing up development plans in England and Wales. The Milton Keynes Local Plan and associated Supplementary Planning Guidance will eventually be replaced by Local Development Documents.

## 4.5 Other Implications

*Equality:* Issues relating to Equality have been considered through the document.

*E Govt:* The SHLAA will be made available through the council's web pages.

*Sustainability:* The SHLAA has considered the sustainability of sites in Milton Keynes for development. It will help support the continued delivery of housing sites, ensuring sustainable patterns of delivery.

*Users, Partners and Stakeholders:* There are a number of stakeholders involved in the production of the SHLAA. Primarily, there was consultation on the methodology for undertaking the assessment and stakeholders have had the opportunity to submit sites for consideration.

Y	Equalities / Diversity	Y	Sustainability	N	Human Rights
Y	E-Government	Y	Stakeholders	N	Crime and Disorder
N	Carbon and Energy Policy				

## **Background Papers:**

PPS3- Housing

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/planningpolicystatement3.pdf>

South East Plan <http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/seplan.html>

Milton Keynes Draft Core Strategy

<http://cmis.milton-keynes.gov.uk/CmisWebPublic/Binary.ashx?Document=27063>

DCLG Practice Guidance

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/landavailabilityassessment>

SHLAA methodology

<http://www.miltonkeynes.gov.uk/planning-policy/documents/revised%5FSHLAA%5FMethodology%5FOct%5F08%2Edoc>

LDF Advisory Group meeting, December 2008

<http://cmis.milton-keynes.gov.uk/CmisWebPublic/Meeting.aspx?meetingID=8465>

**Milton Keynes Council  
Draft Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment  
June 2009**





## **Table of contents**

To be added

## **List of appendices**

1. SHLAA tables-
  - Table 1: Suitable sites- Urban area
  - Table 2: Suitable Sites- rest of the borough
  - Table 3: Suitable sites- potential expansion areas
  - Table 4: Sites assessed as unsuitable
  - Table 5: Sites ruled out of the assessment
  - Table 6: Sites confirmed as unavailable
  - Table 7: Urban area- available deliverable and developable sites
  - Table 8: Rest of the borough- available deliverable and developable sites
  - Table 9: Expansion areas- available deliverable and developable sites
  - Table 10: Sites with uncertain availability- urban area
  - Table 11: Sites with uncertain availability- rest of the borough
  - Table 12: Deliverable and developable sites- key settlements and listed village only
  - Table 13: Deliverable and developable sites- Strategic Development Area
2. Methodology- stakeholder consultation representations
3. Call for sites proforma
4. Site assessment proforma
5. Rural windfall summary
6. Email panel members

## **List of tables**

- Table 1: Regional Housing requirements
- Table 2: Completions, permissions and allocations (at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009)
- Table 3: Sources of sites with potential for housing
- Table 4: Sustainable rural settlements
- Table 5: Average housing densities across Milton Keynes
- Table 6: Housing yields by site size
- Table 7: Factors affecting site suitability
- Table 16: Summary of deliverable and developable sites
- Table 21: Summary of assessment outcomes against housing requirements over next 15 years



## Study Overview

### **Introduction: purpose and context**

The Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is part of the evidence base supporting the production of the Milton Keynes Local Development Framework (LDF). Its primary function is to verify that there is sufficient land across Milton Keynes to meet local requirements, as set out at a regional level<sup>1</sup>.

A SHLAA is required as evidence under the national Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3) to ensure that land availability is not a constraint to the delivery of homes across the country. It is part of a more responsive approach to land supply at a local level.

The SHLAA Practice Guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government, July 2007 (referred to as the Practice Guidance from now on) lists the main requirements of a SHLAA as to:

- Identify sites with potential for housing
- Assess their housing potential
- Assess when they are likely to be developed

This report includes the outcomes of the SHLAA assessment which supports work that has been ongoing over the last 5 years to prepare a strategy for growth in Milton Keynes. Work on the strategy for growth predated the requirement for a SHLAA to be undertaken, meaning that this SHLAA report has not been used to inform the strategy for growth. It has been prepared in a 'period of transition'<sup>2</sup> and as such reviews land availability across Milton Keynes, both in areas included within the strategy of growth and areas currently not identified for growth.

Stage 8: Review of the Assessment, summarises the conclusions for land availability within those areas within the strategy for growth, disaggregating the information from the wider, more general assessment across the whole borough.

**It should be noted that the inclusion of sites in areas not identified for growth does not mean that the Council has altered its emerging strategy for growth and that these sites will actually be allocated for development. This is a matter for the planning process and, as with all sites in the study, the identification of a site in this study does not mean it will actually be allocated or that planning permission for residential development will be granted. This will need to be considered through the normal planning process. This report is simply a technical, evidenced base piece of work.**

---

<sup>1</sup> In the case of Milton Keynes, the local housing requirement is set out in the South East Plan.

<sup>2</sup> The period of transition refers to the fact that the Council has already undertaken work on the strategy for growth, meaning the SHLAA cannot inform the decisions made, but can help to verify the deliverability of the strategy.

Conversely, sites not included in the study could still be considered for allocation through the LDF or be granted planning consent for development if it was deemed suitable.

The SHLAA has been prepared in accordance with the Practice Guidance, Department for Communities and Local Government, July 2007, which provides practical advice on the stages of carrying out an assessment. The Practice Guidance has been adapted where necessary to take into account local circumstances and the purpose of the SHLAA for Milton Keynes Council.

Other Guidance notes have also helped to inform the SHLAA, including the 'SHLAA and Development Plan Documents Preparation' and 'SHLAA-Frequently Asked Questions', both published in January 2008 by the Planning Officers Society. Although these are not formal guidance notes, they provide important practical guidance for practitioners preparing a SHLAA.

The Practice Guidance states that the SHLAA should aim to identify specific sites for at least the first 10 years of a plan from the anticipated date of its adoption and sites or broad allocations for at least a further 5 years of the plan.

In the context of Milton Keynes, the Council is required to deliver the housing targets set out in the South East Plan<sup>3</sup>, which cover the period from 2006 to 2026. The SEP was approved in May 2009, with the figures inline with those in the Panel Report, which were originally used as the basis for the SHLAA. The housing requirements assessed in this SHLAA are therefore the final figures for Milton Keynes.

These figures have been adapted to take into account housing completions between April 2006 and March 2009, which is the base date for the assessment. The outcomes of this assessment report on land availability for 15 years from April 2009, to give an up-to-date picture of land availability.

---

<sup>3</sup> Housing requirements are set out in more detail on page 3.

## Planning policy context and housing requirements

### National Policy

PPS3: Housing provides the national context for SHLAA preparation. Annex C of PPS3 sets out that a SHLAA should:

- Assess the likely level of housing that could be provided if unimplemented planning permissions were brought into development.
- Assess land availability by identifying buildings or areas of land (including previously developed land and greenfield) that have development potential for housing, including within mixed use developments.
- Assess the potential level of housing that can be provided on identified land.
- Where appropriate, evaluate past trends in windfall land coming forward for development and estimate the likely future implementation rate.
- Identify constraints that might make a particular site unavailable and/or unviable for development.
- Identify sustainability issues and physical constraints that might make a site unsuitable for development.
- Identify what action could be taken to overcome constraints on particular sites.

These requirements are picked up in the Practice Guidance, as outlined in the previous section, and have formed the basis for this assessment.

### Regional Policy

At a regional level the SEP sets out the level of housing that needs to be provided in Milton Keynes. The requirements for Milton Keynes are set out in the table below.

**Table 1: Regional Housing Requirements**

Area	Housing requirement
Urban area	34,160
South East Strategic Development Area (MK area)	4,800
Rest of the borough	2,400

In addition to housing growth within the existing boundaries of Milton Keynes Borough, growth is also planned across boundaries with Aylesbury Vale and Central Bedfordshire. There is a requirement for 5,360 homes to be found on the edge of Milton Keynes in Aylesbury Vale and for up to 5,600<sup>4</sup> homes to be found in Central Bedfordshire as a continuation of the SE SDA set out in table 1 above.

<sup>4</sup> Provision in Central Bedfordshire to be determined through a review of the East of England Plan.

This SHLAA has only considered sites within the boundaries of Milton Keynes. Cross boundary growth however is acknowledged in the report with a summary of the findings of the Aylesbury Vale SHLAA and work undertaken by Central Bedfordshire on [page 59](#).

## **Local Policy**

Locally, Milton Keynes has an existing Local Plan which identifies sites for development up to 2011 as well as additional capacity beyond this point. The Local Plan focuses development on the urban area of Milton Keynes, allocating key brownfield sites for redevelopment, as well as allocating expansion sites on the edge of the city.

The Local Plan also identifies Key Settlements and Selected Villages across the rural part of Milton Keynes, where a small extensions to villages boundaries and sensitive redevelopment of sites are planned.

The Council is in the process of preparing a Core Strategy as part of its LDF. The Preferred Options were published in September 2007. The Preferred Options document was prepared in line with the regional policy for the area which governed the housing numbers and the split between urban growth, further expansion and rural development.

As set out in paragraph [??](#), this SHLAA report has been prepared after a significant amount of work has been undertaken on developing the Spatial Strategy for the growth of Milton Keynes. Work on the MK2031 Growth Strategy<sup>5</sup>, the Core Strategy and their Sustainability Appraisals has helped to establish a strategy which focuses development on the city and strategic development areas, with a limited amount of sensitive growth in the rural area, in line with previous rates of growth in rural settlements.

The emerging approach for the rural areas is a continuation of the existing Key Settlements and Selected Villages policy, whereby development is focused on the largest, most sustainable settlements (Newport Pagnell, Olney and Woburn Sands) and areas where there is local support for additional housing (currently Sherington).

## **Existing commitments**

As was acknowledged in paragraph [??](#), there have already been significant housing completions towards the SEP requirements between April 2006 and March 2009. There are also a significant number of dwellings either already under construction, with planning permission or allocated for development. This is summarised in the table below.

---

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.miltonkeynespartnership.org/future\\_plans/MK\\_2031.php](http://www.miltonkeynespartnership.org/future_plans/MK_2031.php)

**Table 2: Completions, permissions and allocations (at 1<sup>st</sup> April 2009)**

<b>Completions</b> (April 2006-March 2009)		5,845
<b>Permissions</b> (inc under construction)	Full/REM	6,057
	Outline	14,296
<b>Local Plan Allocations</b>		9,511

The sites which make up the totals above (excluding completions) can be considered suitable for housing development under the requirements of PPS3. This SHLAA report assesses their availability and deliverability (see section 7) to give a true reflection of land availability across Milton Keynes.

It can be seen that there is a significant amount of suitable land already identified for development across Milton Keynes. However, it is important for the SHLAA in this period of transition, the first for Milton Keynes, not just to focus on these existing commitments and the areas identified for future growth. It is required to look at land availability in all areas of the borough to be able to give a true report on the availability of land across the borough. This will provide a thorough assessment to support the development of future Local Development Documents.

The SHLAA considers each of the SEP requirements separately from this point forward.

### **SHLAA outcome requirements**

The SHLAA requirements are to:

- Identify specific deliverable sites for the first 5 years of the plan which are ready for development;
- Identify specific, developable sites for years 6-10, and ideally years 11-15, in plans to enable the five year supply to be topped up.

Working to the SEP figures and taking completions from April 2006 to March 2009 this means that the SHLAA is required to identify the following for the next 15 years:

Urban area<sup>6</sup>- 8,510 specific, deliverable sites  
17,020 specific developable sites (at least 8,510 plus broad areas/windfall)

Rural Area<sup>7</sup>- 535 specific, deliverable sites  
1,070 specific developable sites (at least 535 plus broad areas/windfall)

SE SDA- 1,410 specific deliverable sites

<sup>6</sup> Based on the requirement to deliver an average of 1,702 homes per year to fulfil the remaining SEP requirement over the next 17 years.

<sup>7</sup> Based on the requirement to deliver an average of 107 homes per year to fulfil the remaining SEP requirement over the next 17 years.

2,820 specific, developable sites (at least 1,410 plus broad areas)

The requirement for the SE SDA has been included as an yearly average in the same way as the urban area and rural area requirements. However, it is not anticipated that development in the area will commence until 2016, meaning that there will appear to be a shortfall in delivery in the early years. This should not be a concern as, inline with delivery on other large sites in Milton Keynes, completion rates over the anticipated construction period of the SE SDA will be far in excess of the yearly average figure.

By assessing the outcomes of the assessment against these requirements (see Stage 8: Reviewing the Assessment), a true reflection of the land supply in Milton Keynes to continue to support the delivery of housing targets will be provided.



## **Stage 1- Planning the Assessment**

### **Study Area**

As outlined previously, the SHLAA has been undertaken just for the Milton Keynes local authority area. The Practice Guidance advocates the preparation of SHLAAs for housing market areas where possible, but in the case of Milton Keynes, given the differing timescales of LDF production this was not possible. The SHLAA report does however address cross boundary issues in section 8, providing a summary of land availability across the wider Milton Keynes area.

### **Partnership approach**

Ideally a Housing Market partnership would be used to take forward the SHLAA. However, the existing Housing Market Partnership in Milton Keynes disbanded in 2008 so this has not been possible. Work on re-establishing a HMP, possibly at a sub-regional level, is underway. Once established, this forum will have involvement in future SHLAAs for Milton Keynes.

Milton Keynes has an existing Joint Housing Delivery Team (JHDT) which has been set up to support housing delivery across the growth area. The JHDT has representatives from Milton Keynes Council and Milton Keynes Partnership/Homes and Communities Agency, with meetings attended by GOSE representatives. Officers on the team are in constant contact with developers and landowners to ensure the continued supply of housing land and the delivery of homes by identifying and tackling any blockages in the system. This team and its members has provided key support to the preparation of the SHLAA throughout the study.

It developing the methodology for undertaking the SHLAA, all existing Council contacts with an interest in housing issues were asked to consider issues such as the scope of the study, which sites should be surveyed and the approach to estimating housing potential. The findings of this initial partnership engagement and how it influenced the methodology can be seen in appendix 2.

As part of the process the Council has sought input from the development industry to support the robustness of the study. There was very limited interest in partaking in a developer panel initially but several stakeholders did agree to participate in an email forum through which key issues around the suitability and deliverability of sites were discussed to ensure the findings of the SHLAA are robust (see sections 7c/7d).

The Council has also sought to involve local members and Parish Council's in the SHLAA process where possible. Each Parish Council was contacted to let them know about the SHLAA process and to give them an opportunity to identify sites they felt should be investigated through the SHLAA. It was felt important to involve Parish Councils through out the process to minimise any misunderstanding of the purpose and impact of the assessment on local areas.

## **Project team**

The SHLAA has been prepared in-house by members of the Development Plans team. Expert advice on housing issues has been sought from members of the JHDT and other stakeholders, including Tim Watton at RPS who kindly provided independent experience from involvement in SHLAA steering groups in a previous role for the House Builders Federation.

The Council's existing housing monitoring team have also been involved in the preparation of the SHLAA. The Council, as a major growth area, has extensive arrangements in place to monitor housing delivery and land supply, meaning much of the base work for the SHLAA was readily available. The monitoring team have played an important role in ensuring figures are up-to-date and robust, as well as clarifying the outcomes of the study.

## **Timescales**

A baseline of April 2009 has been used for the SHLAA. Originally, April 2008 was set as the base date but slips in the study progress and the speed of the monitoring team in updating the 2009 housing figures has allowed the more recent figures to be used, giving an up-to-date view of land availability.

## **Stage 2- Determining sources of supply**

The Practice Guidance outlines a series of sources from which potential housing sites can be identified. These cover both sites already within the planning process and sites outside of the planning process. Not all of these are relevant to Milton Keynes. Those which are relevant are listed in the table below. The reason for excluding certain sources listed in the practice guidance are discussed after the table.

**Table 3: Sources of sites with potential for housing**

<b>Sites in the planning process</b>
▪ Land allocated (or with permissions) for employment or other land uses which are no longer required for those uses
▪ Existing housing allocations and development briefs
▪ Unimplemented/outstanding planning permissions for housing
▪ Planning permissions for housing that are under construction
<b>Sites not currently in the planning process</b>
▪ Vacant and derelict land and buildings
▪ Surplus public sector land
▪ Land in non-residential use which maybe suitable for redevelopment for housing, such as commercial buildings or car parks, including part of mixed use developments
▪ Additional housing opportunities in established residential areas, such as under-used garage blocks
▪ Sites in rural settlements and rural exception sites
▪ Urban extensions

### **Types of site excluded form the assessment**

The investigation of large scale redevelopment of existing residential areas was not considered necessary for the SHLAA there is no current context within which this would happen over the next 15 years. The majority of housing estates in the urban area, although in some case of low quality, are all currently still occupied and functional, unlike in some areas of the country. An early analysis of the figures of existing commitments also identified no pressing need to pursue options for delivering significant additional housing numbers in the urban area, which may have necessitated more thorough investigation of residential redevelopment.

The Practice Guidance states the need for new free standing settlements will normally have been identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) (page 11). As this is not the case in the SEP, free standing settlements have not been looked at in the assessment. This includes smaller areas of land, with no relationship with any urban areas, speculatively put forward to the Council as potential housing sites.

## **Urban extensions**

The Practice Guidance does also say that the need for urban extensions will have been identified in the RSS. Urban extensions of Milton Keynes are promoted in the SEP and have therefore been covered in the SHLAA. The emerging SEP identifies the location of the Strategic Development Areas to the South East and South West of Milton Keynes (the later is in Aylesbury Vale). However, as the SHLAA has been prepared in a period of transition, all options for urban extensions in the context of the MKSM Sub Regional Strategy have been assessed in the SHLAA. This is advocated by the POS note (page 11).

Where numerous small sites have been received within an area of expansion, these have been considered together as part of one larger growth area, to simplify the assessment.

All other sites will be included in the assessment. Other sites maybe excluded from the assessment when considering their suitability (see section 7a) but this will be explained later in the report.

## **Call for sites**

As part of the search for sites the Council issued a 'call for sites' to land owners and develops in January 2009. This is not a formal requirement of the SHLAA but is considered best practice in identifying land available for development. Sites received by the 18<sup>th</sup> February 2009 have all been taken into account in the assessment.

Sites were also put forward to the Council during consultation on the Core Strategy. As with the 'call for sites', any sites received by the Council before 18<sup>th</sup> February either through formal periods of consultation or as part of ongoing discussions have been included in the assessment.

## **Rural settlements**

The Practice Guidance notes the requirement to not narrow down the assessment by applying existing policies designed to constrain development. In the case of Milton Keynes such a policy would be the designation of Newport Pagnell, Olney and Woburn Sand as Key Settlements and Hanslope and Bow Brickhill as Selected Villages.

Even though a similar policy approach is emerging through the Core Strategy, the assessment has not used this policy designation to limit the scope of the SHLAA. A pragmatic approach has however been taken to the scope of the assessment in the rural area, based on the requirements of PPS7, Sustainable Development in Rural Areas, for rural housing growth to promote sustainable patterns of development.

The POS Report (page 6) suggests that:

*“There is no expectation that every possible greenfield site should be assessed within the SHLAA. In many rural areas there will be large numbers of theoretically possible sites, many of which are patently unsuitable for housing because of their isolation from settlements or for other reasons. Rather, the assessment should concentrate on those sites which have the best potential as possible housing areas.”*

Considering this, only sites in and on the edge of rural settlements deemed to be sustainable were considered in the assessment. Sustainable was defined as having a school and at least 7 of the 16 facilities identified in the Rural Services Audit, 2007. Despite some suggestions that sites in all areas should be considered, the majority of stakeholder feedback agreed with this definition of sustainable and the scope of the study. The settlements are listed in the table below.

**Table 4: Sustainable rural settlements**

<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Range of facilities</b>
Newport Pagnell	16
Woburn Sands	16
Olney	15
Hanslope	12
Lavendon	9
Sherington	9
Stoke Goldington	9
Wavendon	8
Bow Brickhill	7
Castlethorpe	7
North Crawley	7

In addition, all sites within existing development boundaries were considered. This includes some additional settlements to those identified above, but was felt necessary given that it would be realistic to expect such sites to be able to come forward for development through the planning system.

## **Stages 3 and 4- Desktop review and determining which sites to be surveyed**

### **Desktop review**

As a starting point existing information from the housing monitoring team was collected on sites within the planning system. This was supplemented by information from the Joint Housing Delivery Team, which provides monthly updates from developers on the progress and expected completion times on major sites across the city.

At this stage other desk-based sources of information including the National Land Use Database (NLUD), the Vacant Properties Register and aerial photography, were also used to identify potential housing sites.

Each of these sites were compiled in a database and their boundaries mapped on GIS. In some cases sites were picked up from two or more sources. At this stage, duplicate records were removed.

For each site basic information on size, current use, site constraints (such as flood risk and conservation issues) and planning history was compiled based on desktop information.

### **Size threshold**

Given the significant number of new dwellings to be delivered in Milton Keynes it was not felt necessary to investigate any new sites that could accommodate under 5 dwellings. The majority of development will be on larger sites and given that over 30,000 dwellings need to be found, the work that would be required to potentially assess 300 sites for 1 to 4 dwellings that could contribute as little as 1% of the total housing requirement is not justified.

However, where information is already held about sites with planning permission for 1-4 dwellings, these were left in as they involved far less assessment work as they are already deemed suitable.

This approach is advocated by the Practice Guidance (page 25) which suggests that the nature of the housing challenge and the resources available are two of the considerations in determining the sites and areas to survey.

### **Site surveys**

Undertaking a 'call for sites' period helped reduce the number of sites to be identified via site surveys. With a number of Parish Councils identifying sites in their areas and approximately 100 sites put forward to the Council through the 'call for sites', many sites that would have been identified via sites visits had already been brought to the Councils attention.

When carrying out the survey (see stage 5) Officers assessed areas they were visiting for potential housing sites. This covered the whole of Milton

Keynes and was primarily focused on identifying brownfield and underutilised sites.

## **Stage 5- Carrying out the Survey**

All sites identified through the desktop study have been visited. In the case of sites in the planning system, these sites are visited as a matter of course by monitoring staff as part of the ongoing housing monitoring arrangements. These visits note progress on site and assess any changes in site circumstances that may affect housing delivery.

For sites not in the planning system, sites visits were used to update information on sites that could not be ascertained through the desk-top review. This primarily involved looking at constraints that would affect the suitability of the site for housing development or would affect the rate and time at which it would be delivered.

Factors recorded on site visits included-

- The character of the surrounding area
- Neighbouring uses
- Topography- e.g. steep slopes, ground conditions
- On site constraints- e.g. pylons
- Existing onsite use
- Access arrangements

An example of the proforma used can be seen in appendix 3.

At this stage an initial view on whether there were specific factors that could limit the use of the site for housing was noted to help with Stage 7 (assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed) of the assessment process. Specifically, when issues of access or conservation have been noted these have been raised with the Highways and Design and Conservation teams to get an expert opinion of the suitability of the land. Feedback from this consultation fed into Stage 7 of the assessment.

The character of the site in relation to its surrounding was also considered here. In some cases large sites on the edge of settlements could, in part be realistic extensions to a settlement boundary, but as a whole would be inappropriate. Where a site is felt to only be partly suitable for housing, this has been noted and the change in site boundary considered prior to Stage 6 (estimating housing potential) of the process.

The findings of the site surveys have been combined with the desktop survey in a database which will be able to be updated on an annual basis, or as required, when land availability needs to be reviewed.



## Stage 6- Estimating the housing potential of each site

For sites with planning permission, the housing figures agreed through the planning permission have been taken forward into the assessment. In the case of sites that are under construction, site visits in April 2009 have helped to confirm the remaining capacity of sites and this figure has been taken forward into the assessment.

The SHLAA has not carried out detailed design appraisals of each of the other sites to ascertain whether particular housing densities could be accommodated on individual sites. This was not felt necessary for the purpose of this assessment and would have been unrealistic due to both time and budgetary constraints.

However, where more detailed design work has been undertaken on individual sites this has been taken into account in the assessment. This is the case for a number of the larger sites put forward through the 'call for sites' and Core Strategy consultations.

In other cases, a density multiplier approach has been used to provide a practical and effective assessment method that can be applied to all sites. This has made for a consistent approach that can be applied relatively quickly and fairly across Milton Keynes.

The existing Local Plan policy on average housing densities across different areas of Milton Keynes has been used as the basis for the estimates. These are summarised in the table below.

**Table 5: Average housing densities across Milton Keynes**

<b>Zone</b>	<b>Settlements/areas</b>	<b>Density</b>
1	CMK (including Campbell Park)	100 dph
2	Adjoining grid squares north and south of CMK, Bletchley, Kingston, Stony Stratford, Westcroft and Wolverton:	40dph
3	The rest of the City, City Expansion Areas, Newport Pagnell, Olney and Woburn Sands	35dph
4	The rest of the Borough	30dph

To give a realistic interpretation of the housing yield from individual sites, it has been assumed that in the case of the larger sites that not all of the available land could be developed for housing. On the largest sites only 50% of land has been assumed to be available for housing given the requirement to provide jobs, education facilities and so on, as part of sustainable communities. The table below summarises the assumptions about the proportion of individual sites that is assumed to be available for housing

**Table 6: Housing yields by site size**

Small up to 0.3 hectares)	100% available for housing
Medium (0.3- 5ha)	75% available for housing
Large (over 5ha)	50% available for housing

As was noted in the previous section, site visits have concluded that certain sites have only partial potential for housing, given their relationship with existing settlements. Where this is the case the reduced capacity of a site has been calculated at this stage to avoid an unrealistic housing projection being included in the assessment.

**The housing potential of each site calculated at this stage is only indicative for the purpose of the SHLAA (unless a planning permission has already been granted). It should not be assumed that planning permission would be granted for the figures quoted in this report. The true potential of individual sites would have to be determined through a detailed site assessment which takes into account a number of more detailed factors than are considered in this assessment.**

The estimated housing potentials can be seen in SHLAA tables 1-3 in appendix 1.

## **Stage 7- Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed**

In terms of the overall assessment process stages 7 (a to d) are integral to ensuring the outcomes of the SHLAA are as robust as possible. This stage of the process assesses the suitability, availability and achievability of a site. It needs to be considered whether a site is:

**Deliverable-** available now, offers a suitable location for housing development now and there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years of adoption of the plan: and

**Developable-** in a suitable location for housing development and there is a reasonable prospect that it will be available for and could be developed at a specific point in time.

When it is unknown when a site could be developed it should be classed as currently undevelopable. This could be either because a severe constraint has been identified that it is not known when it will be overcome or, as is the case in the current economic climate, a developer or land owner has clearly indicated that they have no intention of developing their site at the current time.

The approach taken in stages a-d is pragmatic and realistic, and takes into account assumptions on availability and achievability that have been reviewed by a number of stakeholders for robustness.

All sites identified have been assessed and are referenced at some stage in the next four sections, whether they are part of the emerging strategy for growth or not. All sites are mapped and can be seen in the separate document containing mapped information.

### **Stage 7a: Assessing the suitability for housing**

The Practice Guidance states that a site is suitable for housing development if it offers a suitable location for development and would contribute to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities.

It is assumed that all sites with planning permission are suitable for housing as their suitability has been assessed through the planning process. These sites have all been included in SHLAA tables 1-3 (appendix 1) which list suitable housing sites in Milton Keynes.

The Practice Guidance requires a series of factors which affect suitability to be considered. The Practice guidance list covers:

- **Policy restrictions-** such as designations, protected areas, existing planning policy and corporate, or community strategy policy (*this does not mean that sites outside of Local Plan policy and Core Strategy identified areas can be removed from the assessment*);
- **Physical problems or limitations-** such as access, infrastructure, ground conditions, flood risk, hazardous risks, pollution or contamination;

- **Potential Impacts-** including effect upon landscape features and conservation; and
- **The environmental conditions-** which would be experienced by prospective residents.

In terms of sustainability, all sites that have been included in the assessment parameters are deemed to be sustainable. The focus of development is the Milton Keynes urban area and all sites within this area are deemed to have reasonable access to the required day-to-day services and public transport. In rural areas, only sites within settlements deemed to be sustainable will be bought forward into the assessment. Therefore, there is no need to specifically assess sustainability as a separate 'suitability' characteristic.

Taking this into account the criteria in table 7 have been used to assess site suitability. The information has been collected through proformas, desktop reviews and site visits. An example of the sheet used to summarise the findings of site visits, the desktop review and facts for the proforma is shown in appendix 4.

**Table 7: Factors affecting site suitability**

<b>Environmental impacts</b>	
Landscape character	Is the site within/contain designated important areas of landscape character, scenic quality or particular natural asset?
Nature conservation	Does the site contain areas designated for nature conservation value (LP Policy NE1), or important/protected species?
Heritage conservation	Would the development require loss of a listed building or impact on one? Is the site in a conservation area?
<b>Physical characteristics</b>	
Flooding	Is the site within a floodplain? Is there standing water or unstable ground?
Topography	Does the site have steep slopes?
Access	Is there adequate road access to the site? Could it be achieved? Is the local highway network adequate? Is pedestrian access achievable?
Contamination	Is contamination a risk? Is it treatable?
Power cables etc...	Would they constraint development?
<b>Existing use</b>	
Nature of existing use	Is the site already in use? What is the nature of the use?
Amenity of neighbours surrounding uses	Are surrounding uses compatible with housing? Would they impact on the attractiveness of the site?
Loss of community facilities	Would development lead to loss of planned open space (sports pitches etc...) or other community facilities.

All sites within the parameters of the assessment (i.e. size of site, location) were assessed against these criteria in the table above. Sites outside the parameters of the assessment have been listed in SHLAA table 5- Sites ruled out of the assessment (appendix 1), alongside the reason for ruling them out of the assessment.

If a site clearly failed to positively satisfy any of the criteria it has been deemed as unsuitable for development and ruled out of the assessment (i.e. greenfield site wholly within floodplain or a severe slope on the site). These sites are listed in SHLAA table 4- Sites assessed as unsuitable (appendix 1). In some cases where there is a constraint but there is reasonable evidence of how it could be overcome, it has been left in the assessment but the constraint noted.

SHLAA tables 1-5 in appendix 1 show the suitable sites and those that are unsuitable/have been ruled out of the assessment. The tables are clearly broken down into urban, expansion and sites in the rest of the borough inline with the three distinct areas of housing provision in the SEP.

In the case of the expansion sites, general constraints to development have been assessed and noted, but if allocations and development were to actually be pursued, far more detailed transport, landscape and other detailed assessments, which is outside the scope of the SHLAA, to assess impacts.

For those sites put forward through the 'Call for sites' or that are Council identified, there is a note of any constraints to factors that affect the suitability of the site and would need to be addressed either prior to its development and as part of it. Those sites with planning permission or an allocation are deemed 'already suitable for development' and only have notes where new information is available affecting their suitability.

### **Suitability Conclusions**

An estimate of the housing potential for each of the suitable sites has been made using the methods set out under stage 6. This estimates that there are over 29,000 suitable housing sites across the urban area of Milton Keynes (including existing Strategic Reserve areas), over 3,500 sites within the rural area and potentially over 20,000 sites as part of greenfield expansion areas on the edge of the urban area.

These sites individually are all deemed to be generally suitable for housing development, given their location and characteristics. However this does not mean that there is potential for all of these sites to be developed collectively, as there may well be constraints with factors such as highway capacity and service provision that would preclude them all being developed. This is particularly the case for expansion sites, when a full assessment on the capacity of Milton Keynes to absorb further growth would need significant investigation, and the rest of the borough, when the need to retain rural character would need to be considered.

Each of the suitable sites has been taken forward into the next stage of the assessment.

There are potentially other suitable sites within Milton Keynes which it was not felt appropriate to include in the assessment at this time. There are a number of areas identified for regeneration across the urban area. At the present time there is no commitment to or basis for physical redevelopment and/or infill in these areas so they have not been investigated through this assessment. If the position changes with in future years, such sites and areas will be included in the assessment, potentially increasing the supply of suitable sites in the urban area.

There are also a number of 'community reserve' sites across the urban area. These are areas reserved to enable unforeseen community uses (when estates were originally planned and developed) to be developed easily within estates. There is potential for these sites to provide additional housing where it is felt that there is no additional community need. However, they have not been included in the assessment so as not to pre-empt an assessment of their need for community purpose. When they have been reviewed, future SHLAA assessments will incorporate relevant sites.

There are also potentially other suitable sites in the rural area that were not identified through the SHLAA. The Council will be beginning the process of producing a Site Allocations DPD for non-strategic allocations in the area later in 2009. Any new sites/areas identified through this process will be include din the review of the SHLAA next year.

**It should be stressed that the inclusion of sites in SHLAA tables 1-3 does not mean that planning permission for housing development would be granted or that the site will be allocated for housing development at any point in the future, as set out in para ???. This is still the role of the planning process and will be determined through the Local Development Framework and Development Control processes. The SHLAA is an evidence based piece of work which will help to inform the LDF process- not replicate or replace it.**

At this stage there are 50 sites ruled out of the assessment or deemed unsuitable. These are primarily sites that are outside of the scope of the assessment (i.e. too small or unsustainable locations), that have a severe constraint (e.g. greenfield floodplain) or that have been ruled out as they are covered by other sites. This is particularly an issue for expansion areas where developers have put forward sites as part of consortia, but where individual owners have also put them forward. These sites are ruled out of the assessment at this stage.

## **Stage 7b- Assessing the availability for housing**

To be able to carry a site forward in the assessment, the availability of each needs to be established to check that there is a reasonable prospect of development occurring on site at a particular time. The Practice Guidance states that

*‘a site can be considered available for development when on best information available, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems, such as multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements of landowners’.* (Practice Guidance para 39)

It should be controlled by a landowner who has expressed an intention to develop, or the land owner has expressed an intention to sell.

### **Sites in the planning system**

For sites with planning permission or an existing housing allocation it has not simply been assumed that an active planning permission means that a site is definitely available for development, as the planning permission has not necessarily been made by the person who currently controls the land.

For each site with an active planning permission, the land owner (where known) or their agent was sent a proforma requesting up-to-date information on the future of the site. This asked if there was:

- An intention not to proceed with development;
- If there were any constraints to development; and
- What the current timescales for development were.

Where a written response has not been received from the developer/land owner/agent follow-up phone calls have been made and information recorded.

This information was supplemented by figures from the Joint Housing Delivery Team who provide monthly updates on projections for major sites direct from the developers<sup>8</sup>.

At this stage only where a developer/land owner/agent has confirmed that there is no intention to pursue development of the site has the site been deemed unavailable.

Those sites with an active planning permission or an allocation where clarification of availability has not been received either in writing or via a follow up phone call, have been left in the assessment and carried forward to the next stage of the assessment. These sites are however, kept separate in the assessment due to lack of clarity over availability, with their availability classed as ‘uncertain’.

---

<sup>8</sup> The most up-to-date JHDT monitoring figures available at the time of writing have fed into the SHLAA report.

This is inline with a quote on land availability from the Inspector of the Tandridge Core Strategy

*“...whilst a site’s suitability and achievability can be ascertained from site surveys and other assessments, the reasonable prospect of its availability is much more difficult to assess where there is no hindrance to its developability (as here) other than the landowners’ intentions. This is because landowners’ intentions beyond the short-term (i.e. the first five years) are often unknown, even to themselves. In addition, the very identification of a site for development can trigger landowner or developer action, thus creating a ‘self-fulfilling prophecy’. Therefore, if a landowner has not said categorically that they have no intention of selling their site or that it should not be included for other reasons, then I believe it has a reasonable prospect of being available in the second or third of the five year PPS3 periods.”*  
[Planning Inspectorate’s Reference: PINS/M3645/429/3]

### **Sites outside the planning process**

Those sites submitted to the Council through the call for sites and Core Strategy consultations are generally assumed to be available for development as they have been promoted by the land owners or their agents. Where additional information is available on issues such as ransom strips, this has also been used to supplement the assessment of availability.

In certain cases, the site surveys have shown there to be activity on sites which could limit their immediate availability, such as continued employment use with potential tenancy issues. Where this is the case, further information has been sought from the developer/landowner/agent to clarify site availability.

For sites identified by Council Officers or Parish Councils, efforts have been made to establish land ownership and the availability of the land. Where this has not been possible, the sites have been classed as having ‘uncertain availability’.

In Milton Keynes there are also a significant number of Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) owned sites which are allocated for development but are yet to come forward. These sites are monitored through JHDT and therefore the monthly update has been used to establish the position regarding the availability of these sites.

### **Conclusions- unavailable sites**

Rather than list all of the available sites, SHLAA table 6 (appendix 1) lists all of the suitable but **unavailable** sites along with the reason why they are unavailable.

As a result of the investigations into site availability, only three sites, containing an estimated 287 units, have been confirmed as being unavailable, as are not carried forward any further in the assessment.

There are, however, a significant number of smaller sites where availability is uncertain, either due to no further information being forthcoming from land



owners or their agents, or as site ownership is unknown. These sites have been carried forward in the assessment, but are treated separately from this point forward.

## **Stage 7c and 7d: Assessing achievability for housing and overcoming constraints**

### **Assessing achievability for housing**

A site is considered achievable for housing development where there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about economic viability of the site, and the capacity of the developer to complete a sell the housing over a certain period of time (Practice Guidance, page 16).

The assessment of achievability is affected by a number of issues including-

- Market factors- attractiveness of the location, market demand for the site, potential value of alternative use, projected rate of sales
- Cost factors- site preparation costs, physical constraints, planning standards/s106 requirements, potential to address identified constraints
- Delivery factors- build out rates and phasing, single or multiple developers and their capacity

In the current economic climate it is extremely difficult to assess the short term achievability of sites, given the reluctance of developers to build homes that they potentially are not going to be able to sell. However, best efforts have been made to give a realistic interpretation of when housing is likely to be achieved on individual sites.

### **Achievability of sites in the planning system**

As with site availability, each developer/landowner/agent has been contacted to see if there were any mitigating circumstances that would affect the achievability of housing on their sites and what the timescales for delivery on their sites are.

This information has been supplemented by work from the JHDT on the larger sites in Milton Keynes where the speed of progress sites under construction is monitored and developer aspirations for sites with planning permission are recorded and updated monthly.

When considering achievability the stakeholders on the forum were asked to comment on assumptions made about when sites could be achieved. The three key assumptions agreed as logical are:

- Any sites where land owners/developers/agents have indicated that they still intend to progress development but that it is unlikely to proceed until the housing market picks up have been pushed back to the latest possible start time, based on the planning consent. This is on the basis that there is

no significant history of unimplemented housing permissions in Milton Keynes. This will be kept under review on an annual basis as part of housing monitoring in April each year.

- Build out rates on the larger sites have been based on feedback from developers, which take into account current (2009) predictions about demand for new properties, and lead-in times on previous large expansion sites.
- For sites where availability is uncertain due to a lack of feedback from the land owner/developer/agent (see para ?? above), information from the Council's existing housing monitoring system, used to produce the annual housing trajectory, has been used to estimate completion dates. To avoid an unrealistic interpretation of the 5 year supply (given current market conditions), where no information is available from the landowner/ developer/agent, sites will not be included in the first 5 years of land supply but will be included in the 6-10 year period. This is not specifically inline with the Government's Practice Guidance, but is inline with the recommendation of the Inspector of the Tandridge Core Strategy (see para) and aims to give a realistic interpretation of land supply. As per para ?? this information is shown in a separate table, 'Sites with Uncertain Availability'.

### **Achievability of sites outside the planning system**

Stakeholders were also asked to agree a series of assumptions regarding the achievability of housing on sites currently outside the planning system. The following assumptions were generally agreed to be logical:

- In light of the current economic slow down and the relative lack of activity in the housing market, it is felt unrealistic to include any sites currently outside of the planning process in the first 5 years of housing supply, but it may be realistic to assume that they will be available in the period 5-10 years if owners/agents have indicated that the site is available in the short/medium term, subject to a planning consent being granted. This is based on a piece of general housing market research by Savills, Residential Development Focus, Winter 2008<sup>9</sup> (which they have given permission for us to reference in the SHLAA) that suggests that demand for new housing could pick up from 2011.
- It is assumed that the current affordable housing requirements (30% on sites over 15 units), the requirement for high standards of construction (Code Level 4 from 2010 subject to Core Strategy adoption) and general s106 requirements locally, will not prevent any type of site being available for development. This is based on previous completion history on greenfield/brownfield urban/rural sites alike, the ability for negotiation in

---

<sup>9</sup> The report is available via the Savills website at:  
<http://www.savills.co.uk/research/Report.aspx?nodeID=10292#>

cases of uncertain viability and the fact that emerging policy requirements are broadly the same as in previous years.

- Sites in all areas of Milton Keynes are deemed to be marketable, although it is recognised that in the short term sites in areas where sale prices are lower are unlikely to be viable. This is covered by the previous point.
- Build out rates have been adapted from those of similar sites where existing developer information is available. On the basis of updated completion rates in existing expansion areas, in the short to medium term, larger sites are likely to be developed over a longer period than would have been the case a couple of years ago. Information from site promoters has supplemented the assessment.
- It has been assumed that cost factors associated with site remediation are in all cases not excessive to prevent development occurring, as this is not normally an issue in Milton Keynes.

Information provided by developers as part of call for sites submissions has also helped to inform the assessment of achievability. The proforma required information on:

- Perceived marketability of the site/attractiveness of the locality
- The sensitivity of the site to changes in the housing market
- Alternative uses
- Relationship with surrounding sites
- Site preparation costs
- Potential phasing

This information was supplemented by information recorded in site visits, particularly relating to factors that could affect marketability (i.e. neighbouring uses) or site assembly (i.e. existing uses).

The information compiled sets out estimates of completions on a year by year basis. This information has been transferred into 5 year periods, as per the SHLAA Practice Guidance requirements, and is set out in SHLAA tables 7-9 (appendix 1) along with clarification as to how assumptions on availability have been made.

SHLAA tables 10 and 11 (appendix 1) summarise the additional sites carried forward from stage 7b where availability is uncertain.

### **Conclusions- achievability for housing**

The findings of the study show that there is a significant amount of available housing land across the borough. Table 8 below summarises the findings.

**Table 8: Summary of deliverable and developable sites**

<b>Area</b>	<b>0-5 yrs</b>	<b>6-10 yrs</b>	<b>11-15 yrs</b>	<b>15+ yrs</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Urban</b>	8,054	14,418 (+ 208 uncertain)	6,746	0	29,218 (+ 208 uncertain)
<b>Rest of the borough</b>	400	2,059 (= 211 uncertain)	583	0	3,042 (+211 uncertain)
<b>Expansion</b>	0	9,047	9,292	2,373	21,159

The implications of these findings are discussed in more detail under stage 8: Reviewing the Assessment, where those sites within the emerging growth strategy are disaggregated from the wider supply.

The two tables covering sites with uncertain availability show that there is uncertainty around the delivery of approximately 419 dwellings across the borough (208 in the urban area and 211 in the rest of the borough). These are primarily smaller sites with planning permission where it has been difficult to establish current site ownership and to gain feedback on the sites.

Delivery on these sites will continue to be monitored and reported in future SHLAA reports.

## **Stage 7d: Overcoming constraints**

Where constraints have been identified, the assessment needs to consider what actions are needed to overcome them. Actions could include the need for investment in infrastructure, dealing with fragmented land ownerships, environmental improvements, or the need to amend planning policy which is constraining housing development.

In assessing the constraints identified throughout the assessment, there are no particular physical issues that appear to be constraining housing growth in Milton Keynes. There are issues with individual sites that would need to be investigated and overcome on a site-by-site basis, but no major constraints to development overall. The infrastructure required to support growth already in the planning system is planned through the MKP Business Plan and the Tariff, with similar arrangements anticipated to support future growth requirements.

The required delivery rates in the SE SDA will require measures to be taken to ensure maximum output across the site on an annual basis. Delivery could be constrained by the number of development parcels available at any one time and within the market, so it will be important that the parcelling of land and phasing of development is considered early, ideally through the Development Framework process.

In the rural area, planning policy currently constrains growth to the largest, most sustainable settlements. In the short/medium term, there appears to be a sufficient supply of sites to enable the regional housing requirement to be delivered.

However it is clear that there is a need to allocate additional sites through an Allocations Development Plan Document soon to allow this supply to be delivered. In the future, however, the supply of larger sites, particularly those brownfield in nature, appears to be limited and there will be increasing pressure on those settlements selected for development. There may be a need to amend planning policy to enable sites to be allocated in other rural settlements, enabling a continued supply of sites in the rural area.

Conversely, given the character and role of the rural area, it could be argued in the future that there is simply insufficient capacity to continue to deliver sites in truly sustainable locations. If this is considered to be the case, rather than reviewing local policy, a case could be made for assessing regional policy to lower the expectation of development in the rural areas of Milton Keynes.

## Stage 8: Review of the assessment

### Supply within the emerging strategy

As was acknowledged in paragraph ?? the SHLAA has been prepared in a period of transition. It has been undertaken as if there were no emerging planning policy in place, which is not the case. The emerging Core Strategy focuses development within the boundaries of Milton Keynes on:

- The urban area;
- A Strategic development area to the south east of the city
- Key Settlements of Newport Pagnell, Olney and Woburn Sands; and
- Selected Village of Sherington

It is therefore important that the land availability within these areas is disaggregated from the wider assessment of availability to establish supply in these areas.

This has been done by removing any sites from the assessment which lie outside of the areas and settlements listed above or which do not lie within the existing development boundaries of any settlements across the borough.

This primarily means removing:

- Those sites which would lead to the expansion of the boundaries of rural settlements not listed above; and
- any sites promoted as potential areas of expansion for the city, excluding sites within the identified SE SDA.

Availability within these areas are shown in SHLAA tables 12 and 13 in appendix 1.

For the urban area, all sites listed within SHLAA table 7 are part of the emerging strategy for growth. There is therefore no need to revisit them.

### Overall Conclusions

**Table 9: Summary of assessment outcomes against housing requirements over next 15 years**

Area		0-5 years	6-10	11-15	Total
Urban	Requirement	8,485	8,485	8,485	25,455
	Supply	8,054	14,418	6,746	29,218 (+208 Uncertain)
Rest of the borough	Requirement	535	535	535	1,605
	Supply	400	706	440	1,546 (+211 uncertain)
Strategic Development Area	Requirement	1,415	1,415	1,415	4,245
	Supply	0	750	3,000	3,750

It can be seen from table 9 that in the case of the urban area the number of specific sites identified through the assessment is sufficient to meet the housing requirements set out in the SEP. This does not take into account any 'broad areas' or 'windfall' development. In the case of the rest of the borough and the SE SDA, it can be seen that there is a slight shortfall over the 15 year period,. The rural area is discussed in more detail in the next section and the delivery plans for the SE SDA are discussed in more detail in para ?? below.

It can be seen from the first column that there is a shortfall in identifying specific, deliverable sites for the first 5 years of the plan. This can be directly attributed to the economic slow down, which has had an impact on the rate of house buying and subsequently the desire of landowners to sell land (due to decreasing land values) and the desire of developers to build homes, due to the lack of demand.

The largest shortfall appears to be in the rural area where deliverable supply for the next five years is just over 75% of the required average over the plan period. However, it can also be seen that there is a significant amount of developable land estimated as being available in the 6-10 year period. This shortfall is looking to be addressed through the production of a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (beginning in 2009), which will help increase the number of deliverable sites.

As has been noted previously, the ability of all non-allocated sites to be developed is currently unclear. Each has been assessed for its suitability and developability, but this does not take into account cumulative impact and the level of development that would be suitable for individual settlements. This would need to be considered in more detail through the LDF process.

In the case of the Strategic Development Area, it is unlikely that any housing completions will come forward in the next 5 years as the SDA is a recent requirement of regional policy. The area will need to be comprehensively planned and primary infrastructure established before house building can begin, meaning it is not surprising that in the 0-5 year period there are no estimated completions. The assessment has shown that the land is available to deliver the 4,800 required by 2026 (4,230 which should be delivered by 2023 if split on average over the plan period), and subject to land assembly and production of a suitable development framework that protects the integrity of the existing settlements and their rural character, and which delivers an appropriate phasing of development, there are no major physical constraints to development over the plan period. The phasing of delivery on the site does, however, mean that over the next 15 years, the requirement based on the notional per year average is not anticipated as being available. In line with plans for the area, this is not seen as being a problem.

There appear to be a significant number of sites to support delivery of the urban housing requirement over the next 15 years. Although there is a slight shortfall over the first 5 years, there is a significant amount of 'backed-up' supply, primarily due to the slow down of delivery on large sites which are currently under-construction. The assessment shows that there is over 14,000

homes to be completed in the 6-10 year period, which would be an average of over 2,800 per annum. This may not be realistic given past completion rates and the ability of the local market to deliver and sustain such a level of supply, and in reality, a proportion of these dwellings are likely to be delivered later in the plan period. However, it reinforces the fact that there is not a shortage of suitable land in Milton Keynes.

As the SHLAA has been prepared in a period of transition, it has also looked at sites outside the strategy for growth, covering areas it would have done if it had been prepared at an earlier date. This work established that there are significant amounts of suitable and available housing land in the rural area and on the edge of the urban area, potentially to accommodate further areas of growth.

This land has been excluded from the final conclusions on land availability, but it shows that there are options to accommodate further growth or, if necessary, to alter the strategy for growth in the future. However, it should be noted that this would obviously need to be subject to significant further investigation, which is outside the scope of the SHLAA.

### **Windfall and Broad Areas**

The SHLAA Guidance allows windfall allowances or broad areas to be included in the overall supply for the 11-15 year period, where necessary. As there appears to be a shortfall in supply for the rural area, windfall completions have been assessed in this area.

Historic trends show that 44.94% of housing completions in the rural area over the last 10 years have been windfall development. These have primarily been smaller developments consisting of small infill developments, conversion of old industrial buildings and farm redevelopments. It is expected that windfall development will continue to play a significant role in rural completion rates over the next 15 years as settlements continue their natural evolution.

It is difficult to assess whether windfall completion rates will continue at the same rate as they have done in the past but there are still opportunities within rural settlements for small scale infill development and Development Control have reported that they continue to provide receive pre-application advice for small rural sites.

If current windfall completion rates continue as they have done historically, at an average annual completion rate of 107 units, over 5 years **240** units would be expected to come from windfall development. It is felt that this is a fair assumption given that small sites, which will make up a proportion of this amount, have not been specifically identified through the assessment, and only one new brownfield site has been included, meaning other redevelopment opportunities will not have been double counted.

Adding this figure to the already identified available and deliverable sites in table 9 gives an overall supply of **1,781**, which is in excess of the SEP requirement for the area.



## **Supply outside of the borough boundary**

Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) has undertaken a separate SHLAA for their district. As part of the assessment they considered the growth of Milton Keynes across the boarder into their district, as required though the SEP.

The AVDC SHLAA concludes that there are suitable sites for up to 15,900 new dwellings in AVDC to accommodate future growth of Milton Keynes. However, as has been acknowledged previously in this report, the assessment does not take into account the ability of the area to support the delivery of all of this land in a sustainable manner, meaning the available supply could be less.

In addition to the sites assessed in the AVDC SHLAA, two sites that cross the MK/AVDC boundary were submitted to Milton Keynes Council through the call for sites. This assessment just looked at the sites within the Milton Keynes boundary, but it should be acknowledged that there are other potentially suitable sites outside of the Milton Keynes boundary where future potential growth could be accommodated, subject to significant additional constraints of the overall capacity of Milton Keynes.

The growth of Milton Keynes will also cross into Central Bedfordshire. Although Central Beds have yet to undertake a SHLAA, work jointly commissioned by MK and Mid Beds (as it was at the time) looked at the capacity of an area to the south east of Milton Keynes in Mid Beds, which concluded that there is potential for approximately 3,500 homes as part of the growth of Milton Keynes. This figure will be confirmed via a review of the East of England Plan in due course.

As with AVDC, a site crossing the boundary with Central Bedfordshire was put forward to Milton Keynes council through the call for sites. This area has not been specifically included in this assessment but it further emphasises the point that any further future growth of Milton Keynes will need to consider all options, including sites that are not necessarily within the Milton Keynes authority area.



## Appendix 1- SHLAA tables

**SHLAA table 1: Suitable sites- Urban area**

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
MK2	Former Gasworks Site, Stony Stratford	0.5	15	Town Council/developer promoted	Part of the site is still in use as a caravan sales site, also several unused houses on site. The site is also within a flood risk zone, however development could aid flood mitigation prospects. No major constraints to development.
MK3	Land rear of Citreon Garage, Stony Stratford	0.35	10	Town Council	Ownership unknown. Suitable, however issues over access to site and ownership unknown. Access could be provided if site were to come forward with MK 115- otherwise would require demolition of an existing dwelling to gain access.
MK4	Wolverton Police Station	0.145	5	developer promoted	The garage is still in use. Police station is also still in use, but land would be available providing Thames Valley Police can find a new location, to provide for both the Wolverton and Newport Pagnell Stations.
MK5	Former BP Garage, New Bradwell	0.72	18	NLUD	Brownfield site containing an old disused garage, that would need to be demolished. Lies within flood risk area- but redevelopment could improve flood water management. Currently for sale for development. Developer suggests the site could be part of a wider development site with large neighbouring gardens.
MK6	Warren Farm, Wolverton Mill	2.94	107	developer promoted	Office buildings on site are relatively new and in good condition. 56% long term vacancy rate. Potentially high development costs but conversion possible. Listed buildings on site.
MK7	Car parking off Silbury Boulevard, opposite Next, CMK	2.14	160	developer promoted	Site is still in use as a car park, and also there are issues over the part ownership of the site. No major physical constraints. Figures based on Local Plan.
MK8	Car parking adjacent to John Lewis, CMK	2.67	200	developer promoted	Site still in use as a car park. Slight topographical issues. Issues over part ownership. No major physical constraints. Figures based on Local Plan.
MK9	Food Centre, CMK	3	250	developer promoted local plan proposal	Several of the units including larger units such as Waitrose and Iceland and the multi storey car park, are still in use. Many empty units. Issues over part ownership. Apart from costs of redevelopment, no major constraints. Figures from Local Plan.
MK11	Windmill Hill Golf Course	2.5	65	developer promoted	Development would need consent from the freehold owner, Milton Keynes Council. May need some demolition of buildings. Access possible. Would need some reconfiguration of golf course.
MK12	Albert Street Car Park and Enigma Pub Site, Bletchley	1.36	40	NLUD	The site is still in use, with a functioning pub, Burger King and Aldi, and with the Car Parks being used for these services. Proposed leisure led redevelopment being discussed.
MK13	Briar Lodge and Snowberry Close, Stacey Bushes	2.5	65	NLUD	Some continued residential use. Disused sheltered accommodated awaiting demolition. Discussions regarding redevelopment ongoing.
MK17	Ashland Phase 2		208	Permission	Already considered suitable

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
MK18	Rear of 19 Stoke Road, Bletchley		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK19	Bletchley College, Sherwood Drive		97	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK20	Bletchley Park		64	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK21	Bletchley Park Phase 2		26	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK24	Shenley House Hotel, Bletchley		12	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK25	Land at London Road, Broughton		24	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK27	Campbell Park Phase 1		252	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK29	Bong, Stratford Road, Wolverton		16	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK30	Wolverton Park Sports Ground, Wolverton		300	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK31	Bracken House, Beanhill		15	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK32	128 Western Road, Bletchley		5	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK33	Land To Rear of No 1-11, North Street, Bletchley		10	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK34	Land at Claridge Drive, Middleton		115	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK35	Lathams Buildbase		75	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK36	Off Penn Road, Bletchley		30	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
Mk37	Former Nursing Home, Mavoncliff Drive, Tattenhoe		21	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK38	Site 29 Off Hengistbury Lane, Tattenhoe		5	Permission	Already considered suitable
Mk39	Former Post Office Depot, Church Street, Wolverton		24	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK40	Peek Developments Ltd, McConnell Drive, Wolverton		14	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK41	Mill Farm, Bletchley		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK42	133 Fishermead Boulevard, Fishermead		4	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK43	Plot 1, Ashford Crescent, Grange Farm		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK44	Plot 2, Ashford Crescent, Grange Farm		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK45	Plots 11, 12 & 13, Asford Crescent, Grange Farm		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK46	Former Coopers Works, The Wharf, Great Linford		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK47	Land At 7 Guest Gardens, New Bradwell		1	Permission	Already considered suitable

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
MK48	Land adj Stonebridge House Farm, New Bradwell		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK49	89 Oldbrook Boulevard, Oldbrook		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK50	Land adjoining 36 Augustus Road, Stony Stratford		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK51	17 The Green, Woughton on the Green		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK52	2 Hunter Drive, Bletchley		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK53	83 Bushy Close, Bletchley		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK54	Carwash Valeting And Service Centre At Findlay Way, Bletchley		4	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK55	Land adjacent to 30 Jonathans, Coffee Hall		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK56	58, 60 & 62 High Street, Stony Stratford		3	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK57	Land to the rear of Egmont Avenue, Stony Stratford		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK58	Campbell Park Remainder		2040	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK59	Central Milton Keynes Site B3		16	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK60	Central Milton Keynes Site C4.2/3/4		140	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK61	Central Milton Keynes YMCA		254	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK62	CMK Station 1, central Milton Keynes		470	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK64	D3.3/D3.4, Central Milton Keynes		200	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK65	Xscape, Central Milton Keynes		100	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK66	Former School Site, Shenley Brook End		32	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK67	West of Redbridge, Stantonbury		85	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK68	115A Queensway, Bletchley		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK69	121A Queensway, Bletchley		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK70	15 Calluna Drive, Bletchley		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK71	156 Church Green Road, Bletchley		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK72	220 Queensway, Bletchley		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK73	25 The Elms, Bletchley		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK74	29 Cheshire Rise, Bletchley		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK75	62-66		2	Permission	Already considered suitable

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
	Queensway, Bletchley				
MK76	72 Western Road, Bletchley		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK77	Land adj to 130 Buckingham Road, Bletchley		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK78	Land at Three Trees Pub, Bletchley		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK79	Land between 24 & 30 George Street, Bletchley		3	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK80	41 Stanton Avenue, Bradville		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK81	Land at Brooklands, Eastern Expansion Area		2501	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK82	1 to 3 Brooklands Farm Cottages		3	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK83	613 South Eighth Street, Central Milton Keynes		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK84	89 Gurnards Avenue, Fishermead		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK85	1 The Crescent, Great Linford		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK86	4 Common Cottages, Loughton		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK87	9 Pitcher Lane, Loughton		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK88	Linceslade Grove (Plot 1), Loughton		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK89	Linceslade Grove (Plot 2), Loughton		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK90	115 Tower Drive		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK91	4 Glyn Street Flats, New Bradwell		3	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK92	Land adj Newport Road, New Bradwell		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK93	Unit 2A Lawn Farm, Oakhill		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK94	Land adj 6 Egerton Gate, Shenley Brook End		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK95	394 Simpson		4	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK96	Land at 139 Simpson		4	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK97	10 Calverton Road		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK98	73 Ousebank Way, Stony Stratford		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK99	75 Ousebank Way, Stony Stratford		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK100	Adj to 2 Market Square, Stony Stratford		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK101	Tattenhoe Park		1310	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK102	33 Stratford Road, Wolverton		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK103	25 Walton Road, Walnut Tree		4	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK104	37 Aylesbury		2	Permission	Already considered suitable

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
	Street, Wolverton				
MK105	49 - 50 Stratford Road, Wolverton		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK106	96 - 97 Stratford Road, Wolverton		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK107	99 Stratford Road, Wolverton		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK108	Land adj 7 Woburn Avenue, Woverton		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK109	Manor Farm, Old Wolverton		5	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK110	Reserve Sites A & D, Hindhead Knoll, Walnut Tree		42	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK111	Central Milton Keynes Site D4, Wyvale Site		100	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK112	Site B1.1 South, North Second Street, Central Milton Keynes		24	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK113	Land at Tattenhoe Bare Farm, Kingsmead		4	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK114	Land Adjacent To 11 Shenley Road, Shenley Church End		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK115	BMG Motors Site, Stony Stratford		45	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK116	Kingsmead South Phase 1		160	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK117	Kingsmead South Phase 3		89	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK118	Kingsmead South Phases 2 & 4		199	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK119	Leisure Centre, Princes Way, Bletchley		230	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK120	Leisure Centre Blocks A & B, Princes Way, Bletchley		15	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK121	Leisure Centre Phase 1, Princes Way, Bletchley		55	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK122	Former First School Site, Westcroft		68	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK124	No 7 and Land rear of 1 - 13 Blenheim Avenue		8	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK125	Former EMEB Office, Wolverton		95	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK126	Land off Walker Avenue, Wolverton Mill East		9	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK127	Broughton Manor Business Park		72	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK128	Site 1 Gyosei Canalside, Willen Park		170	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK129	Oxley Park Site 1		44	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK130	Oxley Park Site 2		238	Local Plan	Already considered suitable



SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
	& 3			Proposal	
MK131	Oxley Park Site 4		56	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK132	Oxley Park Site 5		112	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK133	Oxley Park Site 6		69	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK134	Oxley Park West Phase 2		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK135	Oxley Park West Phase 4		12	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK136	Oxley Park West Phase 6		27	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK137	Oxley Park West Phase 7 & 8		162	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK138	Oxley Park West Phase 9		9	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK139	Oxley Park West Phase 10		12	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK140	Broughton Manor Farm A		111	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK141	Broughton Gate Parcel B		67	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK142	Broughton Gate Parcel C		84	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK143	Broughton Gate Parcel D		116	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK144	Broughton Gate Parcel E		70	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK145	Broughton Manor Farm F		124	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK146	Broughton Gate G1 & G2		73	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK147	Broughton Manor Farm H		76	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK148	Broughton Manor Farm Parcels I1 & I2		191	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK149	Broughton Gate Parcel J		76	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK150	Broughton Gate Parcel K		204	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK151	Broughton Gate Parcel L		73	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK152	Broughton gate Parcel M1 & M1		112	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK153	Newton Leys, Phase 1, George Wimpey		197	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK156	Bramley Grange, Lakes Estate		9	Council identified	Existing Bramley Grange care home would need to be demolished. Could be part of a wider regeneration scheme in local area. No major physical constraints.
MK157	Stantonbury Park Farm		530	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK158	Former Reckitt and Coleman Site		210	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK160	Former Rocla Pipes Site (NEA), Area 1		135	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK161	Former Rocla Pipes Site (NEA), Area 2		123	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK162	Former Rocla		10	Permission	Already considered suitable

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
	Pipes Site (NEA), Area 3				
MK163	Former Rocla Pipes Site (NEA), Area 4		64	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK164	Former Rocla Pipes Site (NEA), Area 5		91	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK165	Wilton Avenue, Bletchley	0.31	9	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK166	Leadenhall adj Woughton Campus	0.16	5	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK167	Middleton Adj Fire Station	0.30	10	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK168	Middleton Griffith Gate Adj Surgery	0.43	11	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK169	Stratford House, Stony Stratford		12	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK170	WEA 10.1 - 10.3		4330	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK171	WEA Area 11		2220	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK172	Wolverton West End (Radcliffe School)		466	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK173	Broughton Infill		5	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK174	Grange Farm Site 8		10	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK175	Great Holm XMC Extension		10	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK176	Monkston Park Selfbuild Plots		14	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK178	Oakgrove		1300	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK179	Intervet, Walton		176	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK180	Newton Leys		1423	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK181	Waterhall School		61	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK182	Residential Quarter Phase 1		650	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK183	Residential Quarter Phase 2		545	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK184	Residential Quarter Phase 3		592	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK185	Residential Quarter Phase 4		143	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK186	Bedgbury Place, Kents Hill		35	NLUD	Site currently awaiting clearance in preparation for sale and development. Housing would be replacement for former student flats. No physical constraints.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
MK187	Wolverton railway works	13.18	264	NLUD	Site constrained by buildings with railway heritage and operational rail line. Some buildings would need to be retained. Existing opporational lease until 2018. Owners will review site aspirations at the end of the lease. Potential development opportunity post 2018.
MK188	Shenley Wood Extra Care		300	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK189	Land adj. Slade Lane, Shearmans, Fullers Slade		37	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK190	Land at Strategic reserves- east MK		2500	Local Plan Proposal	Confirmed by JHDT
MK191	31 Stoke Road, Bletchley		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK192	9 St Davids Road		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK193	Land adj 5 Oxford Street, Bletchley		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK194	Land rear of 28 and 30 Staple Hall Road		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK195	Land adj 64 Bradwell Road, Bradville		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK196	50 Lennon Drive, Crownhill		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK197	Plot 14, Ashford Crescent, Grange Farm		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK198	2 Sheldon Court, Great Holm		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK199	Adj Anglesey Court, Great Holm		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK200	Loughton Site 5		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK201	Adj to 8 Fletchers Mews, Neath Hill		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK202	1A Bradwell Road, New Bradwell		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK203	9A Whaddon Way		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK204	Little stocking, Valley Farm barn		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK205	Shenley Church End F1/G1		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK206	Shenley Lodge W, Rotherford		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK207	Parish Hall, London Road, Stony Stratford		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK208	143 Pettingrew Close, Walnut Tree		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK209	Mill Lane plot (Old House), Woolstone		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK210	9 Verley Clsoe, Woughton on the Green		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK 211	105 Tattenhoe Lane, Bletchley		2	Permission	Already considered suitable

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
MK212	5 North Gate, Bletchley		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK213	College, Sherwood Drive, Bletchley		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK214	R/O 169/171 Queensway		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK215	208 A and B North Row, CMK		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK216	29 Gibbwin, Great Linford		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK217	9 Gibbwin, Great Linford		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK218	Shenley Lodge D2		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK219	16 Belsize Avenue, Springfield		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK220	58 Ashfield, Stantonbury		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK221	Former Library site, Walnut Tree		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK222	29 and 30 Stratford Road, Wolverton		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK223	91 Church Street, Wolverton		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK224	Adj to 1 Rectory Fields		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK225	Site B3.2 North Midsummer Boulevard		3	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK226	The Paddocks, Bradwell road, Loughton		3	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK227	20 Langland Road, Netherfield		3	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK228	Land rear of 226 Wolverton Road, Blakelands		4	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK229	Walnut Tree Reserve site C		4	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK230	Land adj Stonebridge House Farm		5	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK232	The Sidings, Fenny Stratford		12	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK233	Tollgate Cottage, WEA		90	Local Plan Allocation	Already considered suitable
MK234	Community Reserve, Byrd Crescent		13	Refused permission	Within residential area. Existing community reserve. Access possible. No major constraints.
Total Suitable sites- urban area			<b>29,685</b>		

**SHLAA table 2: Suitable Sites- rest of the borough**

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
S1	Church Farm, Sherington	0.33	7	developer promoted	Possible access and archaeological issues
S2	Land at Crofts End, Sherington	1.43	32	developer promoted	implications of ancient monument
S4	Land off Sherington High Street	0.85	19	developer promoted	Large unconstrained field on edge of village. Development of whole area would be out of character with surroundings. Smaller site area assumed.
S5	Land at Water Lane, Sherington	0.91	20	developer promoted	Existing employment use onsite. Existing dwelling within boundary would need to be retained. Development of unkempt yard would improve the appearance of the area.
S6	Land adjacent to 10 Crofts End, Sherington		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
S7	24 Gun Lane, Sherington		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
NC7	Hurst End Farmhouse, North Crawley		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
CS1	Gobby's Field, Castlethorpe	4.95	111	developer promoted	Possible minor archaeological and train noise constraints. Access could be constrained due to links through existing residential areas.
CS2	Land East of Fox Covert Lane, Castlethorpe	4.48	100	developer promoted	Possible noise issues relating to the railway line at the bottom of the site. In an AAL.
CS4	Land off Hanslope Road, Castlethorpe	2.44	55	developer promoted	Potential noise from railway. Slope of the site would affect design. Possible archaeological constraints to consider.
CS5	Land to the South of Maltings Farm, Castlethorpe		23	developer promoted	Potential noise from railway. Two potential access points. Abuts conservation area to the north.
CS7	Land rear of 65 to 67 Station Road, Castlethorpe		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
HN1	Cuckoo Hill Farm yard, Hanslope	0.49	11	developer promoted	Potential archaeological constraints. Need to address access to employment to the rear of the site. Demolition of old and derelict farm buildings required.
HN2	Cuckoo Hill Farm Paddock, Hanslope	2.35	52	developer promoted	No major constraints. Some noise from farm next door and distant railway. Other recent development nearby.
HN3	Land rear of the Globe PH, Hartwell Road, Hanslope	1.2	26	developer promoted	Existing pub still in use. No major constraints on the land to the rear.
HN4	Land at Hanslope, Parcel 1 (Land at Halfway Houses)	1.7	38	developer promoted	Agricultural land. Neighbours small area of large homes. Would connect Hanslope with Halfway Way Houses. Inspector recommended allocation through the Local Plan.
HN5	Land at Hanslope, Parcel 2	9.9	222	developer promoted	Agricultural land. Beyond logical edge of village. However, several potential access points. Abuts conservation area to the west. Archaeological notification site covers large area.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
HN6	Land at Hanslope, Parcel 3	0.7	15	developer promoted	Some barns still in use on the site. Remainder in agricultural use. No significant constraints.
HN7	land at Hanslope, Parcel 4	0.66	14	developer promoted	Agricultural land. No natural boundary to the rear of the site. No significant constraints.
HN8	land and Buildings at Model Farm, Hanslope	0.57	12	developer promoted	Site is still in use, with barns containing livestock, current access is poor and would need improving. Potential archaeological constraints.
HN9	Land at Model farm, Hartwell Road, Long Street, Hanslope	1.44	32	developer promoted	Potential archaeological issues. Development could be out of character with linear nature of the development. Access available from Harwell road. No defined boundary on rear of the site.
HN11	Glebe Farm, Glebe Lane, Hanslope		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
HN12	Land Adjacent To 29/31, Castlethorpe Road, Hanslope		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
HN13	22 Long Street Road, Hanslope		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
HN14	Grange Farm, Higham Cross, Hanslope		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
HN15	New Buildings Farm, Bullington End, Hanslope		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
HN16	The Old Bus Garage, Hanslope		3	Permission	Already considered suitable
HN17	Land off Nevill Close, Hanslope		9	Permission	Already considered suitable
HN18	7 Weavers End, Hanslope		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
HN19	Land off Nevill Close- additional pot		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
HN21	Cuckoo Hill Far, Hanslope		14	Permission	Already considered suitable
SG1	Maltings Close, Stoke Goldington	3.3	74	developer promoted	Site area amended- part of site has no relationship to village. May need highway improvements. Part of AAL.
SG2	Ram Alley, Stoke Goldington	3.47	78	developer promoted	Impact on listed building to be considered. Undulating land and lack of good access points to be addressed.
SG3	Westside Lane, Stoke Goldington	0.55	12	developer promoted	Possible archaeological issues and would need some demolition of old barns.
SG4	Land at Stoke Goldington	2	45	developer promoted	Site boundary amended- part of site has no relationship with the village. In AAL. Some demolition of old barns necessary.
SG5	Land at Malting Close, Stoke Goldington	1.86	41	developer promoted	Potential archaeology and location of sands and gravel. In AAL. Access available from Malting Close but potential ransom strip.
SG6	Land to rear of Tower End Crescent, Stoke Goldington	2.3	51	developer promoted	Possible issues with archaeology. In AAL. Extends a significant distance from village centre. No major constraints.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
SG9	Land off High Street, Stoke Goldington	0.89	20	developer promoted	No significant constraints. Would require access form the High Street.
SG11	land to the west of Dag Lane, Stoke Goldington	0.68	15	developer promoted	Access issues form Dagg Lane would need to be resolved. Also possible effects on a listed property and archaeological site. No major constraints.
SG12	Home Close, Church Lane, Stoke Goldington	4.06	91	developer promoted	Possible archaeological issues. Site in current use as paddocks, existing barns would need demolishing. Options for access. No major constraints
SG13	Orchard Way, Stoke Goldington	2.5	56	developer promoted	Possible issues with archaeology and slight slope on site. Access possible. No major constraints.
SG14	22 High Street, Stoke Goldington		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
SG15	Church Farm Unit 1, Stoke Goldington		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
SG16	Church Farm Unit 2, Stoke Goldington		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
SG17	Lodge Farm, Purse Lane, Stoke Goldington		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
SG18	Bulls Head Farm, Stoke Goldington		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
SG19	Land off Town End Cres, Harley Field Barn		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
CA3	Barns 1 & 2, Calverton Manor Farm, Calverton		2	permission	Already considered suitable
CA4	Barn 3, Calverton Manor farm		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
LV1	Lavendon Garage, Olney Road, Lavendon	0.14	5	NLUD	Access, conservation and potentially low risk contamination issues to be resolved from previously refused application. Principle of residential development accepted. Availability confirmed by owner.
LV2	Land at Olney Road, Lavendon	1.335	30	developer promoted	In AAL. Conservation area and archaeological site to the north. Access available.
LV3	Land North of Lodge Farm, Lavendon	0.54	12	developer promoted	Access available. Near conservation area. No major constraints to development.
LV4	Land adjacent to Northampton Road, Lavendon	1	22	developer promoted	10-15% of site in area of flood risk. Adjacent to archaeological notification site. Potential access from north row. No major constraints.
LV5	Land adjacent to 'The Glebe', Lavendon	3.46	77	developer promoted	Issues relating to a ransom strip on the only logical access point. Agricultural land. No other major constraints.
LV6	Land off Olney Road, Lavendon	2.6	58	developer promoted	Electricity pylons a major constraint. Would need to be re-routed or planned into layout of development. In AAL. Constraints could be overcome through effective design.
LV7	Land at Northampton Road, Lavendon	2.75	61	developer promoted	Lack of access would need to be addressed- but opportunities to do so. Agricultural land bounded by housing.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
LV8	Paddock Field, New Row, Lavendon	0.53	13	developer promoted	Site in use as a paddock. Good potential access point. No major constraints. Could facilitate access to LV7
LV10	Barns at Lavendon Mill, Lavendon		1	permission	Already considered suitable
LV11	112 to 114 Olney Road, Lavendon		2	permission	Already considered suitable
LV12	80 Olney Road, Lavendon		1	permission	Already considered suitable
LV13	26 Castle Road, Lavendon		1	permission	Already considered suitable
LV14	Castle Farm, Lavendon		2	permission	Already considered suitable
LV15	Lavendon Mill, Coney Hutch, Lavendon		1	permission	Already considered suitable
LV17	74 Lavendon road		4	Permission	Already considered suitable
AST3	7 & 8 Turvey Road, Astwood		2	permission	Already considered suitable
AST4	Lum Reek, Turvey Road, Astwood		1	permission	Already considered suitable
AST5	Three Willows, Turvey Road, Astwood		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
CR2	Costerpits Barn, Clifton Reynes		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
CR3	Whitelands Shed, Clifton Reynes		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
NB3	Old Rectory, High Street, Newton Blossomville		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
NB4	Riverview Barn, Newton Blossomville		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
NB5	Land adj to 3 and 4 Clifton road, Newton Blossomville		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
RA1	Yew Tree Farm, Stoke Goldington Road, Ravenstone		5	Permission	Already considered suitable
RA2	Chestnut Cottage, Ravenstone		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
RA3	Horseshoe Farm, Ravenstone		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
WU1	Flamingo Zoological Gardens, Olney Road, Weston Underwood		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
WU2	Land off Ravenstone Road, Weston Underwood		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
GA1	Land at Newport Road, Gayhurst		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
GA2	Reading Room, Park Farm, Gayhurst		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
HA1	Haversham Grange Barn, Haversham		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
WA1	New Pastures Farm, Warrington		1	Permission	Already considered suitable



SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
OL1	Land off Aspreys, Olney	9.67	169	developer promoted	The site would break a logical boundary to Olney, however the school already in part establishes this as acceptable
OL2	Land off Whirley Pit Roundabout, Olney	4.47	117	developer promoted	The site is separated from the residential area of Olney by an industrial park and sewage works. Isolated from other housing areas.
OL5	Land South of Lavendon Road, Olney	1.3	30	developer promoted	Larger site (8.2ha) - flood risk issues. Suitable area reduced to 1.3ha. In AAL. Sand and gravel deposits present. Access available.
OL6	Land North of Lavendon Road, Olney	0.6	15	developer promoted	Possible issues with archaeology. Separated from settlement boundary but linked by OL5 in the same ownership.
OL8	Brocks Garage, Olney		8	Permission	Already considered suitable
OL9	51 Midland Road, Olney		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
OL10	13 Midland Road, Olney		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
OL11	Land adj to 94 Weston Rd, Olney		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
OL12	Land at Corner of Lavendon Road, Olney		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
OL13	Land rear of 43 High Street, Olney		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
OL14	Land to rear of 26 High Street		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
OL15	The Old Fire Station, Olney		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
OL16	Austen Avenue, Olney		26	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
OL17	East Street Site 1, Olney		42	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
OL20	Town Farm, West Street, Olney		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
NP6	Land at Tickford Fields Farm, Newport Pagnell (SRS Site)	22	385	Council Identified	The site is a strategic reserve site. Total dwgs covers sites NP6 and NP6i. In AAL. Potential archaeological issues. Access available from Tickford Street. No major constraints
NP6i	Tickford Fields Farm, Newport Pagnell	11.89		developer promoted	Part of NP6- separate ownerships. Flooding issues on part of the site would need to be resolved- reliant on development of southern half of NP6 for access. In AAL.
NP7	City House, North Crawley Road, Newport Pagnell	1.98	69	Council Identified	The land is owned by the Council, and the warehouses, office block and refuse site are all still in use. Part of existing Strategic Reserve area.
NP9	Newport Pagnell Police Station	0.592	15	developer promoted	Still in use, however Thames Valley Police would vacate if another site was found to accommodate both Newport and Wolverton stations. The site would need considerable demolition, and also carries potential archaeological and Conservation issues.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
NP10	Land at Little Linford Lane, Newport Pagnell	19.68	344	developer promoted	Distant from any other residential area and separated from Newport Pagnell by the M1. Access to the site is poor, as it is only accessible from Little Linford Lane. In AAL. Noise level from M1 is high.
NP11	Portfields Farm, Newport Pagnell	12.7	222	developer promoted	Access to the southern part of the site could be difficult. Noise from the M1 could constraint development. Access road to north of site likely to need upgrading. Notable species on site. In AAL. Large spinney on part of the site.
NP12	Land adjacent to 17 London Road, Newport Pagnell		1	permission	Already considered suitable
NP13	No 3 High Street, Newport Pagnell		1	permission	Already considered suitable
NP14	59-61 High Street, Newport Pagnell		2	permission	Already considered suitable
NP15	Taylor's Mustard Factory, Union Street, Newport Pagnell		5	Local Plan Proposal	Site in state of disrepair. Ongoing discussion regarding improvements. Confirmed by JHDT
NP16	38 High Street, Newport Pagnell		2	permission	Already considered suitable
NP17	Former Post Office, 69 - 71 High Street, Newport Pagnell		2	permission	Already considered suitable
NP18	Cottages at Wepener, 23 London Road, Newport Pagnell		2	permission	Already considered suitable
NP19	Kickles Lodge, Newport Pagnell		1	permission	Already considered suitable
NP20	Land to the rear of 50 High Street, The Cannon, Newport Pagnell		3	permission	Already considered suitable
NP21	23 Wolverton Road, Newport Pagnell		2	permission	Already considered suitable
NP22	Green End Farm, Newport Pagnell		22	permission	Already considered suitable
NP23	Yard Off Taylor's & Post Office, Newport Pagnell		6	permission	Already considered suitable
NP24	Land to the rear of 72 - 84 Wolverton Road, Newport Pagnell		12	permission	Already considered suitable
NP25	Aston Martin Site, Newport Pagnell		105	NLUD	Outline permission for housing granted 2008. Some constraints due to historic buildings. Site unavailable due to sale to current application for retail development.
NP26	D J C Autos Site, Newport Pagnell		5	Permission	Already considered suitable
NP29	69-71 High Street, Newport Pagnell		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
NP30	Pagnell Grange extension, Newport Pagnell		49	Permission	Already considered suitable

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
NP31	Adj to 40 Annesley Road		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
BB1	Land at Rectory Farm, Bow Brickhill	0.19	5	developer promoted	Could be more suitable if put forward with site BB2. Good relationship with surrounding residential use.
BB2	Land off Edwin Close, Bow Brickhill	1.09	24	developer promoted	Would be more suitable if brought forward in conjunction with BB1. Some possible issues caused by footpaths and Anglian Water pump house, however the site was recommended by the inspector at the Local Plan inquiry.
BB7	Blind Pond Farm, Bow Brickhill		25	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
BB8	11 Church Road, Bow Brickhill		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
LB7	Garage, Watling Street, Little Brickhill	0.6	13	NLUD	Small workshop still in use. Site generally run down. Conservation issues to be taken into account in design. Potential contamination from former use. Ownership unconfirmed.
LB8	Land at Tall Timbers and Pine Haven, Little Brickhill		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
HA2	16 Chalmers Avenue, Haversham		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
WS3	Nampak PLC, Woburn Sands		134	Permission	Already considered suitable
WS4	8 Spring Grove, Woburn Sands		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
WS5	9 Spring Grove, Woburn Sands		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
WS6	Station Road/West Road, Woburn Sands		5	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
WS7	Nampak Phase 3, Woburn Sands		121	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
WS8	521 Newport Road, Woburn Sands		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
<b>Total Suitable sites- rest of the borough</b>			<b>3,637</b>		

**SHLAA table 3: Suitable sites- potential expansion areas**

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
Ex1	South east SDA	365	4,800	developer promoted	Issues with coalescence with rural villages to be addressed. Part of site is an existing golf course with landscape character value. Treatment would need to be considered. Access to and within the site will need to be considered but general connections to the area are good and no significant infrastructure would be needed (in addition to that within the development). SEP requirement for 4,800 home in this area tested through growth study and capacity study. More specific individual constraints in a-j below. Total covers whole area-areas below also promoted separately within SE SDA. Included for clarity.
EX1a	Wavendon Golf Centre	54.29	950	developer promoted	Numerous listed buildings to be considered. Currently used as a golf course therefore landscape impact needs to be considered. No other significant constraints to development noted
Ex1b	Land at Lower End Road, Wavendon	1.4	31	developer promoted	No constraints identified. Near listed buildings that would need to be considered during any development
Ex1d	Smith Stuart Reynolds Site 1, Wavendon	9.1	136	developer promoted	Currently pasture land. Possible protection issues on a row of trees. 6 notable bird species. No other constraints identified.
Ex1f	Land South of A421, Wavendon	14.2	249	developer promoted	Site area reduced as partly covered by EX1a. Some limited farm buildings. No other constraints identified.
Ex1g	Land South of Wavendon, East of Woburn Sands	71.74	1256	developer promoted	Limited areas of AAL and wildlife corridor would have to be factored in to any development. Part of site is strategic reserve form the Local Plan. Area removed for double counting.
Ex1h	Land at Newport Road	9.5	166	developer promoted	Adjacent to employment land designation. No significant constraints.
Ex1j	Land either side of Cranfield Road, Woburn Sands	41.3	722	developer promoted	Majority of land bounds Woburn Sands- issues with coalescence will need to be addressed. Listed building at Deeth Farm and one protected species on site.
Ex2	Land at WEA (Fairfield Expansion)	54.9	823	developer promoted	Land is beyond a boundary planned as a long term edge to Milton Keynes. Potential coalescence with Calverton and Wealds villages. Potential access issues from Milton Keynes due to planned WEA. Development would be long term due to need to complete WEA first.
Ex3	Land at Eaton Leys	110.4	1656	developer promoted	Over half the site is outside of the Milton Keynes city boundary, additional capacity in AVDC land (subject to their assessment) ????. Wildlife issues to address- inc 18 notable species. Wildlife corridors on site and a limited amount of floodplain land to incorporate.
Ex4	Lavente Gate	74	1110	developer promoted	Well over half the site is outside of the Milton Keynes city boundary. Potentially additional capacity in AVDC area of ????. Separated from urban area by EX3- therefore would be long term proposal. Partly within an AAL. Potential Landscape issues to address.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
Ex5	Shenley Dens	29.5	516	developer promoted	Access issues as it would require an extension to an existing grid road. Over a landscape ridge- development could have detrimental landscape impacts. Would need a much closer examination to determine landscape impacts. Near land of ecological value.
Ex6	North West & South East of Salford Rd	175	3062	developer promoted	These figures are for only half of the site, as the other half lies outside the Milton Keynes boundary. Total figure for site including land outside MK boundary = 8150 dws. Issues regarding access (crossing M1). Likelihood of minerals throughout the site. Some flood constraints. Low landscape quality but potential issues of coalescence and views to/from local villages. Notable bird species present.
Ex8	Land North of Wolverton Road, South of Hanson Environmental Centre	8.4	189	developer promoted	Flooding issues to be addressed on part of the site, as could possible affects on Linford Lakes. In an AAL and a biological notification site. Notable species of the badger to be protected.
Ex9	South of Newport Pagnell, Lovat Park	280	5000	developer promoted	Issues around flooding on over half of the site area. Also constraints with links to Milton Keynes and potential impact junction 14 of the M1. Part covered by area of current mineral extraction.
EX11	Bellow Hill Farm, Bow Brickhill	110.12	1927	developer promoted	Concern of coalescence of Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands and railway line could be argued as natural boundary to the city. Issues with access across the rail line.
Ex11a	Part of Below Hill Farm, Bow Brickhill	6.6	99	developer promoted	Reliant on EX11 being developed as it is an isolated site. Used as agricultural land. No major constraints.
EX11b	Development Site, Bow Brickhill	5.5	96	developer promoted	Reliant on EX11 being developed. Currently used as paddocks and nursery. Some associated buildings and structures. No other significant constraints.
EX11c	Development site 2, Bow Brickhill	16.8	294	Developer promoted	Reliant on EX11 being developed. Agricultural land. No major constraints.
<b>Total Suitable sites- potential future expansion areas</b>			<b>20,607</b>		

**SHLAA table 4: Sites assessed as unsuitable**

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
MK1	land off Calverton Road, Stony Stratford	1.7	44	developer promoted	Ruled out- flood risk area. Site is within linear park extension.
S3	Land at rear of School Lane, Sherington	1.8	40	developer promoted	Ruled out as there are no clear access points to the site.
CS3	Land to North of Lodge Farm Court, Castlethorpe	2.53	56	developer promoted	Ruled out as the site is too narrow and thin to practically fit houses on.
CS6	Former goods yard, Castlethorpe	0.38	8	NLUD	Site ruled out as the site is too small and is sloping and would therefore not be suitable for residential development
OL3	Land off Warrington Road, Olney	3.2	84	developer promoted	Ruled out as there is no good access to the site and there are several physical constraints including the width of the site and the landscaping and potential drainage issues.
OL4	Land adjacent to Yardley Road, Olney	4		developer promoted	Ruled out as there is no clear access to the site and there are several physical constraints relating to the topography of the site. The site is separated from the residential area of Olney by an industrial area,
NP2	Land North of H3, Newport Pagnell	8.38	146	developer promoted	Ruled out-60-70% of site in area of flood risk.
NP3	Land at London Road, Newport Pagnell	0.45		developer promoted	Ruled out because of flood risk
NP4	Land at Willen Road, Newport Pagnell	1.09		developer promoted	Ruled out because of flood risk
NP10	Land at Little Linford Lane, Newport Pagnell		344	Developer promoted	Ruled out- poor access, poor relationship with urban area, landscape and noise issues.
MK10	Belvedere Farm, Fenny Stratford			Developer promoted	Ruled out, as the entire site is located within zone 3 flood designation and the area is designated as linear park extension due to these flooding issues.
BB5	Land south of Bow Brickhill	3.5	78	developer promoted	Ruled out as there is no direct access to the site, and no relationship with existing village.
WS2	Land east of station crossing, Woburn Sands	0.38	9	NLUD	Ruled out as the site is too small, narrow and close to the railway for residential development.
Ex7	Land South of Caldecotte Lake, In between A5 and Brickhill Street	30		developer promoted	Ruled out as land is designated as linear park extension in the Local Plan
MK123	Wolverton Mill, North of Stratford Road			developer promoted	Ruled out as approximately 70% of the greenfield site is within a flood risk zone

**SHLAA table 5: Sites ruled out of the assessment**

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions
NC1	Land at Folly Lane, North Crawley	0.42	9	developer promoted	Ruled out as the site is separate from the village boundary.
NC2	Land adjacent to 45 High Street, North Crawley	0.13		developer promoted	Ruled out as the site is too small to provide enough houses to be above the SHLAA threshold of 5.
NC3	Land adjacent to 4 Chicheley Road, North Crawley	0.07		developer promoted	Ruled out as the site is too small to provide enough houses to be above the SHLAA threshold of 5.
NC4	Land adjacent to 17 High Street, North Crawley	0.05		developer promoted	Ruled out as the site is too small to provide enough houses to be above the SHLAA threshold of 5.
NC5	Land adjacent to 1 High Street, North Crawley	0.064		developer promoted	Ruled out as the site is too small to provide enough houses to be above the SHLAA threshold of 5.
NC6	Land adjacent to 1 Folly Lane, North Crawley	0.045		developer promoted	Ruled out as the site is too small to provide enough houses to be above the SHLAA threshold of 5.
CA1	Land at Lower Weald, Calverton	0.5	11	developer promoted	Site ruled out. Outside of study parameters
CA2	Kestrel View Stables, Middle weald, Calverton	3.4	76	developer promoted	Site ruled out- outside of the study parameters. However included as part of EX2
LV9	Land adjacent to A428, Lavendon	12		developer promoted	Ruled out as the site is isolated from existing development, and would require other land which has not been put forward to be developed first.
AST1	Land at Elm Hall, Astwood	1.05	23	developer promoted	Ruled out- outside the scope of the study.
AST2	Land adjacent to 3 Cranfield Road, Astwood	0.08		developer promoted	ruled out as the site is too small to provide enough houses to be above the SHLAA threshold of 5.
CR1	Land at the Robin Hood PH, Clifton Reynes	1	22	developer promoted	Ruled out- outside the scope of the study.
NB1	Land at Newton Blossomville, p11	2.36	53	developer promoted	Ruled out- outside the scope of the study.
NB2	Land at Newton Blossomville, p9	0.97	21	developer promoted	Ruled out- outside the scope of the study.
OL7	Part of Pheasants Nest Farm, Land to West of Olney	1.75		developer promoted	Ruled out as the site is isolated from existing development. Would require other land which has not been included in the assessment to be developed first.
NP5	Far Farm (Land West of A509), Newport Pagnell	30.44		developer promoted	Ruled out as the site is completely separated from existing developed area.
NP8	Land North of Newport Pagnell	18.54		developer promoted	Ruled out as the site is completely separated from existing developed area.
MK14	Oold cinema & 66 Stratford Road, Wolverton	0.12	4	NLUD	Ruled out as the site is too small to provide enough houses to be above the SHLAA threshold of 5.
MK15	Demolished House, Mill lane, Woolstones	0.3	10	NLUD	Ruled out- Existing planning permission in place. Also in flood risk area.
MK16	Wheelspan Garage, Watling Terrace, Fenny Stratford	0.08	2	NLUD	Ruled out as the site is too small to provide enough houses to be above the SHLAA threshold of 5
LB1	Land off Watling Street, Little Brickhill	0.8	18	developer promoted	Ruled out as it is outside the scope of the study
LB2	Bidwells Site A, Little Brickhill	0.244	7	developer promoted	Ruled out as it is outside the scope of the study
LB3	Bidwells Site B (Land adjacent to Warren Farm), Little Brickhill	0.21	6	developer promoted	Ruled out as it is outside the scope of the study
LB4	Bidwells Site C, Little Brickhill	0.75	16	developer promoted	Ruled out as it is outside the scope of the study
LB5	Bidwells Site D, Little Brickhill	0.08	2	developer promoted	Ruled out as it is outside the scope of the study

LB6	Bidwells Site E, Little Brickhill	0.25	7	developer promoted	Ruled out as it is outside the scope of the study
EM1	2 Harvey Drive, Emberton	0.41	9	developer promoted	Ruled out as outside of the scope of the assessment.
EM2	Emberton Site C	0.14	4	NLUD	Ruled out as the site is too small to provide enough houses to be above the SHLAA threshold of 5.
H2	Land at Haversham Hill, Haversham	20.8	624	Developer promoted	Ruled out- outside of study parameters.
SG7	Land opposite Tower End Crescent, Stoke Goldington	1.6	36	developer promoted	Ruled out- duplicate site. Covered by SG4
SG8	Land opposite Home Close Stable, Stoke Goldington	0.44	9	developer promoted	Ruled out- no relationship to existing settlement boundary.
SG10	Land to the rear of Mount Pleasant, Stoke Goldington	1.37	25	developer promoted	Ruled out- no relationship to existing settlement boundary.
EX10	Paddocks Lane, Woburn Sands	69.4	1214	developer promoted	Ruled out- covered by EX 11 and EX11c
Ex1e	Smith Stuart Reynolds Site 2, Wavendon	5	131	developer promoted	Ruled out- covered by Ex1G
Ex1c	Vandyke Close, Woburn Sands	2.6	78	developer promoted	Ruled out- covered by EX1J
Ex1i	Land west of Newport Road, between Woburn Sands and Wavendon	4.7	105	developer promoted	Ruled out- covered by Ex1G



**SHLAA Table 6: Sites confirmed as unavailable**

<b>SHLAA Ref No.</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>NO of DWGS</b>	<b>Conclusions/constraints</b>
MK33	Land To Rear of No 1-11, North Street, Bletchley	10	Applicant not continuing with application due to council covenant, site is therefore not available
MK187	Wolverton railway works	264	Active use on site. Lease runs until 2018. Unavailable until then and potentially beyond.
MK 234	Community reserve Byrd Crescent, Wavendon Gate	13	Land owner no intention of pursuing residential development

**SHLAA table 7: Urban area- available deliverable and developable sites**

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info From
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
MK3	Former Gas Works Site, Stony Stratford	15		15		Proforma
MK4	Wolverton Police Station	5		5		Pro Forma
MK5	Former BP Garage, New Bradwell	18		18		Pro Forma
MK6	Warren Farm, Wolverton Mill	107		107		Pro Forma and letter
MK7	Car parking off Silbury Boulevard, opposite Next, CMK	160			160	Pro Forma
MK8	Car parking adjacent to John Lewis, CMK	200			200	Pro Forma
MK9	Food Centre, CMK	250			250	Pro Forma/email
MK11	Windmill Hill Golf Course	65		65		Pro Forma
MK12	Albert Street Car Park and Enigma Pub Site, Bletchley	40		40		Pro Forma
MK13	Briar Lodge and Snowberry Close, Stacey Bushes	65	65			Pro Forma
MK17	Ashland Phase 2	208	208			confirmed by applicant via telephone call
MK19	Bletchley College, Sherwood Drive	97	97			Confirmed by JHDT
MK20	Bletchley Park	64	64			Confirmed by JHDT
MK21	Bletchley Park Phase 2	26	26			Confirmed by JHDT
MK24	Shenley House Hotel, Bletchley	12	12			confirmed by applicant via telephone call
MK25	Land at London Road, Broughton	24	24			confirmed by applicant via telephone call
MK27	Campbell Park Phase 1	252	252			confirmed by applicant via telephone call
MK29	Bong, Stratford Road, Wolverton	16	16			confirmed by applicant via letter
MK30	Wolverton Park Sports Ground, Wolverton	300	300			confirmed by agent via letter
MK31	Bracken House, Beanhill	15	15			confirmed by agent via letter
MK32	128 Western Road, Bletchley	5	5			confirmed by applicant via telephone call
MK34	Land at Claridge Drive, Middleton	115	115			confirmed by housing JHDT
MK35	Lathams Buildbase	75		75		confirmed by applicant via letter
MK36	Off Penn Road, Bletchley	30		30		confirmed by applicant via letter
Mk37	Former Nursing Home, Mavoncliff Drive, Tattenhoe	21	21			confirmed by applicant via telephone call
MK38	Site 29 Off Hengistbury Lane, Tattenhoe	5	5			confirmed by applicant via letter
Mk39	Former Post Office Depot, Church Street, Wolverton	24	24			confirmed by applicant via letter

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info From
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
MK40	Peek Developments Ltd, McConnell Drive, Wolverton	14	14			confirmed by applicant via letter, currently selling to housing association
MK58	Campbell Park Remainder	2040	100	1160	780	Confirmed by JHDT
MK59	Central Milton Keynes Site B3	16	16			Confirmed by JHDT
MK60	Central Milton Keynes Site C4.2/3/4	140		140		Confirmed by JHDT
MK61	Central Milton Keynes YMCA	254		214	40	Confirmed by JHDT
MK62	CMK Station 1, central Milton Keynes	470			470	Confirmed by JHDT/email
MK64	D3.3/D3.4, Central Milton Keynes	200			200	Confirmed by JHDT/email
MK65	Xscape, Central Milton Keynes	100			100	Confirmed by JHDT/email
MK66	Former School Site, Shenley Brook End	32	32			Confirmed by JHDT
MK67	West of Redbridge, Stantonbury	85	40	45		Confirmed by JHDT
MK81	Land at Brooklands, Eastern Expansion Area	2501	350	1500	651	confirmed by JHDT
MK101	Tattenhoe Park	1310	300	966	44	confirmed by agent via email
MK110	Reserve Sites A & D, Hindhead Knoll, Walnut Tree	42	42			confirmed by agent via telephone call
MK111	Central Milton Keynes Site D4, Wyvale Site	100		100		confirmed by JHDT
MK112	Site B1.1 South, North Second Street, Central Milton Keynes	24		24		confirmed by agent via telephone call- is reliant on attracting funding.
MK115	BMG Motors Site, Stony Stratford	45	45			confirmed by JHDT
MK116	Kingsmead South Phase 1	160	72	88		Confirmed by JHDT
MK117	Kingsmead South Phase 3	89	36	53		Confirmed by JHDT
MK118	Kingsmead South Phases 2 & 4	199	120	79		confirmed by applicant via letter and by JHDT
MK119	Leisure Centre, Princes Way, Bletchley	230	150	80		confirmed by agent via letter
MK120	Leisure Centre Blocks A & B, Princes Way, Bletchley	15	15			confirmed by JHDT
MK121	Leisure Centre Phase 1, Princes Way, Bletchley	55	55			Confirmed by JHDT
MK122	Former First School Site, Westcroft	68	68			Confirmed by JHDT
MK125	Former EMEB Office, Wolverton	95	95			confirmed by owner via telephone call
MK126	Land off Walker Avenue, Wolverton Mill East	9	9			confirmed by applicant via telephone call
MK127	Broughton Manor Business Park	72	72			confirmed by owner via telephone call
MK128	Site 1 Gyosei Canalside, Willen Park	170	170			confirmed by owner via telephone call

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info From
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
MK129	Oxley Park Site 1	44	44			construction confirmed by agent via telephone call, figures confirmed by site visits.
MK130	Oxley Park Site 2 & 3	238	148	90		confirmed by JHDT
MK131	Oxley Park Site 4	56		56		confirmed by JHDT
MK132	Oxley Park Site 5	112	20	92		confirmed by JHDT
MK133	Oxley Park Site 6	69	69			confirmed by landowners by telephone call
MK134	Oxley Park West Phase 2	2	2			Confirmed by owner via telephone call
MK135	Oxley Park West Phase 4	12	12			Confirmed by JHDT
MK136	Oxley Park West Phase 6	27	27			Confirmed by JHDT
MK137	Oxley Park West Phase 7 & 8	162	162			Confirmed by developer by telephone call
MK138	Oxley Park West Phase 9	9	9			Confirmed by developer by telephone call
MK139	Oxley Park West Phase 10	12	12			Confirmed by JHDT
MK140	Broughton Manor Farm A	111	111			confirmed by JHDT
MK141	Broughton Gate Parcel B	67	67			confirmed by owners via telephone call
MK142	Broughton Gate Parcel C	84	84			Confirmed by JHDT
MK143	Broughton Gate Parcel D	116	116			confirmed by owners via letter
MK144	Broughton Gate Parcel E	70	70			confirmed by owners via letter
MK145	Broughton Manor Farm F	124	124			Confirmed by developer by telephone call
MK146	Broughton Gate G1 & G2	73	73			Confirmed by developer by telephone call
MK147	Broughton Manor Farm H	76	76			confirmed by owners via letter
MK148	Broughton Manor Farm Parcels I1 & I2	191	191			Confirmed by JHDT
MK149	Broughton Gate Parcel J	76	76			Confirmed by JHDT
MK150	Broughton Gate Parcel K	204	204			Confirmed by developer by telephone call
MK151	Broughton Gate Parcel L	73	73			confirmed by owners via letter
MK152	Broughton gate Parcel M1 & M1	112		112		Confirmed by JHDT
MK153	Newton Leys, Phase 1, George Wimpey	197	197			confirmed by applicant via telephone call
MK156	Bramley Grange, Lakes Estate	9		9		Pro Forma
MK157	Stantonbury Park Farm	530	425	105		Confirmed by lead developer via telephone call
MK158	Former Reckitt and Coleman Site	210	210			confirmed by JHDT
MK160	Former Rocla Pipes Site (NEA), Area 1	135	70	65		confirmed by JHDT

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info From
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
MK161	Former Rocla Pipes Site (NEA), Area 2	123	123			confirmed by JHDT
MK162	Former Rocla Pipes Site (NEA), Area 3	10	10			confirmed by JHDT
MK163	Former Rocla Pipes Site (NEA), Area 4	64	64			confirmed by JHDT
MK164	Former Rocla Pipes Site (NEA), Area 5	91	91			confirmed by JHDT
MK170	WEA 10.1 - 10.3	4330	570	2250	1510	confirmed by JHDT
MK171	WEA Area 11	2220		1374	846	Confirmed by JHDT
MK172	Wolverton West End (Radcliffe School)	466	50	350	66	confirmed by JHDT
MK173	Broughton Infill	5	5			confirmed by JHDT
MK174	Grange Farm Site 8	10	10			confirmed by JHDT
MK175	Great Holm XMC Extension	10	10			Potential site for affordable housing. Confirmed by owner.
MK176	Monkston Park Selfbuild Plots	14	14			confirmed by JHDT
MK178	Oakgrove	1300	400	900		confirmed by JHDT
MK179	Intervet, Walton	176	120	56		Site on market. Current uncertainty about timescale for development. Updated using JHDT figures
MK180	Newton Leys	1423	129	850	444	confirmed by JHDT
MK181	Waterhall School	61	61			Confirmed by owner. Market reasons holding back progress.
MK182	Residential Quarter Phase 1	650	340	310		confirmed by JHDT
MK183	Residential Quarter Phase 2	545		545		confirmed by JHDT
MK184	Residential Quarter Phase 3	592		450	142	confirmed by JHDT
MK185	Residential Quarter Phase 4	143			143	confirmed by JHDT
MK186	Bedgbury Place, Kents Hill	35	35			Confirmed by owner via email
MK188	Shenley Wood Extra Care	300	100	200		Confirmed by JHDT
MK189	Land adj. Slade Lane, Shearmans, Fullers Slade	37	37			confirmed by JHDT
MK190	Strategic Reserve sites- east MK	2500		1800	700	Confirmed by JHDT
MK232	The Sidings, Fenny Stratford	12	12			Site Visit- under construction
MK233	Tollgate Cottage, WEA	90	90			Confirmed by JHDT
Many	Available sites under 5 dwellings <sup>10</sup>	61	61			Various
<b>Urban area- Total Available sites</b>		<b>29,218</b>	<b>8054</b>	<b>14,418</b>	<b>6,746</b>	

<sup>10</sup> For a full list of sites see appendix 6.

**SHLAA Table 8: Rest of the borough- available deliverable and developable sites**

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info from
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
S1	Church Farm, Sherington	7		7		Proforma
S2	Land at Crofts End, Sherington	32		32		Proforma
S4	Land off Sherington High Street	19		19		Proforma
S5	Land at Water Lane, Sherington	20		20		Proforma
S6	Land Adjacent to 10 Crofts End, Sherington	1	1			Site visit- under construction
S7	24 Gun Lane, Sherington	1	1			Site visit- under construction
CS1	Gobby's Field, Castlethorpe	111			111	Proforma
CS2	Land East of Fox Covert Lane, Castlethorpe	100		100		Proforma
CS4	Land off Hanslope Road, Castlethorpe	55		55		Proforma
CS5	Land to the South of Maltings Farm, Castlethorpe	23		23		Proforma
NC7	Hurst End Farm House, North Crawley	2	2			Site visit- under construction
HN1	Cuckoo Hill Farm yard, Hanslope	11		11		Proforma
HN2	Cuckoo Hill Farm Paddock, Hanslope	52		52		Proforma
HN3	Land rear of the Globe PH, Hartwell Road, Hanslope	26		26		Proforma
HN4	Land at Hanslope, Parcel 1 (Land at Halfway Houses)	38		38		Proforma
HN5	Land at Hanslope, Parcel 2	222		222		Proforma
HN6	Land at Hanslope, Parcel 3	15		15		Proforma
HN7	land at Hanslope, Parcel 4	14		14		Proforma
HN8	land and Buildings at Model Farm, Hanslope	12		12		Proforma
HN9	Land at Model farm, Hartwell Road, Long Street, Hanslope	32			32	Proforma
HN11	Glebe Farm, Glebe Lane, Hanslope	1	1			Site visit- under construction
HN12	Land adjacent to 29/31 Castlethorpe Road	1	1			Site visit- under construction
HN15	New Buildings Farm, Bullington End, Hanslope	1	1			confirmed by agent via letter
HN17	Land off Nevill Close, Hanslope	9	9			confirmed by agent via telephone call

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info from
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
HN20	Spinney Lodge Farm, Hanslope	1	1			Site visit- under construction
HN21	Cuckhoo Hill Farm, Hanslope	14	14			Site visit- under construction
SG1	Maltings Close, Stoke Goldington	74		74		Proforma
SG2	Ram Alley, Stoke Goldington	78		78		Proforma
SG3	Westside Lane, Stoke Goldington	12		12		Proforma
SG4	Land at Stoke Goldington	45		45		Proforma
SG5	Land at Malting Close, Stoke Goldington	41		41		Proforma
SG6	Land to rear of Tower End Crescent, Stoke Goldington	51		51		Proforma
SG9	Land off High Street, Stoke Goldington	20		20		Proforma
SG11	land to the west of Dag Lane, Stoke Goldington	15		15		Proforma
SG12	Home Close, Church Lane, Stoke Goldington	91		91		Proforma
SG13	Orchard Way, Stoke Goldington	56		56		Proforma
SG15	Church Farm, Unit 1, Stoke Goldington	1	1			Site visit- under construction
SG18	Bulls Head Farm, Stoke Goldington	1	1			Site visit- under construction
SG19	Land off Town End Cres, Harley Field Barn	1	1			Site visit- under construction
CA3	Barns 1 & 2, Calverton Manor Farm, Calverton	2	2			Proforma
LV1	Lavendon Garage, Olney Road, Lavendon	5	5			confirmed by owner via telephone call
LV2	Land at Olney Road, Lavendon	30		30		Proforma
LV3	Land North of Lodge Farm, Lavendon	12		12		Proforma
LV4	Land adjacent to Northampton Road, Lavendon	22		22		Proforma
LV5	Land adjacent to 'The Glebe', Lavendon	77		77		Proforma
LV6	Land off Olney Road, Lavendon	58		58		Proforma
LV7	Land at Northampton Road, Lavendon	61		61		Proforma
LV8	Paddock Field, New Row, Lavendon	13		13		Proforma
LV12	80 Olney Road, Lavendon	1	1			confirmed by agent via letter
LV14	Castle Farm, Lavendon	2	2			confirmed by agent via letter

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info from
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
LV16	Barns at Lavendon Mill, Lavendon	1	1			Site visit- under construction
AST3	7 & 8 Turvey Road, Astwood	2	2			confirmed by agent via letter
AST4	Lum Reek, Turvey Road, Astwood	1	1			confirmed by applicant via letter
CR2	Costerpits Barn, Clifton Reynes	1	1			confirmed by agent via letter
NB3	Old Rectory, High Street, Newton Blossomville	1	1			confirmed by applicant via letter
RA1	Yew Tree Farm, Stoke Goldington Road, Ravenstone	5	5			Confirmed by agent via letter
RA2	Horseshoe Farm, Ravenstone	1	1			Site visit- under construction
HA1	Haversham Grange Barn, Haversham	1	1			Confirmed by applicant via letter
WA1	New Pastures Farm, Warrington	1	1			Confirmed by agent via letter
WU1	Flamingo Zoological Gardens, Western Underwood	1	1			Site visit- under construction
WU2	Land off Ravenstone Road, Western Underwood	1	1			Site visit- under construction
OL1	Land off Aspreys, Olney	169		100	69	Proforma
OL2	Land off Whirley Pit Roundabout, Olney	117		100	17	Proforma
OL5	Land South of Lavendon Road, Olney	30		30		Proforma
OL6	Land North of Lavendon Road, Olney	15		15		Proforma
OL8	Brocks Garage, Olney	8	8			confirmed by agent via letter
OL9	51 Midland Road, Olney	1	1			Site visit- under construction
OL14	Land to rear of 26 High Street	1	1			confirmed by agent via letter
OL16	Austen Avenue, Olney	26	26			Confirmed by JHDT
OL20	Town Farm, West Street, Olney	1	1			Site visit- under construction
NP6	Land at Tickford Fields Farm, Newport Pagnell (SRS Site)	385		200	185	Confirmed by landowner via email
NP6i	Tickford Fields Farm, Newport Pagnell					Proforma
NP7	City House, North Crawley Road, Newport Pagnell	69			69	The land is owned by the Council, and the warehouses, office block and refuse site are all still in use. Part of existing Strategic Reserve area.
NP9	Newport Pagnell Police Station	15		15		Proforma
NP11	Portfields Farm, Newport Pagnell	222		122	100	Proforma



SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info from
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
NP13	No3 High Street, Newport Pagnell	1	1			Site visit- under construction.
NP14	59-61 High Street, Newport Pagnell	2	2			confirmed by housing statistics, but applicant is currently unsure of completion date, as has no intention to develop at this stage.
NP15	Taylor's Mustard Factory, Union Street, Newport Pagnell	5	5			Site in state of disrepair. Ongoing discussion regarding improvements. Confirmed by owner via telephone call
NP16	38 High Street, Newport Pagnell	2	2			confirmed by agent via letter
NP17	Former Post Office, 69 - 71 High Street, Newport Pagnell	2	2			confirmed by agent via letter
NP22	Green End Farm, Newport Pagnell	22	22			confirmed by applicant via telephone call
NP23	Yard Off Taylor's & Post Office, Newport Pagnell	6	6			confirmed by owner via telephone call
NP29	69-71 High Street	1	1			Site visit- under construction
NP30	Pagnell Grange Extension	49	49			Site visit- under construction
BB1	Land at Rectory Farm, Bow Brickhill	5		5		Proforma
BB2	Land off Edwin Close, Bow Brickhill	24		24		Proforma
BB7	Blind Pond Farm, Bow Brickhill	25	10	15		Pre-application discussions held. Confirmed via agent
BB9	Land at Blind Pond Farm	1	1			Site visit- under construction
WS3	Nampak PLC, Woburn Sands	112	112			Confirmed by applicant via telephone call
WS7	Nampak Phase 3, Woburn Sands	121	90	31		confirmed by JHDT
<b>Rest of the borough- Total Available sites</b>		<b>3,042</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>2,059</b>	<b>583</b>	

**SHLAA Table 9: Expansion areas- available deliverable and developable sites**

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability				Info from
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	15 yrs+	
Ex1	South east SDA	4800		750	3000	1050	Proforma <sup>11</sup>
EX1a	Wavendon Golf Centre	950 <sup>12</sup>		950			Proforma
Ex1b	Land at Lower End Road, Wavendon	31		31			Proforma
Ex1d	Smith Stuart Reynolds Site 1, Wavendon	136		136			Proforma
Ex1f	Land South of A421, Wavendon	249		249			Proforma
Ex1g	Land South of Wavendon, East of Woburn Sands	1256		1256			Proforma
Ex1h	Land at Newport Road	166		166			Proforma
Ex1j	Land either side of Cranfield Road, Woburn Sands	722		361			Proforma
Ex2	Land at WEA (Fairfield Expansion)	823				823	Proforma
Ex3	Land at Eaton Leys	1656		1250	406		Proforma
Ex4	Lavente Gate	1110			1110		Proforma
Ex5	Shenley Dens	516		516			Proforma
Ex6	North West & South East of Salford Rd	3062		1500	1562		Proforma
Ex8	Land North of Wolverton Road, South of Hanson Environmental Centre	189		189			Proforma
Ex9	South of Newport Pagnell, Lovat Park	5000		2250	2250	500	Proforma
EX11	Bellow Hill Farm, Bow Brickhill	1927		963	964		Proforma
Ex11a	Part of Below Hill Farm, Bow Brickhill	99		99			Proforma
EX11b	Development Site, Bow Brickhill	96		96			Proforma
EX11c	Development site 2, Bow Brickhill	294		294			Proforma
<b>Rest of the borough- Total Available sites</b>		<b>21159</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9407</b>	<b>9292</b>	<b>2373</b>	

<sup>11</sup> Additional information sought from consortium lead on ownership and site assembly information to aid the assessment of deliverability.

<sup>12</sup> Figures in grey form part of the total for EX1- they should not be double counted.

**SHLAA Table 10: Sites with uncertain availability- urban area**

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS
MK3	Land rear of Citreon Garage, Stony Stratford	10
MK43	Plot 1, Ashford Crescent, Grange Farm	1
MK44	Plot 2, Ashford Crescent, Grange Farm	1
MK45	Plots 11, 12 & 13, Asford Crescent, Grange Farm	1
MK52	2 Hunter Drive, Bletchley	1
MK54	Carwash Valeting And Service Centre At Findlay Way, Bletchley	4
MK55	Land adjacent to 30 Jonathans, Coffee Hall	1
MK68	115A Queensway, Bletchley	2
MK69	121A Queensway, Bletchley	2
MK70	15 Calluna Drive, Bletchley	1
MK71	156 Church Green Road, Bletchley	1
MK72	220 Queensway, Bletchley	1
MK73	25 The Elms, Bletchley	1
MK75	62-66 Queensway, Bletchley	2
MK76	72 Western Road, Bletchley	2
MK77	Land adj to 130 Buckingham Road, Bletchley	2
MK79	Land between 24 & 30 George Street, Bletchley	3
MK82	1 to 3 Brooklands Farm Cottages	3
MK83	613 South Eighth Street, Central Milton Keynes	2
MK84	89 Gurnards Avenue, Fishermead	1
MK87	9 Pitcher Lane, Loughton	2
MK88	Linceslade Grove (Plot 1), Loughton	1
MK89	Linceslade Grove (Plot 2), Loughton	1
MK90	115 Tower Drive, Neath Hill	1
MK92	Land adj Newport Road, New Bradwell	1
MK93	Unit 2A Lawn Farm, Oakhill	2
MK94	Land adj 6 Egerton Gate, Shenley Brook End	1
MK95	394 Simpson	4

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS
MK166	Leadenhall adj Woughton Campus	20
MK167	Middleton Adj Fire Station	8
MK168	Middleton Griffith Gate Adj Surgery	11
MK169	Stratford House, Stony Stratford	12
MK191	31 Stoke Road, Bletchley	1
MK192	9 St Davids Road	1
MK193	Land adj 5 Oxford Street, Bletchley	1
MK194	Land rear of 28 and 30 Staple Hall Road	1
MK195	Land adj 64 Bradwell Road, Bradville	1
MK196	50 Lennon Drive, Crownhill	1
MK198	2 Sheldon Court, Great Holm	1
MK199	Adj Anglesey Court, Great Holm	1
MK200	Loughton Site 5	1
MK201	Adj to 8 Fletchers Mews, Neath Hill	1
MK204	Little stocking, Valley Farm barn	1
MK205	Shenley Church End F1/G1	1
MK206	Shenley Lodge W, Rotherford	1
MK207	Parish Hall, London Road, Stony Stratford	1
MK208	143 Pettingrew Close, Walnut Tree	1
MK209	Mill Lane plot (Old House), Woolstone	1
MK210	9 Verley Clsoe, Woughton on the Green	1
MK 211	105 Tattenhoe Lane, Bletchley	2
MK212	5 North Gate, Bletchley	2
MK213	College, Sherwood Drive, Bletchley	2
MK215	208 A and B North Row, CMK	2
MK216	29 Gibbwin, Great Linford	2
MK218	Shenley Lodge D2	2
MK219	16 Belsize Avenue, Springfield	2

MK96	Land at 139 Simpson	4
MK98	73 Ousebank Way, Stony Stratford	1
MK99	75 Ousebank Way, Stony Stratford	1
MK100	Adj to 2 Market Square, Stony Stratford	1
MK102	33 Stratford Road, Wolverton	2
MK104	37 Aylesbury Street, Wolverton	2
MK105	49 - 50 Stratford Road, Wolverton	1
MK107	99 Stratford Road, Wolverton	2
MK113	Land at Tattenhoe Bare Farm, Kingsmead	4
MK124	No 7 and Land rear of 1 - 13 Blenheim Avenue	8
MK165	Wilton Avenue, Bletchley	9

MK220	58 Ashfield, Stantonbury	2
MK221	Former Library site, Walnut Tree	2
MK222	29 and 30 Stratford Road, Wolverton	2
MK223	91 Church Street, Wolverton	2
MK224	Adj to 1 Rectory Fields	2
MK227	20 Langland Road, Netherfield	3
MK228	Land rear of 226 Wolverton Road, Blakelands	4
MK229	Walnut Tree Reserve site C	4
MK230	Land adj Stonebridge House Farm	5
MK231	Land to rear of Nos 1-11 North Street, Bletchley	10
<b>Total Urban Uncertain</b>		<b>208</b>

**SHLAA table 11: Sites with uncertain availability- rural area**

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS
S6	Land adjacent to 10 Crofts End, Sherington	1	OL10	13 Midland Road, Olney	1
S7	24 Gun Lane, Sherington	1	OL11	Land adj to 94 Weston Rd, Olney	1
NC7	Hurst End Farmhouse, North Crawley	2	OL12	Land at Corner of Lavendon Road, Olney	1
HN11	Glebe Farm, Glebe Lane, Hanslope	1	OL13	Land rear of 43 High Street, Olney	1
HN12	Land Adjacent To 29/31, Castlethorpe Road, Hanslope	1	OL15	The Old Fire Station, Olney	1
HN13	22 Long Street Road, Hanslope	1	OL17	East Street Site 1, Olney	42
HN14	Grange Farm, Higham Cross, Hanslope	1	OL18	2 to 4 Market Place, Olney	1
HN16	The Old Bus Garage, Hanslope	3	OL19	97 Weston Road, Olney	1
HN18	7 Weavers End, Hanslope	1	NP12	Land adjacent to 17 London Road, Newport Pagnell	1
HN19	Land off Nevill Close-additional plot	1	NP13	No 3 High Street, Newport Pagnell	1
HA2	16 Chalmers Avenue, Haversham	1	NP18	Cottages at Wepener, 23 London Road, Newport Pagnell	2
SG14	22 High Street, Stoke Goldington	1	NP19	Kickles Lodge, Newport Pagnell	1
SG15	Church Farm Unit 1, Stoke Goldington	1	NP20	Land to the rear of 50 High Street, The Cannon, Newport Pagnell	3
SG16	Church Farm Unit 2, Stoke Goldington	1	NP21	23 Wolverton Road, Newport Pagnell	2
SG17	Lodge Farm, Purse Lane, Stoke Goldington	1	NP24	Land to the rear of 72 - 84 Wolverton Road, Newport Pagnell	12
LV10	Barns at Lavendon Mill, Lavendon	1	NP25	Former Aston Martin Site	105
LV11	112 to 114 Olney Road, Lavendon	2	NP26	D J C Autos Site, Newport Pagnell	5
LV13	26 Castle Road, Lavendon	1	NP27	23 London Road Barn, Newport Pagnell	1
LV15	Lavendon Mill, Coney Hutch, Lavendon	1	NP28	45 Broad Street, Newport Pagnell	1
LV17	74 Lavendon Road, Lavendon	4	NP30	Adj to 40 Annesley Road	1
CR3	Whitelands Shed, Clifton Reynes	1	LB7	Garage, Watling Street, Little Brickhill	13
NB4	Riverview Barn, Newton Blossomville	1	LB8	Land at Tall Timbers and Pine Haven, Little Brickhill	2
NB5	Land adj to 3 and 4 Clifton Road, Newton Blossomville	2	WS4	8 Spring Grove, Woburn Sands	1
RA2	Chestnut Cottage, Ravenstone	1	WS5	9 Spring Grove, Woburn Sands	1
RA3	Horseshoe Farm, Ravenstone	1	WS6	Station Road/West Road, Woburn Sands	5
WU1	Flamingo Zoological Gardens, Olney Road, Weston Underwood	1	WS8	521 Newport Road, Woburn Sands	1
WU2	Land off Ravenstone Road, Weston Underwood	1	AT5	Three, Willows, Turvey Road	1
GA1	Land at Newport Road, Gayhurst	1	BB8	11 Church Road, Bow Brickhill	1

GA2	Reading Room, Park Farm, Gayhurst	1
OL9	51 Midland Road, Olney	1

CA4	Barn 3, Calverton Manor Farm	1
CS7	Land rear of 65 to 67 Station Road, Castlethorpe	1
<b>Total Rural Uncertain</b>		<b>211</b>

**SHLAA table 12: Deliverable and developable sites- key settlements and listed village only**

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info from
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
S1	Church Farm, Sherington	7		7		Proforma
S2	Land at Crofts End, Sherington	32		32		Proforma
S4	Land off Sherington High Street	19		19		Proforma
S5	Land at Water Lane, Sherington	20		20		Proforma
S6	Land adjacent to 10 Crofts End, Sherington	1	1			Site visit- under construction
S7	24 Gun Lane, Sherington	1	1			Site visit- under construction
NC7	Hurst End Farm House, North Crawley	2	2			Site visit- under construction
HN11	Glebe Farm, Glebe Lane, Hanslope	1	1			Site visit- under construction
HN12	Land Adjacent to 29/31 Castletorpe Road	1	1			Site visit- under construction
HN15	New Buildings Farm, Bullington End, Hanslope	1	1			confirmed by agent via letter
HN17	Land off Nevill Close, Hanslope	9	9			confirmed by agent via telephone call
HN20	Spinney Lodge Farm, Hanslope	1	1			Site visit- under construction
HN21	Cuckoo Hill Farm, Hanslope	14	14			Site visit- under construction
SG15	Church farm, Unit 1, Stoke Goldington	1	1			Site visit- under construction
SG18	Bulls Head Farm, Stoke Goldington	1	1			Site visit- under construction
SG19	Land off Town End Cres, Harley Field Barn	1	1			Site visit- under construction
LV1	Lavendon Garage, Olney Road, Lavendon	5	5			NLUD
CA3	Barns 1 & 2, Calverton Manor Farm, Calverton	2	2			Proforma
LV12	80 Olney Road, Lavendon	1	1			confirmed by agent via letter
LV14	Castle Farm, Lavendon	2	2			confirmed by agent via letter
LV16	Barns at Lavendon Mill, Lavendon	1	1			Site visit- under construction
AST3	7 & 8 Turvey Road, Astwood	2	2			confirmed by agent via letter
AST4	Lum Reek, Turvey Road, Astwood	1	1			confirmed by applicant via letter
CR2	Costerpits Barn, Clifton Reynes	1	1			confirmed by agent via letter
NB3	Old Rectory, High Street, Newton Blossomville	1	1			confirmed by applicant via letter

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info from
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
RA1	Yew Tree Farm, Stoke Goldington Road, Ravenstone	5	5			Confirmed by agent via letter
RA2	Horseshoe Farm, Ravenstone	1	1			Site visit- under construction
HA1	Haversham Grange Barn, Haversham	1	1			Confirmed by applicant via letter
WA1	New Pastures Farm, Warrington	1	1			Confirmed by agent via letter
WU1	Flamingo Zoological Gardens, Western Underwood	1	1			Site visit- under construction
WU2	Land off Ravenstone Road, Western Underwood	1	1			Site visit- under construction
OL1	Land off Aspreys, Olney	169		100	69	Proforma
OL2	Land off Whirley Pit Roundabout, Olney	117		100	17	Proforma
OL5	Land South of Lavendon Road, Olney	30		30		Proforma
OL6	Land North of Lavendon Road, Olney	15		15		Proforma
OL8	Brocks Garage, Olney	8	8			confirmed by agent via letter
OL9	51 Midland Road, Olney	1	1			Site visit- under construction
OL14	Land to rear of 26 High Street	1	1			confirmed by agent via letter
OL16	Austen Avenue, Olney	26	26			Confirmed by JHDT
OL20	Town farm, West Street, Olney	1	1			Site visit- under construction
NP6	Land at Tickford Fields Farm, Newport Pagnell (SRS Site)	385		200	185	Confirmed by landowner via email
NP6i	Tickford Fields Farm, Newport Pagnell					Proforma
NP7	City House, North Crawley Road, Newport Pagnell	69			69	The land is owned by the Council, and the warehouses, office block and refuse site are all still in use. Part of existing Strategic Reserve area.
NP9	Newport Pagnell Police Station	15		15		Proforma
NP11	Portfields Farm, Newport Pagnell	222		122	100	Proforma
NP13	3 High Street, Newport Pagnell	1	1			Site visit- under construction
NP14	59-61 High Street, Newport Pagnell	2	2			confirmed by housing statistics, but applicant is currently unsure of completion date, as has no intention to develop at this stage.



SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info from
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
NP15	Taylor's Mustard Factory, Union Street, Newport Pagnell	5	5			Site in state of disrepair. Ongoing discussion regarding improvements. Confirmed by owner via telephone call.
NP16	38 High Street, Newport Pagnell	2	2			confirmed by agent via letter
NP17	Former Post Office, 69 - 71 High Street, Newport Pagnell	2	2			confirmed by agent via letter
NP22	Green End Farm, Newport Pagnell	22	22			confirmed by applicant via telephone call
NP23	Yard Off Taylor's & Post Office, Newport Pagnell	6	6			confirmed by owner via telephone call
NP29	69-71 High Street	1	1			Site visit- under construction
NP30	Pagnell Grange Extension, Newport Pagnell	49	49			Site visit- under construction
BB7	Blind Pond Farm, Bow Brickhill	25	10	15		Confirmed via telephone conversation.
BB9	Land at Blind Pond Farm, Bow Brickhill	1	1			Site visit- under construction
WS3	Nampak PLC, Woburn Sands	112	112			Confirmed by applicant via telephone call
WS7	Nampak Phase 3, Woburn Sands	121	90	31		Confirmed by JHDT
		<b>1,546</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>440</b>	

**SHLAA table 13: Deliverable and developable site- Strategic Development Area**

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability				Info from
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15 yrs	15+ yrs	
Ex1	South east SDA	4800		750	3000	1050	Proforma/ additional
EX1a	Wavendon Golf Centre	950 <sup>13</sup>		500	450		Proforma
Ex1b	Land at Lower End Road, Wavendon	31		31			Proforma
Ex1d	Smith Stuart Reynolds Site 1, Wavendon	136		136			Proforma
Ex1f	Land South of A421, Wavendon	249		249			Proforma
Ex1g	Land South of Wavendon, East of Woburn Sands	1256		750	506		Proforma
Ex1h	Land at Newport Road	166		166			Proforma
Ex1j	Land either side of Cranfield Road, Woburn Sands	722		361			Proforma
			<b>0</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>1050</b>	

<sup>13</sup> Figures in grey form part of the total for EX1- they should not be double counted.

## Appendix 2- Methodology- stakeholder consultation representations

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
Gallagher Estates	Milton Keynes Council should work jointly with Aylesbury Vale to consider cross-boundary housing opportunities	The government SHLAA - practice guidance encourages Local Planning Authorities to work together in the preparation of joint assessments. This is particularly important in Milton Keynes where many growth areas overlap with adjoining Local Authorities particularly Aylesbury Vale. Given that Aylesbury Vale is within the same region and also expected to accommodate significant Milton Keynes growth in the next planned period, it is considered essential the Milton Keynes Council work jointly with Aylesbury Vale to consider cross-boundary housing opportunities, which will then be identified through the SHLAA process. This is fundamental to the success of the SHLAA as, it is unreasonable to artificially exclude sites purely on geographical location when the whole thrust of the South East Plan is that adjoining authorities should share some of Milton Keynes' growth.	MKC have been in discussions with Aylesbury Vale and Mid Bedfordshire regarding the SHLAA and cross boundary issues. The MKC SHLAA report will reflect the outcomes of the Aylesbury Vale SHLAA which has assessed the availability and suitability of development sites on the border with Milton Keynes. The methodology will be amended to make this clear.
	Agreement with stage 6 of the SHLAA process	In terms of estimating the housing potential of each site (Stage 6 of the SHLAA process); I agree that it seems sensible to use a 50% assumption in calculating the net developable area of the site.	Noted.
	Housing densities seem sensible	I believe the housing densities included within Table 4 on page 15 of the Draft Methodology seems sensible and based on policy credible basis.	Noted.
	Essential of the SHLAA to consider landownership scenarios	At Stage 7C (Page 16), it is essential that SHLAA consider the landownership scenarios. Sites with single landowner/developers are far more deliverable than sites where there are numerous ownerships where a significant amount of land assembly needs to be undertaken. There can be no certainty attached to unassembled sites whereas confidence can be attached to those sites which are already in the ownership of single developers, which are therefore more readily available for development.	Noted. Ownership issues will be flagged up as a potential constraint to delivery, where necessary, in the assessment.

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
Whaddon Parish Council	Concern regarding location of longer term development	Whaddon is concerned about the remaining part of Milton Keynes lying over the ridge towards Whaddon down to the AVDC boundary - commonly referred to as area 10.4. Please advise us if this area is targeted for longer term development.	This area is not currently in the emerging strategy for growth of Milton Keynes up to 2026 and is not a direction of growth in sub regional or emerging regional policy. However, if the site is put forward as part of the assessment it will need to be considered along with sites in all other areas of Milton Keynes.
MK Forum	Relating housing provision to public transport and community facilities	While presumably you are working to a prescribed structure for the methodology I did not immediately pick up on any criteria that relates housing provision to public transport routes and community facilities or for that matter understood how the assessment will relate to an emerging plan which has not yet clarified the strategic approach to movement and centres issues. An assessment of their inter-relationship should be a critical part of the methodology. A summary note was recently prepared as part of the Transport Strategy discussion.	The purpose of the SHLAA is not to assess the relative planning merits of individual sites but is to assess their suitability and availability for development at some point in the future. Many sites in Milton Keynes, due to its nature, will be greenfield and will need to build-in new public transport provision as part of the wider network. In relation to sites promoted within the urban area, it is not felt necessary to rule out any sites as being suitable for development if they are not a prescribed distance from a public transport route. The methodology does refer to sites near to public transport routes being a potential broad area of search in the event the initial assessment shows that there are insufficient sites identified to meet our requirements.
	Inconsistency of density zones	I would also have to question the density zones as presented which seem to be inconsistent and disregards the densities proposed for the expansion and growth areas and seems to suggest a concentric pattern of densities that reduce as development falls away from the city centre. Is it to early to make this assumption? There are probably other density patterns appropriate for a city originally conceived as a multi centred city.	The density zones follow those set out in the Local Plan and represent approximate densities in different areas of the borough where there are different characteristics. This includes a notional density of 35 dph in the expansion areas, which is the adopted planning policy for this area. In reality densities delivered on sites that do come forward for development may not be exactly those that are set out in the table, for numerous reasons. However for the purpose of the SHLAA, and gaining a realistic estimate of the likely housing potential of each site, it is felt that basing the assessment on established planning policy is the most robust

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
PRP architects	Paragraph 2.7	Strongly agree with the focus and statement that the scope of assessment will not be narrowed down by existing policy constraints.	approach. Noted
	Paragraph 2.9	Strongly agree with all three factors identified.	Noted
	Paragraph 2.10, threshold amount	The threshold is too low at 5 housing units. We would suggest the threshold starts at 10 units. Encouraging the submission of smaller (5 unit) sites could generate a large amount of assessment work. These are better left to come forward as windfall sites, where they will be considered using the normal planning policies.	The need to consider sites that could potentially accommodate only 5 dwellings was felt necessary to enable a realistic interpretation of land availability, particularly in the rural area, where sites are often smaller, to be established. The call for sites has returned approximately 80 sites for consideration, meaning the workload is manageable.
	Paragraph 2.10, MK urban area	It would be helpful to clarify what is considered to be part of Milton Keynes urban area, for example this would include Bletchley.	Yes, Bletchley is part of the urban area. The urban area covers all of the city estates as well as the adjoining towns of Stony Stratford and Wolverton. Newport Pagnell has traditionally been classed as part of the rural area and this classification is carried forward in this assessment. The rural area also covers the market towns of Olney and Woburn Sands and all other villages separate from the main urban area of Milton Keynes.
	Paragraph 2.10, Greenfield Sites	The SHLAA methodology should not exclude Greenfield sites at the outset from being assessed, including those that are not associated with the list of settlements or MK urban area. All sites need to be assessed and considered on their merits, otherwise there is a conflict with Practice Guidance which identifies examples of the sources of sites that have the potential for housing and which should be covered in the assessment, as mentioned at section 3.1 and includes 'New free standing settlements'. We note that at Para 3.2 you state that in this case such sites will not be included - however you have not provided any meaningful justification for adopting this approach. Unless you adopt the same approach as advised in the Practice Guidance, how can you know that a	The assessment needs to look primarily at the next 15 years, a period which is covered by the emerging South East Plan which does not promote free standing settlements. This SHLAA is being prepared in a period of transition as work has already taken place to establish the strategy for growth and within this context (linked to para 2.8) it is justified in excluding sites that are not well associated with an existing settlement as they are unlikely to be a source of housing supply in this period. If the policy position changes in the future, this can be reconsidered in future iterations of the SHLAA.

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		new free standing settlement will not be the most appropriate solution to meet future housing needs?	
	Paragraph 2.12	Should refer to previously identified sites, which will also be included in the assessment.	Noted. The paragraph will be amended to clarify that sites submitted as part of the Core Strategy Consultation will be included in the assessment.
	Paragraph 2.13	Parish and town councils should be provided with a pro-forma to use in the exercise of considering submissions and sites within their area, in order to identify the issues that they should consider. This will make for a fairer system where they can all respond in a relevant and valid manner that is specific to the assessment criteria. It will also assist the officers in properly understanding and validating their concerns in their assessment process.	Parish and Town Councils have been invited to suggest sites that they consider to have housing potential or that would benefit from redevelopment in their areas. They will also be contacted specifically with a list of sites that have been identified in their area, which they can feedback if they feel necessary. It is not however, the purpose of the SHLAA to consider the relative merits of each site which remains the role of the plan making system. Parish and Town Councils will simply be asked to provide any local knowledge on the sites which may affect their availability or suitability for development- what feedback we are seeking will be made clear in the correspondence. To ask for any further comment would give an unrealistic impression of the purpose of the SHLAA and the role that Parish and Town Councils play at this stage.
	Paragraph 3.2	Should clarify why the Council does not support, and will not consider, any submissions for new free standing settlements and large scale redevelopment of existing estates. Such submissions should be included in the assessment process.	As per the response to para 2.10 above, the Practice Guidance suggests the extent of the study should respond to the housing challenge and the nature of the supply sought. In the context of the emerging planning position for Milton Keynes at a regional and sub-regional level, including any freestanding greenfield sites in the assessment will give an unrealistic interpretation of the immediate supply of land over the next 15 years. Given what existing monitoring information tells us about land availability in the urban area it is not felt necessary to include the large scale redevelopment of estates

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	Paragraph 5.2	Should be removed, at least in respect to the latter two matters. These are criteria which can be used to judge or/and score sites through an assessment process, but at this stage should not completely disqualify sites from being considered, it may be that the merits associated with a particular allocation for housing outweighs the loss of a listed building or open space.	<p>in the assessment. This may change in future years and be part of future assessments.</p> <p>With regards open space, the wording of this will be amended to reflect strategically planned open spaces, across Milton Keynes, which are managed by the Council and are needed to provide the required level of provision for local residents. This is not meant to include all incidental open spaces that may well benefit from redevelopment. The SHLAA will not go into the level of detail required to determine whether the development of a site with a listed building could be achieved in a sensitive manner. Therefore, to avoid the inclusion of sites that are potentially unsuitable for development in the assessment will assume zero capacity for such sites.</p>
	Paragraph 7.1	Disagree that housing potential should be guided by existing local plan policies, especially where these are clearly out of date in respect of government guidance and policy.	<p>PSS 3 Para 47 states 'Local Planning Authorities may wish to set out a range of densities across the plan area rather than one broad density range although 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) net should be used as a national indicative minimum to guide policy development and decision-making, until local density policies are in place' - which is what the current policy does. Given that since 2005 the standards in the Local Plan have been effectively delivered, they still represent the most appropriate method of assessing the potential development yield of a site for this technical exercise. This is also inline with para 30 of the Practice Guidance. However, where a submission provides additional information that supports a variation away from this method, this will be considered through the assessment.</p>



Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	Paragraph 7.2	Object to the banding applied; each site should be considered on its merits and on any information provided to support a proposed density level or housing number for the submitted site. A banding system that is based on a range would probably be more acceptable and there should be an added proviso that where sufficient information and evidence is provided to support a specific density - this will be considered and will influence the density multiplier calculation.	The point is noted. Particularly on larger sites where more work has gone into looking at the development potential of a site, this will be used as a guide to the assessment.
	Paragraph 7.3	Similar to previous objections made above relating to using local plan policies in the assessment, this needs to be tempered with a reference to national policy that may be more relevant and that any information provided in support of a submission will be properly considered and can influence the assessment	See responses above.
	Paragraph 7.5	Welcome this, which supports our comments made above because it indicates that where specific information is available regarding yield of a site - that it will be used instead of the density multipliers.	Noted. See responses above also
	Paragraph 7.6	<p>We believe that this contradicts para 7.5, by specifically implying that for urban extensions to MK unless the density/yield information provided corresponds to that in the density multiplier in table 4, the council will consider the density/yield as unrealistic.</p> <p>We strongly object to the Council specifying that density calculations for proposed urban extensions to MK will be based on 35 dwellings per hectare. We consider that where calculations are based on the net density as described in para 7.3, 35 dwellings per hectare should be a 'minimum' expectancy NOT an average and certainly NOT a maximum expectancy. This paragraph should be changed and it should include a proviso so that officers can take into account any evidence/information provided which supports the density</p>	The point of the SHLAA is to provide an 'estimate' of the housing potential of each site- it does not set the actual number of homes that would be developed on the site were it to actually come forward for development- this is the role of the planning process. As stated in points above, where further detail is submitted with sites, stating how a different yield could be achieved on the site through design, this will be considered through the assessment. However, what ever the estimated capacity of sites, this should not be seen as a minimum or a maximum- simply an estimate.

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	Paragraph 8.10	<p>Is interesting in today's economic climate. Does MK have the ability to judge the ability of the developer to deliver and sell the housing over a particular period of time?</p>	<p>This will need to be a pragmatic assessment, being realistic about the potential achievability of sites in the current economic downturn. The SHLAA guidance was prepared in a period of economic stability and does not provide specific contingency for the current situation. To guide the assessment market information will be used to estimate when the market could pick up and the Council will seek to engage with developers to seek their views on when sites may be achievable, but it needs to be accepted that this is not an exact science and it is something that is very difficult to accurately assess. It is suggested that to avoid giving an unrealistic interpretation of supply in the short term, no sites currently outside of the planning system (i.e. those with out consent) will be considered to have potential over the next 5 years. The only sites to be included in the first 5 years will be those sites with a planning consent, and information from the landowners/developers of these sites will be used to verify this. This is not to say that sites will not come forward quicker than this in certain cases, but for the purpose of the SHLAA it is felt to be a realistic approach. That can be updated in future years when the economic situation changes.</p>
	Paragraph 10.6	<p>Strongly support the statement that in assessing broad locations, Bletchley and Wolverton will be two of the primary areas of assessment.</p>	<p>Noted. Additional broad areas will only be assessed where the SHLAA shows a need to find more potential housing sites.</p>
Anglian Water		<p>Our only comment is that it is the view of Anglian Water when assessing sites then the following should be included within your methodology: Water Supply - capacity available, Foul Sewer Networks - capacity available, Wastewater Treatment - capacity available, Surface Water Disposal - whose responsibility and how, Pipelines, Pumping Stations - impact</p>	<p>Noted- details of sites to be provided to Anglian Water to enable additional site constraints to be identified.</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
Aspley Guise Parish Council		<p>on assets that may be within the boundary of the site that could result in massive diversion costs that renders the site uneconomical to develop</p> <p>The Secretary of State has made it clear in the government's proposed changes to the South East Plan that any new housing to be built in Mid Bedfordshire should be excluded from the South East Plan. It would therefore be inappropriate for any sites in Mid Bedfordshire to be included in the Milton Keynes SHLAA.</p>	<p>The proposed changes to the South East Plan acknowledge that any development of land in Mid-Bedfordshire as part of the growth of Milton Keynes needs to be established through a review of the east of England Plan. The MKC SHLAA will not specifically look at sites in Mid Bedfordshire, but given the sub regional policy situation and an acknowledgement by Mid-Bedfordshire in their emerging Core Strategy that some growth associated with Milton Keynes is expected in their area, the SHLAA will need to refer to any work undertaken by Mid-Bedfordshire. At the time of writing Mid-Bedfordshire have not completed a SHLAA but it is expected that when they do, they will need to reflect the growth of Milton Keynes, given the current policy situation.</p>
		<p>The SHLAA proforma response form seeks sites to be submitted within "Milton Keynes (including urban extensions)". We believe that this is potentially misleading and could lead to the submission of sites within that part of Mid Bedfordshire which Milton Keynes has designated as part of its South East urban extensions.</p>	<p>Any sites outside of the Milton Keynes boundary will not be included in the MK SHLAA- but reference will be made to cross boundary issues in light of the emerging growth requirements.</p>
		<p>Accordingly we believe that the SHLAA methodology should be amended to make it clear that only sites within the Milton Keynes Unitary Authority Area will be considered as part of the assessment.</p>	<p>This should be clear from the methodology, but wording will be assessed and reviewed where necessary. This will include reference to the final MKC SHLAA acknowledging cross boundary work completed by Mid Bedfordshire and Aylesbury vale.</p>
West Bletchley Council	no comment	no comment	Noted

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
Shenley Brook End & Tattenhoe Parish Council	no comment	The document appears to be a sound and comprehensive basis for the work to be undertaken.	Noted
Turley associates on behalf of Chase Consortium	lack of joint district working	It is unfortunate that the SHLAAs for Milton Keynes and adjoining districts, in particular Aylesbury Vale have not been progressed jointly. The adjoining districts will contribute towards delivering the MK Growth Strategy and therefore cross boundary working is critical for the strategy's success. The SHLAA methodology acknowledges at paragraph 2.1 that the Communities and Local Government SHLAA Practice Guidance recommends that the local planning authorities work together at sub regional level and undertake joint assessments wherever possible. It is therefore disappointing that this approach has not been adopted and therefore the SHLAA will not cover the whole of the housing market assessment area for the city of Milton Keynes. This is a short coming of the document.	It is acknowledged that ideally a joint SHLAA would have been completed for the growth area. However, this was not possible due to the different situations in each authority area at the time. MKC has engaged with the adjoining authorities and ensured that the growth of Milton Keynes is/will be considered as part of their SHLAAs. This work will be reflected in the MKC SHLAA report.
Bidwells	Narrowing down of study area	Paragraph 7 of the Governments practice guidance states that the SHLAA "should aim to identify as many sites with housing potential in and around as many settlements as possible in the study area. The study area should preferably be a sub-regional housing market area, but may be a local planning authority area, where necessary." Paragraph 21 of the same states that "the scope of the assessment should not be narrowed down by existing policies designed to constrain development, so that the local planning authority is in the best possible position when it comes to decide its strategy for delivering its housing objectives" It is Bidwells view that the proposed methodology is therefore contrary to the Practice Guidance particularly where it has been "amended to reflect local circumstances" as states on page 5 of the methodology.	The whole of the standard methodology outlined in the Practice Guidance needs to be followed but related to local circumstance. In particular stage 4-determining which sites to be surveyed provides a list of differing factors that will affect how the survey is carried out in different areas. In relation to the second highlighted paragraph, the assessment hasn't been restricted by existing policies to constrain development, hence the inclusion of sites in areas currently not designated for development and the assessment of sites not identified for growth in the emerging Core Strategy. The assessment has simply ruled out areas where any sites identified would be likely to be unsustainable (i.e.

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
			<p>due to the lack of local services and facilities). The only settlements ruled out are the smallest rural settlements where in the context of the housing requirement of Milton Keynes, any housing numbers delivered would be tiny. Stage 6 specifically says <i>'the estimation of housing potential... should be guided by the existing or emerging plan policy'</i>- again a reflection of the need to take into account local circumstance.</p>
	<p>Excluding sites based on local planning policy.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.7 of the methodology states that there needs to be a <i>"realistic approach to excluding sites from the assessment where they are clearly unsuitable for housing from the outset"</i>. This is without justification and is not supported in the practice guidance; the approach proposed is considered to be flawed. Whilst precluding sites on the basis of statutory designations e.g. SSSI is supported by the Practice Guidance; a blanket exclusion of sites based upon local planning policy designations is not. It is entirely evident that sites are being precluded on a local policy basis rather than adopting the clean slate approach that is sought by the practice guidance.</p>	<p>There is no blanket exclusion- only those areas where housing development would be seen to be unsustainable and where the inclusion of sites would give an unrealistic interpretation of land availability. The study extends to many settlements outside of the existing Local Plan key settlements/listed villages and the emerging settlements included in the Core Strategy inline with the requirement to identify as many sites as possible.</p>
		<p>Whilst the guidance does state that areas can be excluded from the assessment this should be fully justified. A robust justification is not provided; the methodology restricts the possibility of a robust and credible assessment being undertaken. By seeking to concentrate Call for Sites on certain areas undermines the validity of the SHLAA and is contrary to Government Guidance that makes it quite clear that a SHLAA should cover sites across the whole district.</p>	<p>The SHLAA does cover sites in the whole district- but only those where it is deemed that any housing sites that could come forward would be sustainable. It is entirely reasonable for the SHLAA to rule out areas which are 'obvious non-runners' and this is justified by the 2.10. Consideration will be given to the need to alter the wording to make the justification for this clearer.</p>
<p>Preclusion of sites on size</p>		<p>By precluding sites on a preliminary criteria basis the SHLAA eliminates sites that maybe entirely feasible opportunities for the delivery of both market and affordable housing. Doing this on the basis that <i>"the majority of housing is expected to be delivered on large sites"</i> is without justification. There is no</p>	<p>To include all sites of 1-5 dwellings would be extremely resource intensive and when it is taken into account that sites for over 40,000 homes need to be found, it is not felt that even if 100 additional sites for 1 home were to be included, the</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		evidence to suggest at this stage of the SHLAA that sites of 5 or more are any more suitable than sites for 1-5 units, there is therefore no justification for their preclusion.	contribution of this land to the assessment, given the resources required to assess them, would be justified. This is entirely justified by the criteria under para 25 of the Practice Guidance. The fact that the majority of housing development is likely to occur on large sites is also justified by the criteria under this paragraph.
	Preclusion of sites on basis of location	Deviates from practice guidance. Practice guidance indicates that additional housing opportunities in existing residential areas, land in non residential use which may be suitable for redevelopment and sites in rural settlements and rural exceptions sites. This guidance is reproduced in verbatim in the proposed methodology, but then subsequently contradicted at paragraph 2.10. Whilst the approach of limiting the Call for Sites to specific rural settlements will save on time and costs, it does not represent the most appropriate approach and is therefore considered to be unsound. Consideration should be given to all sites put forward across the district and a full and robust assessment of each site should be undertaken. If this approach is not adopted it will not be possible to demonstrate an accurate five year housing land supply.	As explained previously, the SHLAA seeks sites in sustainable locations, which is justified by the Practice Guidance and the PAS guide. However, sites within the boundaries of existing settlements with village boundaries (as per the local plan) will also be considered and this change will be made to the methodology, as sensitive infill or conversion (e.g. of old farm buildings) may be appropriate in these areas. It would be inaccurate to include all sites in the assessment which are obvious non-runners, particularly in the 5 year supply where an allocation, permission and lead in period would all need to be taken into account.
Woburn Sands and District Society		Supportive of the parameters set out in para 2.10	Noted
		Supportive of the densities set out in 7.6 and Table 4. Although we would have preferred that the density of the urban extensions, Olney and Woburn Sands had been classed as zone 4 (30dws/ha) and not zone 3 (35 dws/ha). It is unfortunate that this was not the density of the Nampak development on Woburn Sands.	Noted. For the purpose of the assessment a density related to the character of a particular area needs to be assumed. This is not to say that any development of the site that comes forward in the future may be of a higher, or lower, density.
	concerns over	It should have been made clearer in both the methodology	The proposed changes to the South East Plan

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	unitary authorities boundaries	<p>and the proforma that the sites put forward in respect of the MK urban extensions should have been clarified to be only those that fall within the Unitary Authorities boundaries. The Secretary of States proposed changes to the draft SE Plan agreed that it was not appropriate for MK Partnership to put forward plans for urban extensions of Milton Keynes, which falls within the SE Plan, into an area falling within the east of England Planning Region. Mid Bedfordshire has already carried out a site allocation Issues and Options as part of that Regional Planning process, and it would not be for Milton Keynes to consider sites put forward from another Regional Authority. Therefore we ask that both the SHLAA Methodology and proforma be amended to make clear where the term urban extensions are used, that only urban extensions sites within the Milton Keynes Unitary Authority will be considered. Any sites mistakenly put forward from outside the unitary authority should be sent back to the developer/landowner, clarifying the situation.</p>	<p>acknowledge that any development of land in Mid Bedfordshire as part of the growth of Milton Keynes needs to be established through a review of the east of England Plan. The MKC SHLAA will not specifically look at sites in Mid Bedfordshire, but given the sub regional policy situation and an acknowledgement by Mid Bedfordshire in their emerging Core Strategy that some growth associated with Milton Keynes is expected in their area, the SHLAA will need to refer to work undertaken by Mid- Bedfordshire. At the time of writing Mid Bedfordshire have not completed a SHLAA but it is expected that when they do, they will need to reflect the growth of Milton Keynes, given the current policy situation. The wording of the methodology will be altered to reflect this.</p>
lack of consultation		<p>We have additional serious concern that, as appears to be the case in 2.13, there will not be a consultation period on the sites put forward by developers and landowners. We do not consider it appropriate for the Council and Developers/Landowners to decide potential development sites without consultation with the local parishes and other organisations concerned. Note such consultation was carried out as part of the Site Allocation Issues and Options in Mid Bedfordshire. Paragraph 2.13 states that a "list of sites that were put forward will be made available and discussed with Parish and Town Councillors where necessary". It goes on to say "Parish and Town Councils might require more time to provide their comments".....This would basically mean that local knowledge and views of councillors and others, in respect of particular sites put forward are being excluded from the process, and we consider this inappropriate. We would ask that paragraph 2.13, is amended to state that there</p>	<p>The assessment does not decide potential development sites or show support for the development of particular sites- it is simply an assessment of suitability and availability. The Site Allocations process has yet to be undertaken for Milton Keynes as has happened in Mid- Bedfordshire, which is separate from this process, and will involve extensive consultation with local communities to gain views on the sites, should and should not be developed. The views of local Parish and town Councils will be sought on any constraints to development that they know about which may affect site suitability or availability- but views on whether a site should or should not be developed- i.e. whether there is specific local support for site development or not, is a matter for the Site Allocations DPD, not the SHLAA.</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
Berkeley Strategic	Intro	<p>will be a consultation period following the provision of a list of sites put forward to enable local views and knowledge to be taken into account.</p> <p>The SHLAA Draft Methodology sets out the main stages of the assessment and is generally supported by Berkeley as it accords with the relevant Governments Practice Guidance.</p>	Noted
	Extent of the study area	<p>Central Government have published Practice Guidance (July 2007) that considers the production of SHLAA's.</p> <p>The Guidance identifies that a SHLAA should consider the geographical coverage assessed with regards to the nature of the housing challenge of a local authority. For example, a local authority should specifically consider the methodology and content of its SHLAA appropriate to the quantum and location of the strategic housing requirement that it has to deliver. The Guidance also identifies that a study area may not necessarily strictly refer to a local planning authority area and could, for example, be formed of a housing market area.</p> <p>Para 2.9 of the Milton Keynes SHLAA Draft Methodology (Methodology) identifies that Milton Keynes has high housing requirements; will require the allocation of a mix of rural and urban expansion sites to accommodate the emerging RSS requirements and that the majority of housing will be delivered through large housing sites.</p> <p>Additionally, paragraph 2.10 sets the appropriate parameters, for example size and location of sites, that enables the identification of which sites will be appropriate to assess.</p> <p>However, Berkeley considers that the Methodology should further recognise its role with regards to the development requirements for Milton Keynes, as set out within the RSS.</p> <p>After all, the SHLAA will aim to identify the housing provision</p>	<p>The intention is to consider the rural requirements separately in the SHLAA. The methodology will be amended accordingly to clarify this.</p> <p>The findings of the study will inform the next annual monitoring report and the early work has already helped to update the housing trajectory to be included in the Core Strategy.</p>



Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>over a set period and comment upon how this relates to the strategic housing requirements of Milton Keynes.</p> <p>The South East Plan identifies two distinct and separate areas where housing is to be delivered within the Milton Keynes Unitary Authority. The South East Plan Proposed Changes identifies that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 44,560 dwellings be delivered in and around the Milton Keynes Urban Area</li> <li>• 2,400 dwellings be delivered in the rural areas / rest of Milton Keynes</li> </ul> <p>Berkeley recommend that the Methodology should recognise these two separate and distinct parts of the Milton Keynes administrative area.</p> <p>As identified above, Government guidance identifies that a study area does not have to strictly refer to a local planning authority area. Accordingly, the SHLAA should collate the sites and subsequent housing supply data to accord with these two distinct areas that have to deliver set housing requirements in the period to 2026.</p> <p>This is necessary as the SHLAA provides the base evidence to the LDF and will enable the correct development strategy and location / size of sites to be allocated and delivered.</p> <p>The identification of the distinct areas should also follow through into the Milton Keynes Annual Monitoring Report and associated housing trajectory.</p> <p>If the SHLAA is produced and annually updated on this basis it will provide robust base evidence for the future preparation of development plans and development control decisions.</p>	

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	<p>Demonstrating a Fifteen Year Supply of Sites</p>	<p>The Governments Practice Guidance regarding the preparation of SHLAA's reiterates the requirement of PPS3 for a more responsive approach to land supply at the local level. It requires local authorities to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify specific, deliverable sites for the first five years of a plan that are ready for development;</li> <li>• Identify specific, developable sites for years 6-10, and ideally years 11-15, in plans;</li> <li>• Where it is not possible to identify specific sites for years 11-15 of the plan, indicate broad locations for future growth; and</li> <li>• Not include an allowance for windfalls in the first 10 years of the plan unless there are justifiable local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified.</li> </ul> <p>However, the Practice Guidance states that a SHLAA should ideally identify sufficient sites for longer than the whole 15 year plan period, from the anticipated date of the plans adoption.</p> <p>The 15 Year Supply of Land The Practice Guidance identifies that the purpose of the SHLAA is to aim to identify as many sites with housing potential in and around as many settlements as possible in the study area. It further identifies that a SHLAA should consider the sites assessed with regards to the nature of the housing challenge. For example, where high strategic housing requirements are set this should be reflected in the methodology and results of the SHLAA. Accordingly, Berkeley considers that the Milton Keynes SHLAA should provide the necessary base evidence that will support the delivery of the Milton Keynes Growth Area. Accordingly, in order to achieve this requirement the SHLAA should be produced in accordance with the most stringent of requirements as contained within National Policy and associated Practice Guidance Paragraph 2.9 of the Milton Keynes SHLAA Draft Methodology (Methodology) identifies that Milton Keynes has a high housing requirement; that a mix of rural and urban expansion sites will be required to be identified to satisfy the emerging RSS housing requirement and that the majority of the housing requirement will be delivered through large housing sites. Additionally,</p>	<p>Support for parameters noted. The SHLAA will be updated to reflect the housing position at April 2009 and will seek to identify sites for 15 years from this date. It will be updated annually to reflect changes in site circumstances (i.e. completions, granting of planning consent) and, where appropriate, changing economic circumstance.</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>paragraph 2.10 of the Methodology sets out the parameters, for example with regards to the size and location of sites, that identify those sites that are suitable for further assessment. Berkeley supports these parameters. Paragraph 2.6 identifies that the SHLAA should aim to identify, as a minimum, sufficient sites for at least the first 10 years of the plan. The Methodology identifies that a baseline for the SHLAA is proposed to be April 2008. However, Berkeley consider that the methodology is insufficient in aiming to deliver a SHLAA that strives to meet the most stringent of policy requirements and provide the most robust evidence to enable delivery of the Milton Keynes Growth Area. For this to be achieved the Methodology and resulting SHLAA should identify specific sites for at least a period of 15 from the date that the adopted of the emerging Milton Keynes Plan is adopted. It is acknowledged that it may be difficult to identify when a site could be delivered for the latter part of the 15 year period. However, the document should be constantly updated and a review published on a consistent annual basis. This will enable any inconsistencies in the availability and delivery of each site to be updated and confirmed. Due to the importance of Milton Keynes forming a key growth area the SHLAA and all supporting evidence must be transparent and robust. This will enable the most thorough understanding of the Milton Keynes housing land supply position that will underpin the emerging Milton Keynes LDF.</p>	
	Assessing Deliverability	<p>Berkeley consider that in order to enable a robust SHLAA to be produced credible parameters must be identified against which the delivery of sites and dwellings is identified. The SHLAA should clearly identify the parameters it has applied to the delivery of a site through the development plan and development control process and the identified annual build rates. This information should also be supplemented by correspondence confirming the local authorities understanding of delivery with the sites owner / promoter /</p>	<p>Detailed work of the JHDT team and direct contact with developers/owners/agents has helped to establish the delivery schedule/rates for specific sites already in the planning system. For other sites, additional work is planned with developers to agree the approach to estimating when sites could be delivered. This will include an assessment of build out rates, which will also be informed by previous completion rates across Milton Keynes. This work</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>developer. This detailed information and correspondence should be incorporated within an appendix to the published SHLAA. This information should also be updated, at least annually. Such annual assessments should also consider whether the previous years understanding of delivery is accurate. If the delivery of a site has been inaccurately incorporated with a previous years SHLAA Milton Keynes Council should re-consider the parameters applied regarding the delivery of a site through the development plan and development control process and actual build rates. Berkeley reserve the right to comment further on the Council's application and understanding of the time it will take to deliver sites through the development plan and development control process and deliver actual annual build rates.</p>	<p>will be included in the final assessment but it should be recognised that at the current time, in an economic downturn, it is particularly difficult to accurately predict when individual sites are likely to be developed. All information in the SHLAA will be updated on an annual basis to ensure an accurate record of land availability is available.</p>
Windfall Allowance		<p>Paragraph 11.1 of the Milton Keynes SHLAA Draft Methodology (Methodology) identifies that the supply of housing sites should be based on a supply of specific sites. However, it also identifies that if it is required, or there are genuine local circumstances to justify it, windfall allowances will be taken into account. However, Berkeley considers that a windfall allowance should not be incorporated within the Milton Keynes SHLAA. This is especially the case for that part of the SHLAA that has specific regard to accommodating the Milton Keynes Growth Area development requirements. The SHLAA for Milton Keynes should appropriately respond to its status as a Growth Area, where major development is to be delivered. Additionally, the purpose of not incorporating a windfall allowance is due to the fact that it is unclear as to where development from this source of supply would be delivered. This leads to an element of uncertainty in the supply of housing, makes it more difficult to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is in place to serve such development and reduces the robustness of emerging development plans. It is acknowledged that dwellings will be delivered on a 'windfall' basis. However, this source of</p>	<p>Windfall can reasonably be included in the SHLAA assessment where justified, after the first 10 years, but it is currently not the intention to include windfall in the SHLAA, as early work has indicated that there should be sufficient sites to show how 15 years worth of development could be incorporated (specifically in the urban area). Once further work has been undertaken, a final judgement about whether any work on windfall needs to be included in the assessment will be undertaken.</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	Review of the Assessment	<p>housing land supply should only be identified in the Milton Keynes Annual Monitoring Report against actual completions and inform data collection as part of the annual review of the SHLAA be amended accordingly.</p> <p>The Government's Practice Guidance identifies that once completed the SHLAA should be regularly kept up-to-date on at least an annual basis. It will form part of the Annual Monitoring Report exercise and support the housing trajectory and the five year supply of specific deliverable sites. The Practice Guidance further identifies the main information that is required to be recorded when updating the SHLAA. The Milton Keynes SHLAA Draft Methodology (Methodology) identifies that a database will be set up for internal use that will enable the SHLAA to be easily updated on an annual basis. Berkeley support this position and comment that it is imperative that the SHLAA is both updated and published, at least annually. However, Berkeley further considers that the Methodology should identify in more detail the information that will be sought when updating the SHLAA. Due to the Growth Area status of Milton Keynes it is imperative that the SHLAA provides the most up to date and robust evidence to support the production of development plans, allocation of sites and delivery of the areas strategic housing requirements. Accordingly, the following provides an indication of the information that should be assessed on an annual basis to enable a robust SHLAA to be maintained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites under construction - whether the site is being delivered at the build rate anticipated in previous versions of the SHLAA and detailed consideration of future build rates)</li> <li>• Sites with planning permission – progress made to construct housing and the build rate at which dwellings are being / envisaged to be delivered</li> <li>• Planning applications – progress made on the submission and determination of planning applications for housing</li> <li>• Sites previously considered unsuitable for housing – have previously identified constraints</li> </ul>	<p>The SHLAA will be updated on an annual basis primarily to reflect changes over the preceding year (i.e. completions, new planning permissions, removal of constraints etc...). It is not proposed to carry out a full call for sites unless it is necessary to 'top up' the supply of sites, which it is considered at least in the short term, to be unlikely. The methodology will be amended where necessary to clarify this.</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>been removed• Sites previously considered suitable for development – have unforeseen constraints emerged that deem a site no longer suitable for residential development• Windfall allowance – as detailed above Berkeley consider that a windfall allowance should not be incorporated within the MK SHLAA.Additionally, Berkeley consider that in order to enable a robust SHLAA to be produced credible parameters must be identified and applied, against which the delivery of sites and dwellings through the development plan and development control process and the actual annual build rates are progressed. This information should also be supplemented by correspondence confirming the local authorities understanding of site delivery with the sites owner / promoter / developer. Berkeley reserve the right to comment further on the details of the Council's consideration of site delivery application of</p>	
	<p>Publication, Consultation and the Core Strategy</p>	<p>It is imperative that the Milton Keynes SHLAA is published in full prior to / at the time of the publication of the Milton Keynes Core Strategy Submission Draft The SHLAA forms key evidence that, in part, underpins the emerging development strategy of the Core Strategy and the allocation of sites.The Methodology identifies that a draft report will be issued for a period of consultation and that a final report will be prepared for publication. However, the timing of these stages is not detailed.Berkeley considers that if the SHLAA is not published prior to / at the time the Milton Keynes Core Strategy Submission Draft is published then it would render the Core Strategy as unsound.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that a draft of the SHLAA will be published prior to, or alongside, the Submission Core Strategy. Early work on the SHLAA will feed into the production of the Core Strategy prior to the publication of the report.</p>
RPS	Paragraph 1.1	<p>Response: Paragraph 1.1 is incorrect in referring to a period of 'not less than 10 years'. Paragraph 53 of PPS3 requires Local Planning Authorities, in their Local Development Documents, to identify broad locations and specific sites for at least 15 years from the date of adoption. This is also clarified in paragraph 55(i). The SHLAA guidance produced by DCLG reiterates this requirement specifying that it is</p>	<p>Noted- the wording will be altered to clarify the purpose.</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>necessary to identify specific sites for the years 1 to 10 from adoption and broad locations for years 10 to 15 only where it is not possible to identify site specific sources for this period. Required Change: Paragraph 1.1 should be amended to reflect PPS3 and the SHLAA guidance by referring to a minimum period of 15 years from the date of the adoption of the plan.</p>	
	Paragraph 2.7	<p>Response: RPS support the Council's approach to not narrowing down the study by existing policy. This is the correct manner in which to undertake SHLAA. The narrowing down of the scope of the study by existing policy will prejudice new policy evolution based upon previous constraints. RPS does, however, accept that there are locations that can be excluded from the study area in accordance with paragraph 21 of the guidance. Paragraph 21 however states, that where particular types of land or areas may be excluded from the Assessment, the reasons for doing so will need to be justified and agreed by the Members of the SHLAA Partnership. Therefore the exclusion of sites from the study should be done in accordance with a partnership approach where stakeholders such as the development industry are fully engaged in the decision making process. Required Change: The Council's developer/agent panel should be established from the outset of the preparation of the SHLAA to foster greater ownership of the document and decision making. The reasons for the exclusion of sites and areas should be part of the remit of this group in accordance with paragraph 21 of the guidance.</p>	<p>Noted. Work is underway to look at the options for including developer interest in the process. Unfortunately, the Milton Keynes Housing Market Partnership disbanded last year which would have provided the appropriate forum for this to happen. Where comments relating to exclusion of sites have been made to this assessment, they will be taken on board as part of the process.</p>
	Paragraph 2.10	<p>Response: RPS supports the list of Rural Settlement to be included within the study and the requirement for sites to be either adjacent to the existing urban area or linked through another potential expansion area. In this context, the Council should make it clear in its methodology that while the opportunity to present sites to the Council by stakeholders is a welcome element of the process, it is not a specific</p>	<p>The Council's estates department has been involved in the SHLAA process and has identified suitable sites for inclusion in the assessment. The Council has also identified other suitable sites through sources such as the National Land Use Database, in accordance with national guidance. The methodology will be amended to</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>requirement of the SHLAA process in itself and has been adopted as best practice across the country for the purposes of information gathering. This does not therefore devolve the Council of its responsibility for identifying sites itself in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 7 of the guidance. The Council must therefore seek to identify areas of land which it deems are appropriate for development, including its own landholdings where it can facilitate sustainable development. The Council's Estates Department should therefore be fully engaged in and supportive of the SHLAA process. Required Change: The Council should seek itself to identify sites and not rely solely on those promoting sites. The Council's Estates Department should therefore be fully engaged in and supportive of the SHLAA process. As part of this the Council should identify the Land a Tickford Fields Farm, Newport Pagnell as a suitable, available and achievable site.</p>	<p>clarify that it is not a requirement to issue a call for sites, but it is done as best practice.</p>
	Paragraph 2.14	<p>Response: RPS supports the Council's approach to establishing a SHLAA working group that will review key parts of the assessment. This is considered a proactive approach to engagement and RPS would welcome inclusion on such a Panel on behalf of Old Road Securities Plc. This should not, however, be restricted to reviewing the process but should be actively engaged and integral to the planning and evolution of the assessment. RPS can bring with it the experience of being involved in some 40 SHLAAs across the country and would welcome such engagement in the Council's SHLAA process.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
	Paragraph 3.3	<p>Response: The consideration of allocations should also extend to those sites identified in the existing development plan such as Strategic Reserve Sites, as these are specifically identified as having housing potential. The Council's Estates department</p>	<p>Noted. This has happened.</p>



Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>should therefore be fully engaged within the SHLAA process in respect of the site at Newport Pagnell.</p> <p>Required Change:</p> <p>The methodology should clarify that Strategic Reserve Sites are included from the outset of the study. The Council's Estates department should also be fully engaged within the SHLAA process in respect of the site at Newport Pagnell.</p>	
	<p>Stage 7</p>	<p>Response: The capacity of housing sites should not be determined by existing development plan policy but by new and emerging development plan policy. This is the basis upon which SHLAA will inform (and test) assumptions and policy evolution in the emerging LDF. Density assumptions and the capacity of sites should relate to, and test, the underlying policy assumptions being developed by LDF policy. Relating such assumptions back to soon to be superseded policy is not appropriate. The Council should therefore set out its emerging policy for such issues and then use the SHLAA process to test not only the deliverability of the sites but the policy itself against housing delivery. It is also important to consider that housing development in the plan period will be of a different nature to that witnessed previously. This is particularly pertinent in respect of the Code for Sustainable Homes requirements, energy efficient design and urban design. Solutions to these issues will not reflect the density assumptions of the past. Taking energy efficient design alone, this will result in different residential layouts and densities than we have witnessed historically, especially to achieve higher code ratings. Cognisance of new and emerging density/design issues should therefore have more significance. While it is appreciated that density calculations must commence with certain assumptions, the Council should not restrain the study by these assumptions and should</p>	<p>The point is noted but given that the SHLAA provides an 'estimate' of housing potential of sites, it is felt that in the absence of any clear guidance on average site densities, existing policies are still the most logical mechanism for calculating housing potential. It is acknowledged that in certain cases preliminary design work undertaken by developers may be able to provide a more detailed estimate of the housing potential of each site- the methodology will be amended to make this clear. The Council does not currently have a replacement density policy in the Local Development Framework. This is likely to be part of a Development Management DPD, the production of which will start this year. Any changes brought about by this policy will be reflected in future iterations of the SHLAA</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>progress quickly in refining such assumptions. This should be undertaken by adopting a forward looking approach to density and site capacities rather than a mechanical / mathematical basis that is inflexible and representative of past cancelled guidance 'Tapping the Potential'. It is the role of the developer/agent Panel to assist the Council in this respect. Required Change: While the initial stages of SHLAA may incorporate mechanically formulated capacities, the Council should refine this as part of the SHLAA process through a forward looking and informed approach to density and site capacities rather than retaining a mechanical / mathematical basis that is inflexible.</p>	
	Stage 7B	<p>Response: RPS supports the Council's intentions to establish ownership through a number of means, however, the Council cannot make 'reasoned judgements' when it comes to considering land availability. It must use factual information supported by evidence. Such an approach is not supported in PPS3 or SHLAA practice. Where the Council cannot establish ownership or availability it must phase the site/land to the latter phases of the plan period given the uncertainty presented. As a minimum, all land within the first 10 years of the plan period should be supported by evidence of land availability and contain no assumptions.</p>	<p>Noted. Work has been undertaken to ascertain land availability through land owners and their agents. No sites will be included in the first five years supply without direct contact with the owner/agent to verify availability. The methodology will be amended to reflect this.</p>
	Stage 7B	<p>Response: The Council has rightly assumed in paragraph 8.5 that sites with planning consent are suitable for the purposes of SHLAA, however, there is no mention of existing consents with respect to availability. Not all planning consents will be delivered and while suitability issues are considered in processing a planning application, land availability is not such a key consideration. Indeed it is possible to apply for planning consent on land that is not owned by the applicant where availability is unknown. Therefore in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 58 of PPS3, the Council should undertake an assessment of its existing consents to</p>	<p>Noted. In the case of existing planning permissions or housing allocations, the Council has sought to contact each landowner (or their agent) for clarity about their intentions for delivery on each site. This work is also undertaken for larger sites through the Joint Housing Delivery Team (a partnership of key housing stakeholders), which has also fed into the process. The methodology will be amended if necessary to clarify this process.</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>determine the robustness of relying on them for future capacity. Unless it undertakes this as part of SHLAA the resultant housing trajectory will not conform to the requirements of PPS3. This would also conform to best practice within SHLAA. Required Changes: Planning consents should be assessed for availability and the likelihood of being 'fully implemented' in contributing to supply.</p>	
	Stage 7C	<p>Response: RPS welcomes the Council's approach to considering achievability and the invitation for the development industry to be engaged in this process. Detailed residential appraisals are over complex and often not fit for purpose in such studies, especially with the current market conditions and diversity of the industry. These studies can also be very superficial, become out of date extremely quickly and are often therefore not fit for purpose. In contrast Developer / Agent Panels have worked successfully within the SHLAA process and RPS has experience of them. RPS would therefore welcome an invitation to be part of the Council's SHLAA. In anticipation of any achievability assessment RPS would make the following comment. While there is no need for detailed financial appraisals of sites, the Council needs to appreciate the deliverability of sites and the significance of policy cost factors in order to establish deliverability. To this end it needs to be clear on its policy direction for issues such as the Current Milton Keynes Development Tariff, design requirements, energy efficient aspirations and affordable housing. All of these, when aggregated can provide a proxy for achievability costs and provide robustness to the Council's policy. It will also enable the Council to test the policy assumptions it makes in respect of these policy areas. This will test the deliverability issues associated with these requirements against the proposed housing trajectory which is required by national policy for all of the aforementioned policy areas. Required Changes: The Council needs to be clear on its policy direction for issues</p>	<p>Noted. Work is ongoing to gain developer feedback on such issues. This will feed into the assessment process and is explained in the final report.</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>such as the Current Milton Keynes Development Tariff, design requirements, energy efficient aspirations and affordable housing. All of these, when aggregated can provide a proxy for achievability costs. This should be considered by the developer/agent panel.RPS would also register its interest at being involved on the Developer/Agent Panel and has substantial experience in them.</p>	
	Stage 9	<p>Response: RPS supports the Council's specific reference to producing a housing trajectory and welcomes that approach. The Council must establish key factors within the housing trajectory with the development industry in order to provide the robustness it needs. Such considerations are site build out rates, lead in times and market/infrastructure delivery issues. These should all be agreed through the developer/agent panel process.Required Changes: The Council must establish key factors within the housing trajectory with the development industry in order to provide the robustness it needs. Such considerations are site build out rates, lead in times and market/infrastructure delivery issues.</p>	Noted.
	Stage 8	<p>Response: RPS supports the Council's approach to undertaking a separate risk assessment before proceeding to stages 9 and 10. This is representative of paragraph 45 of the SHLAA Guidance.</p>	Noted.
	Stage 9	<p>Response: The SHLAA methodology is not clear on the manner in which it will consider broad locations and their relative timing. Of particular note are: 1. Paragraph 10.3 states that shortfall in sites is likely to be in the urban area category 2. Paragraph 10.5 refers to areas such a Wolverton and Blechley as the foci for current regeneration activity. 3.</p>	<p>It is not the intention to assess broad areas for the 0-10 year period. If this is necessary, any identified potential would only be included after 10 years. Through annual reviews of the SHLAA, any sites within these areas where potential was identified would be kept under review and moved forward</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>Paragraph 10.6 confirms that these centres will be the primary focus of the assessment along with development hotspots where the focus of recent planning permissions suggests that there is current demand. Each of the above statements implies that the Council will be looking at urban areas and locations where current activity is prevalent or expected earlier rather than later in the plan period. While this in principle is in line with paragraph 26 of the guidance it is not appropriate in the context of identifying broad locations where reliance is for early delivery. A broad location (as has been confirmed by a recent DCLG letter) cannot contribute to housing supply until years 11 to 15 of the development plan. The recent DCLG letter also clarifies this point with respect to the ambiguity that has arisen on this issue from the Planning Advisory Service guidance to SHLAA. In accordance with this principle the Council cannot use any broad location in the areas identified above (where current demand is indicated) as contributing to supply in years 1 to 10 of the plan. Therefore shortfall in the urban areas as set out in paragraph 10.3 cannot contribute to supply until year 11, nor could the centres of Bletchley or Wolverton. If this is the intention of the Council then RPS does not object, however, if it is the intention of the Council that these areas are identified as potential broad locations (should broad locations be necessary) and will contribute to supply before year 11 then RPS would object as this is not in accordance with recently clarified Government policy. This is a mistake made by other SHLAAs elsewhere which has resulted in direct intervention by DCLG to remove such contributions from broad locations until year 11 onwards. Required Change: The Council should clarify the exact timing that it expects broad locations to contribute to housing supply which according to PPS3 is from year 11 of the plan at the earliest and that no contribution from such source can come forward prior to this date. This has been clarified by the recent DLCC letter on this matter.</p>	<p>where appropriate.</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	Stage 10	Response: RPS supports the Council's intentions to establish a supply of housing from site specific sources or broad locations where appropriate in the context of the comments made by RPS to Stage 9 rather than from windfalls.	Noted.

## Appendix 3- Call for sites proforma

# Milton Keynes Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment – ‘Call for Sites’

## Potential New Housing Site

The purpose of this proforma is to provide details of potential housing sites to assist Officers with their own site assessments. Please provide as much detail as possible to enable a thorough site assessment.

Assumptions regarding suitability and potential housing numbers will ultimately be based on observations of Officers. All will be subject to a sifting process to eliminate all those not suitable for inclusion in the SHLAA from the outset as either a) they do not fall within the areas listed below or b) through initial site assessments it is deemed that they are not suitable for housing (i.e. due to significant constraints such as flood risk).

**All proformas must be accompanied by a site plan otherwise they will not be accepted.**

### Checklist

#### **‘DO’ submit sites that:**

- Are likely to become available for development or redevelopment up to 2026
- Could accommodate 5 or more dwellings in or adjoining\*:
  - Milton Keynes (including urban extensions)
  - Newport Pagnell
  - Woburn Sands                      - Sherington
  - Olney                                      - Stoke Goldington
  - Hanslope                                - Wavendon
  - Lavendon                                - Bow Brickhill
  - Castlethorpe
- Sites within the settlement boundaries of any existing settlement

#### **‘DO NOT’ submit sites that:**

- Already have planning permission for development, (unless a significantly new and different proposal is likely in the future)
- Are allocated in the Milton Keynes Adopted Local Plan 2001-2011
- Are not within the areas mentioned above
- Are not in or immediately adjoining the boundary of the abovementioned locations (as shown on the current Local Plan proposals map)

\* These areas are those with 7 or more of the local facilities assessed in the 2007 Rural Services Audit and a school- they are not necessarily all settlements that will accommodate allocations. This will be determined through the Plan making process and NOT the SHLAA.



**Site Name and address:**

--

**Contact details**

Your details:	Agent/Representative details (If applicable)
Name:	Name:
Organisation:	Organisation:
Position:	Position:
Address:	Address:
Postcode:	Postcode:
Telephone:	Telephone:
Email:	Email:

## Site availability

Area (in ha) if known				
Potential timeframe for development	1-5 years (2009 – 2013)	5 - 10 years (2014 – 2018)	10 - 15 years (2019 – 2023)	After 15 years i.e. after 2023
Will the site need to be phased over several years?	1-3 years	3-5 years	Over 5 years (Please specify)	
Is the site currently being marketed either by yourself or through an agent?	Yourself		Agent	
Are you waiting for a decision on a current planning application for the site?	Yes		No	
Are you aware of any legal constraints on the site that might prohibit or delay any development (including tenancies, ransom strips etc...)	Yes (Please explain below)		No	
Please add any additional details regarding the availability of the site, which may help us with our assessment, in the space available below.				

## Achievability

Do you own the site?	Yes	No		
If no, please give provide the owner(s) details. If there is more than one owner, please provide details for all (use a separate sheet if necessary).				
Name:				
Organisation:				
Address:				
Email:				
Telephone:				
Are you an agent representing the site (if No what is your interest in the site)	Yes	No .....		
In your opinion how many dwellings can the site achieve	5-10	11-24	>=25	
If 25 or over, please specify more exactly an estimated capacity:				
In your opinion what type of dwellings could be appropriate on the site?	Houses	Flats	Bungalows	Mix
In your opinion are any other uses suitable for the site?	A1 Retail	B1 Business	D2 Leisure	Other (Please state) .....
What likely affects do neighbouring land uses have on the sites marketability?		Positive	Neutral	Negative
What likely affects does the economic viability of the existing use of the site have on developing the site for housing?		Positive	Neutral	Negative
Does the location of the site have an affect on its attractiveness for marketing the site for housing?		Positive	Neutral	Negative
How will your site be influenced by the local housing market conditions?		Positive	Neutral	Negative
What affect do you envisage site preparation costs may have on the site?		Positive	Neutral	Negative
Are there any other issues that may influence the achievability of the site?(Please comment)				

## Suitability

What is the current use of the site (please tick one):	Vacant brownfield	
	Current employment	
	Current retail	
	Current leisure	
	Greenfield	
Please list which constraints apply to the site (or part of the site)		
Flood Risk		
Comment		
Listed Building(s)/buildings of historical or local importance		
Comment		
Nature Conservation		
Comment		
Accessibility to key services *		
Comment		
Access/infrastructure		
Comment		
Ecology		
Comment		
Archaeological		
Comment		
Conservation Area		
Comment		
Agricultural land		
Comment		
Other constraints (inc pollution/contamination, topography etc...)		
Comment		
What action do you consider could be undertaken in order to overcome these constraints? (investment, infrastructure etc...)		

\* Key facilities denotes: -Hospital, Primary, Secondary Schools, Further Education, Supermarkets, GP's

## Survey issues

In submitting this questionnaire you are giving rights for an officer (or representative of the council) to access and survey the site. If you are the agent please provide the owner(s) authorisation to permit a representative of the council to access and survey the site.

Can you please inform us of any access issues that may effect a site visit?

Signature:.....

Please return the questionnaire along with an up-to-date Ordnance Survey based map (**Without this mapped information we are unable to register the site**) outlining the precise boundaries of the site in its entirety and the part which may be suitable for housing (if this is less than the whole). No later than **18<sup>th</sup> February 2009** to the following address:

Development Plans Team  
Spatial Planning Division  
Environment Directorate  
Milton Keynes Council  
PO Box 112, Civic Offices  
1 Saxon Gate East  
Milton Keynes  
MK9 3HQ



## Appendix 4- Site assessment proforma

### SHLAA Site Assessment Pro Forma

Survey Date	
Name of Surveyor(s)	
<b>Site Details</b>	
Site Reference (from SHLAA list)	North 67
Size and potential capacity	1.09ha
Location	The site is located to the South of Newport Pagnell centre, off the eastern side of Willen Road, adjacent to Newport Town Football Club.
Current Land Use	Open space/agriculture
PDL/Greenfield	Greenfield
Within a Strategic Development Area?	No
<b>Details from Site Submission</b>	
Landowner	XXX
Potential timeframe for development	1-5 years
Potential number of dwellings	33
Availability of infrastructure	
Any other relevant information (e.g., type of dwellings proposed, suitability for mixed use)	The site does not need phasing and could provide a mix of bungalows, flats and houses, as well as being suitable for business use.
<b>Has the site been promoted/assessed before?</b>	
Local Plan? Outcome?	The site is the same as OM72- omitted because the land is within floodplain that is a significant factor in defining the limits to Newport Pagnell in this vicinity. In addition large parts of the site are within a 250m landfill buffer site. These environmental considerations are decisive in ruling out this site for development.
MK 2031 analysis? Outcome?	no
<b>Does it conform to policy?</b>	
Emerging Core Strategy?	
South East Plan?	
How would the site help deliver the vision and objectives of the emerging Core Strategy?	



Does the site have an existing/previous planning permission?	In 1991 and outline application for low cost residential development was refused.
PPS/PPG?	
<b>Known constraints/Local Plan policy</b>	
Is the site within/contain designated important areas of landscape character, scenic quality or particular natural asset?	Half the site is within a 250metre landfill buffer zone.
Does the site contain listed buildings (LP Policy HE2/HE3/HE5), conservation areas (LP Policy HE6), areas of archaeological importance (LP Policy HE1), SAMs etc?	no
Is the area at risk from flooding (LP Policy S13)?	The whole site is covered by either flood risk zone 2 or 3
Does the site contain areas designated for nature conservation value (LP Policy NE1), or important/protected species?	No
Does the site contain any open space used for leisure and recreation (LP Policy L2)?	No
Any other Local Plan designations?	Open countryside, the site is also outside the development boundary of Newport Pagnell.
Any legal constraints?	None known
Are there conflicting adjacent land uses?	
Non-conflicting adjacent land uses?	
Other constraints e.g., power lines, topography, contamination?	
<b>Accessibility</b>	
Where is the proposed access/existing access to the site?	Access to the site would be off of Willen Road.
Broader accessibility (foot/car/redway etc)?	
Is the area close to existing public transport routes?	There are currently two bus services that run through the proposed site, one of which runs 2 services per hour, with the other providing 1-2 services per hour. Both these services connect the proposed site to central Milton Keynes, along with Newport Pagnell Centre and Bedford.

<p>Is there good access to a neighbourhood/local/ district centre and facilities?</p>	<p>The town centre of Newport Pagnell is less than 2km in distance from the proposed site. Newport Pagnell contains amongst other things, several first schools, a secondary school, a small leisure centre, a church, several supermarkets along with numerous other smaller shops and areas of employment.</p> <p>The proposed site is also less than 5km in distance from central Milton Keynes and numerous other services including several secondary schools, supermarkets, retail parks and the Open University.</p>
---	---

Site visit notes and conclusion:

- land is flat
- no physical constraints obvious
- flooding issues are however a major problem, allotments adjacent regularly flood.

## Appendix 5- Rural windfall summary



Settlement	1999/2000	%age	2000/01	%age	2001/02	%age	2002/03	%age	2003/04	%age	2004/05	%age	2005/06	%age	2006/07	%age	2007/08	%age	2008/09	%age	Total	Windfall
Newport Pagnell	59	42.1%	46	32.6%	10	22.2%	3	6.0%	32	29.9%	77	67.5%	35	27.1%	23	12.8%	39	15.4%	77	57.0%	401	155
Oney	33	23.6%	61	43.3%	18	40.0%	16	32.0%	9	8.4%	14	12.3%	52	40.3%	76	42.2%	78	30.7%	2	1.5%	359	169
Woburn Sands		0.0%		0.0%	2	4.4%	1	2.0%	29	27.1%		0.0%	1	0.8%	37	20.6%	116	45.7%	22	16.3%	208	11
Hanslope and Long Street	5	3.6%	14	9.9%	2	4.4%	5	10.0%	3	2.8%		0.0%	3	2.3%	8	4.4%	5	2.0%	23	17.0%	68	44
Castlethorpe	17	12.1%	1	0.7%	1	2.2%		0.0%	16	15.0%	5	4.4%	10	7.8%	7	3.9%		0.0%		0.0%	57	35
Lavendon	9	6.4%	1	0.7%	1	2.2%	2	4.0%	7	6.5%	4	3.5%	3	2.3%	5	2.8%	2	0.8%	1	0.7%	35	22
Tyringham and Flgrave		0.0%	1	0.7%		0.0%	3	6.0%	2	1.9%	2	1.8%	13	10.1%	2	1.1%		0.0%		0.0%	23	18
Astwood		0.0%		0.0%	1	2.2%	14	28.0%		0.0%	3	2.6%	1	0.8%		0.0%	2	0.8%		0.0%	21	7
Haversham/Little Linford	1	0.7%	8	5.7%	1	2.2%		0.0%	1	0.9%		0.0%	4	3.1%	2	1.1%	1	0.4%		0.0%	18	18
Stoke Goldington		0.0%	3	2.1%	3	6.7%	1	2.0%		0.0%		0.0%	5	3.9%	1	0.6%		0.0%	2	1.5%	15	15
Sherington	2	1.4%	2	1.4%	1	2.2%		0.0%	2	1.9%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.6%	3	1.2%		0.0%	11	11
Clifton Reynes		0.0%	1	0.7%	1	2.2%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	6	3.3%	2	0.8%		0.0%	10	9
Newton Blossomville	2	1.4%		0.0%	1	2.2%		0.0%		0.0%	5	4.4%		0.0%	2	1.1%		0.0%		0.0%	10	10
North Crawley	4	2.9%	1	0.7%		0.0%	1	2.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	2	1.1%	2	0.8%		0.0%	10	10
Bow Brickhill	1	0.7%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.8%	2	1.1%		0.0%	3	2.2%	7	7
Emberton/Peisoe End	4	2.9%	1	0.7%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.9%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.6%		0.0%		0.0%	7	7
Gayhurst		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	2.0%	3	2.8%	1	0.9%		0.0%	2	1.1%		0.0%		0.0%	7	7
Cold Brayfield		0.0%		0.0%	2	4.4%	2	4.0%		0.0%	1	0.9%	1	0.8%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	6	5
Wavendon/Cross End + Lower End	1	0.7%	1	0.7%	1	2.2%	1	2.0%		0.0%	1	0.9%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.7%	6	6
Weston Underwood		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.9%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.4%	3	2.2%	5	5
Little Brickhill	1	0.7%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.9%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.6%		0.0%		0.0%	3	3
Ravenstone		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	2	1.1%	1	0.4%		0.0%	3	3
Calverton		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.9%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.7%	2	2
Chicheley		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.4%		0.0%	1	1
Lathbury		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	0.4%		0.0%	1	1
Moulsoe	1	0.7%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	1	1
Hardmead		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	0	0
Warrington		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>###</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>###</b>	<b>1295</b>	<b>582</b>
<b>Planned Sites</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>###</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>###</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>###</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>36.0%</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>66.4%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>48.2%</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>###</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>57.8%</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>80.3%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>###</b>	<b>713</b>	<b>44.94%</b>
<b>Windfall</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>###</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>###</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>###</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>64.0%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>33.8%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>51.8%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>###</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>42.2%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>###</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>Windfall</b>



## Appendix 6- Available urban sites- under 5 dwellings

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info From
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
MK18	Rear of Stoke Road, Bletchley	2	2			Site visit- under construction
MK41	Mill Farm, Bletchley	1	1			confirmed agent via letter
MK42	133 Fishermead Boulevard	4	4			Site visit- under construction
MK46	Former Coopers Works, The Wharf, Great Linford	1	1			Site- visit- under construction
MK47	Land At 7 Guest Gardens, New Bradwell	1	1			Site- visit- under construction
MK48	Land adj Stonebridge House Farm, New Bradwell	1	1			Site- visit- under construction
MK49	89 Oldbrook Boulevard, Oldbrook	2	2			Site- visit- under construction
MK50	Land adjoining 36 Augustus Road, Stony Stratford	1	1			Site- visit- under construction
MK51	17 The Green, Woughton on the Green	1	1			Site- visit- under construction
MK53	83 Bushy Close, Bletchley	1	1			Site- visit- under construction
MK56	High Street, Stony Stratford	3	3			Site Visit- under construction
MK57	Land to the rear of Egmont Avenue, Stony Stratford	1	1			confirmed by agent via letter
MK74	29 Cheshire Rise, Bletchley	1	1			Site- visit- under construction
MK78	Land at Three Trees Pub, Bletchley	2	2			confirmed by agent via letter
MK80	41 Stanton Avenue, Bradville	2	2			confirmed by agent via letter
MK85	1 The Crescent, Great Linford	1	1			confirmed by agent via letter
MK86	4 Common Cottages, Loughton	1	1			Site Visit- under construction
MK91	4 Glyn Street Flats, New Bradwell	3	3			confirmed by agent via letter
MK97	10 Calverton Road	2	2			confirmed by agent via letter
MK103	25 Walton Road, Walnut Tree	4	4			Site- visit- under construction
MK106	96 - 97 Stratford Road, Wolverton	1	1			confirmed by applicant via letter
MK108	Land adj 7 Woburn Avenue, Wolverton	1	1			confirmed by agent via letter
MK109	Manor Farm, Old Wolverton	5	5			confirmed by agent via telephone call
MK114	Land Adjacent To 11 Shenley Road, Shenley Church End	1	1			Confirmed by agent. Work on hold at present, but will be progressed
MK197	Plot 14, Ashford Crescent, Grange Farm	1	1			Site visit- under construction
MK202	1A Bradwell Road, New Bradwell	1	1			Site visit- under construction
MK203	9A Whaddon Way	1	1			Site visit- under construction
MK214	R/O 169/171 Queensway	2	2			Site visit- under construction
MK217	9 Gibbwin, Great	2	2			Site visit- under

	Linford					construction
MK225	Site B3.2 North Midsummer Boulevard	3	3			Site visit- under construction
MK226	The Paddocks, Bradwell road, Loughton	3	3			Site visit- under construction
MK232	128 Western Road, Bletchley	5	5			Site visit- under construction
		61	61	0	0	



## **Appendix 7- Email panel members**

Gary Tucker, George Wimpey  
Darren Farmer, Gallagher Estates  
Jonathon Harbottle, Land and Partners Ltd