

## **Examination of the Milton Keynes Borough Council**

### **SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN DPD**

#### **INSPECTOR'S FINAL MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR EXAMINATION**

##### **Matter 1 – Duty to Cooperate, Local Development Scheme, Consultation, Habitats Regulations, Public Sector Equality Duty, accordance with the Act and Regulations and consistency with national policy**

Issue – has there been compliance with relevant legal and procedural requirements and an assessment of reasonable alternatives?

###### *Questions*

1. Is there any reason to suppose that the SAP has not been prepared in accordance with the minimum requirements of the relevant guidance and legislation?

##### **Matter 2 – The role of the SAP**

Issue – is the SAP consistent with, and does it positively promote, the objectives and spatial policies contained within the Core Strategy?

###### *Questions*

2. Does the scale, type and distribution of the proposed allocations conform to the stated expectations of, and any relevant policies included within, the Core Strategy?
3. Should the SAP have a clear and specific timeframe?
4. Is the use of employment land, whether brownfield or otherwise, for housing allocations justified?

##### **Matter 3 – Individual Allocations**

Issue - Are the individual allocations policies clear, justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

###### *Questions*

5. Is it effective to allocate sites, which already have planning permission, within the SAP?

6. The SAP should set out which extant development plan policies, if any, are being superseded by it. Is there a reason why it does not (e.g. no policies are being so superseded)?
7. Can policy that cross refers in general terms to an '*adopted development brief*' be regarded as effective?
8. Should policy allowing for mixed uses be more specific about the uses and mix expected? In its present form is such policy sufficiently appropriate and effective?
9. SAP2 - What certainty is there that any noise from the neighbouring light industrial uses could be successfully mitigated by a future residential development?
10. SAP4 - What is the justification for allocating a site that is in conflict with part of the adopted development plan? Is it reasonable to take this approach? Would the allocation of the site give rise to adverse parking issues?
11. SAP7 - Given the dismissal on appeal, twice, for residential development on this site (albeit not for housing) for factors including inadequate living conditions for future occupiers, what certainty is there that any noise and/or outlook issues could be satisfactorily overcome?
12. SAP11 and SAP13 - Can these sites reasonably be regarded as available for development?
13. SAP14 - Is it reasonable to allocate this site for residential development given the explicit uncertainty within policy about whether it is deliverable, potentially being required for 'other purposes'?
14. SAP15 - What evidence is there to support the view that the site is not needed for higher education purposes?
15. SAP16 - Can policy that seeks only to 'discourage' on-street parking be regarded as effective?
16. SAP19 - Is the wording of the proposed policy effective in reflecting the extent of the site, the proposals for it and other policies relating to it?