

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 Citroen 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.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
MK17	Ashland Phase 2		208	Permission	Already considered suitable
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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
MK47	Land At 7 Guest Gardens, New Bradwell		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
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
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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
MK74	29 Cheshire Rise, Bletchley		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK75	62-66 Queensway, Bletchley		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
MK102	33 Stratford Road, Wolverton		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK103	25 Walton Road, Walnut Tree		4	Permission	Already considered suitable
MK104	37 Aylesbury Street, Wolverton		2	Permission	Already considered suitable
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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
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 & 3		238	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
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		100	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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
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 Pipes Site (NEA), Area 3		10	Permission	Already considered suitable
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	6	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK166	Leadenhall adj Woughton Campus	0.16	20	Local Plan Proposal	Already considered suitable
MK167	Middleton Adj Fire Station	0.30	8	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		7	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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
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.
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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
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
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, EEA		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.
MK235	Former White Hart Pub, Bletchley		11	Council identified	Disused pub site within residential area. Surrounded by boards for demolition. No physical constraints to development apart from demolition. Ownership unknown.
Total Suitable sites- urban area			29,676		

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. Area currently low density.
S2	Land at Crofts End, Sherington	1.43	32	developer promoted	Significant implications of ancient monument Would reduce potential capacity. Views from the village would be affected. Currently provides a separation to the conservation area. Suitability subject to conservation area review.
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. Suitability subject to conservation area review.
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. Site is however away from the main core of the village.
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. Significant impacts to access would be needed.
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. Potential impact on setting of conservation area and listed buildings. Suitability subject to conservation area character review.
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. Access to the site an issue. May require demolition of the pub.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
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.
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. Access would need significant improvement. Could benefit from joint development with HN9.
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
HN20	Spinney Lodge Farm, Hanslope		1	Permission	Already Considered Suitable
HN21	Cuckoo Hill Far, Hanslope		14	Permission	Already considered suitable
SG2	Ram Alley, Stoke Goldington	3.47	78	developer promoted	Impact on listed is main constraint. Undulating land and lack of good access points to be addressed. Suitability subject to conservation character review.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
SG4	Land at Stoke Goldington	2	45	developer promoted	In AAL. Some existing farm building would need to be demolished. Access possible but potential impact on local distributor road. ¹
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 and constrained housing numbers. Suitability subject to conservation area character review.
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. Key site on entering the village. No major physical constraints. Suitability subject to conservation area character review and cumulative impact on access from Northampton Road.
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- but this would need significant improvement. 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, which would need significant improvement or via LV3. No other 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. Access could constrain the capacity of the site. Agricultural land. No other major constraints.

¹ SG4 and SG5 are generally suitable- but there is a general constraint on the level of potential development in Stoke Goldington (were it to be identified for any new development in the future) in terms of increased stopping and turning on Northampton Road

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/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. Access via Langlands may constrain site capacity.
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.
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
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
LV16	Barns at Lavendon Mill, 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		2	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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
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
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. Some concerns over delivery of a safe highway access due to impact on primary distributor road.
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. Suitability subject to surrounding sites. Access a potential issue if site to be bought forward as it is due to proximity of bend on Lavendon Road.
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
OL18	2 to 4 Market Place, Olney		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
OL19	97 Weston Road, Olney		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
OL20	Town Farm, West Street, Olney		1	Permission	Already considered suitable

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
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.
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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
NP22	Green End Farm, Newport Pagnell		22	permission	Already considered suitable
NP23	Yard Off Taylors & 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
NP27	23 London Road Barn, Newport Pagnell		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
NP28	45 Broad Street, Newport Pagnell		1	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
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. Access to the site is constrained and would need to be addressed.
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
BB9	Land at Blind Pond Farm		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.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
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		112	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
WS9	Land adj 31 Aspley Hill		1	Permission	Already considered suitable
Total Suitable sites- rest of the borough			3,010		

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	283.6	4,800 ²	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). Noise from A421 and M1 would need to be mitigated to north of the site. SEP requirement for 4,800 homes in this area tested through growth study and GVA Grimley 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 ³	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	25	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	159	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 from 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	48.5	849	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. Sewage works in one field would need to be considered.
Ex1k	Lodge Farm	2.41	42	Developer Promoted	Farm land. Existing dwelling on site. Access off Lower End Road. No significant constraints.
Ex1l	Crabtree Farm, Cranfield Road	17.1	299	Developer Promoted	Farm land. Some existing buildings on site. No significant constraints.
Ex1m	Various Uncertain Sites	28.12	492	Council Identified	Various pieces of farmland with uncertain landownership. Land is generally pasture land with some farm buildings and farm houses.
Ex1n	Land south of Newport Road	8.5	149	Developer Promoted	Farm land. Coalescence with Wavendon to be addressed. No major other constraints.

² Figure based on work undertaken to establish potential capacity of SE SDA by GVA Grimley. Figure assumed to be the minimum required to meet the SE Plan requirements although study suggest a higher figure is possible.

³ Notional capacity for individual sites based on calculation outlined under Stage 6.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
Ex1o	Land adjacent to Wavendon lodge	4.05	71	Developer promoted	Flat pasture land. No specific constraints
Ex2	Land at WEA (Fairfield Expansion)	50.2	878	developer promoted	Land is beyond a boundary currently planned as a long term edge to Milton Keynes. Potential coalescence with Calverton and Wealds villages to be considered. Potential access issues from Milton Keynes due to planned WEA. Area need to be re-planned. Landscape impact would need to be looked at in more detail. Would potentially only be suitable as open space in relation to any increase in capacity of WEA (MK170 and MK171)
Ex3	Land at Eaton Leys	40.5	708	developer promoted	Over half the site is outside of the Milton Keynes city boundary, potential additional area in AVDC (subject to their assessment) c.70ha. Wildlife issues to address- inc 18 notable species. Wildlife corridors on site and a limited amount of floodplain land to incorporate. Listed buildings on site would need to be sensitively treated.
Ex4	Lavente Gate	29.9	523	developer promoted	Over half the site is outside of the Milton Keynes city boundary. Potential additional land in AVDC area (subject to their assessment) 40ha. Separated from urban area by EX3- therefore would be long term proposal. Partly within an AAL. Potential Landscape issues to address. Potential impact on Little Brickhill conservation area to consider.
Ex5	Shenley Dens	21.9	383	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	177.6	3108	developer promoted	These figures are for only part of the site, as the over half lies outside the Milton Keynes boundary. Potential additional land outside MK boundary (subject to Beds assessment) c288ha. 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	7.8	136	developer promoted	Some significant constraints. 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. Would need significant highway modification to facilitate an acceptable access from Wolverton Road
Ex9	South of Newport Pagnell, Lovat Park	300	5250	developer promoted	Issues around flooding on approximately 37% of the site area, which would need to be built into any open space provision. Also constraints with links to Milton Keynes and potential impact junction 14 of the M1. Part covered by area of current mineral extraction. Noise from M1 would need to be mitigated on small part of the site.
EX11	Bellow Hill Farm, Bow Brickhill	118.6	2076	developer promoted	Concern of coalescence of Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands to be addressed from a conservation point of view. Railway line could be argued as strong natural boundary to the southern growth of the city. Issues with access across the rail line.
Ex11a	Part of Below Hill Farm, Bow Brickhill	6.4	112	developer promoted	Reliant on EX11 being allocated and developed as it is an isolated site. Used as agricultural land. No major constraints.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
EX11b	Development Site, Bow Brickhill	5.4	95	developer promoted	Reliant on EX11 being allocated and developed. Currently used as paddocks and nursery. Some associated buildings and structures. No other significant constraints.
EX11c	Development site 2, Bow Brickhill	17.4	306	Developer promoted	Reliant on EX11 being allocated and developed. Agricultural land. No major constraints.
Total Suitable sites- potential future expansion areas			18,375		

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.
SG1	Maltings Close, Stoke Goldington	3.3	74	developer promoted	Ruled out- site unsuitable due to inability of Mount Pleasant to support any additional development.
SG3	Westside Lane, Stoke Goldington	0.55	12	developer promoted	Ruled out- unacceptable access to the site. Could support some form of small scale redevelopment only.
SG8	Land opposite Home Close Stable, Stoke Goldington	0.44	9	developer promoted	Ruled out- constrained from a conservation perspective as development would undermine the rural setting of the church and a group of listed buildings.
SG11	land to the west of Dag Lane, Stoke Goldington	0.68	15	developer promoted	Ruled out- constrained from a conservation perspective as development would undermine the rural setting of the church and a group of listed buildings. Adjacent roads also unsuitable to support additional development.
SG12	Home Close, Church Lane, Stoke Goldington	4.06	91	developer promoted	Ruled out- constrained from a conservation perspective as development would undermine the rural setting of the church and a group of listed buildings. Adjacent roads also unsuitable to support additional development.
SG13	Orchard Way, Stoke Goldington	2.5	56	developer promoted	Ruled out- constrained from a conservation perspective as development would undermine the rural setting of the church and a group of listed buildings.
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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	Site Area (Ha)	NO of DWGS	How identified	Conclusions/constraints
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. Potential impact on grade II* listed church.
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.
HA3	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
SG9	Land off High Street, Stoke Goldington	0.89	20	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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Conclusions/constraints
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	
MK2	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			Site Visit – Under Construction
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
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	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	
	Park					
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	100	100			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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info From
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
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
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	7	7			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	140	510		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 ⁴	59	59			Various

⁴ For a full list of sites see SHLAA table 14.

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info From
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
Urban area- Total Available sites		29,186	7831	14,609	6,746	

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
SG2	Ram Alley, Stoke Goldington	78		78		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
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
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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info from
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
RA3	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	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

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	Deliverability/Developability			Info from
			1-5yrs	5-10yrs	10-15yrs	
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 Taylors & 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
Rest of the borough- Total Available sites		2,774	400	1,791	583	

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 ⁵
EX1a	Wavendon Golf Centre	950 ⁶			950		Proforma
Ex1b	Land at Lower End Road, Wavendon	25			25		Proforma
Ex1d	Smith Stuart Reynolds Site 1, Wavendon	159			159		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	849			849		Proforma
Ex1k	Lodge Farm	42			42		Letter form Landowner
Ex1l	Crabtree Farm, Cranfield Road	299			299		Letter from Consultant
Ex1m	Various Uncertain Sites	492			492		Uncertain ⁷
EX1n	Land south of Newport Road	149			149		Letter from Consultant
Ex1o	Land Adjacent to Wavendon Lodge	71			71		Proforma
EX2	Land at WEA	878				878	Proforma
Ex3	Land at Eaton Leys	708		708			Proforma
Ex4	Lavente Gate	523			523		Proforma
Ex5	Shenley Dens	383		383			Proforma
Ex6	North West & South East of Salford Rd	3108		1500	1608		Proforma

⁵ Additional information sought from consortium lead on ownership and site assembly information to aid the assessment of deliverability.

⁶ Figures in grey are site by sites estimates of capacity on for individual parts of the total for EX1- they should not be double counted. They are based on an indicative 35dph and 50% housing yield.

⁷ These are the largest areas where ownership is uncertain. Other smaller pieces of land within the SDA may also have development potential.

			Deliverability/Developability				
Ex8	Land North of Wolverton Road, South of Hanson Environmental Centre	136		136			Proforma
Ex9	South of Newport Pagnell, Lovat Park	5250		2375	2375	500	Proforma
EX11	Bellow Hill Farm, Bow Brickhill	2076		1000	1076		Proforma
Ex11a	Part of Below Hill Farm, Bow Brickhill	112		112			Proforma
EX11b	Development Site, Bow Brickhill	95		95			Proforma
EX11c	Development site 2, Bow Brickhill	306		306			Proforma
Rest of the borough- Total Available sites		18,375	0	7,365	8,582	2,428	

SHLAA Table 10: Sites with uncertain availability- urban area

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS
MK3	Land rear of Citroen Garage, Stony Stratford	10
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
MK96	Land at 139 Simpson	4
MK98	73 Ousebank Way, Stony Stratford	1

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS
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

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	6
MK166	Leadenhall adj Woughton Campus	20

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
MK235	Former White Hart Pub, Bletchley	11
Total Urban Uncertain sites		203

SHLAA table 11: Sites with uncertain availability- rural area

SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS	SHLAA Ref No.	Address	NO of DWGS
HN13	22 Long Street Road, Hanslope	1	OL18	2 to 4 Market Place, Olney	1
HN14	Grange Farm, Higham Cross, Hanslope	1	OL19	97 Weston Road, Olney	1
HN16	The Old Bus Garage, Hanslope	3	NP12	Land adjacent to 17 London Road, Newport Pagnell	1
HN18	7 Weavers End, Hanslope	1	NP18	Cottages at Wepener, 23 London Road, Newport Pagnell	2
HN19	Land off Nevill Close-additional plot	1	NP19	Kickles Lodge, Newport Pagnell	1
HA2	16 Chalmers Avenue, Haversham	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
LV11	112 to 114 Olney Road, Lavendon	2	NP25	Former Aston Martin Site	105
LV13	26 Castle Road, Lavendon	1	NP26	D J C Autos Site, Newport Pagnell	5
LV15	Lavendon Mill, Coney Hutch, Lavendon	1	NP27	23 London Road Barn, Newport Pagnell	1
LV17	74 Lavendon Road, Lavendon	4	NP28	45 Broad Street, Newport Pagnell	1
CR3	Whitelands Shed, Clifton Reynes	1	NP31	Adj to 40 Annesley Road	1
NB4	Riverview Barn, Newton Blossomville	1	LB7	Garage, Watling Street, Little Brickhill	13
NB5	Land adj to 3 and 4 Clifton Road, Newton Blossomville	2	LB8	Land at Tall Timbers and Pine Haven, Little Brickhill	2
RA2	Chestnut Cottage, Ravenstone	1	WS4	8 Spring Grove, Woburn Sands	1
GA1	Land at Newport Road, Gayhurst	1	WS5	9 Spring Grove, Woburn Sands	1
GA2	Reading Room, Park Farm, Gayhurst	1	WS6	Station Road/West Road, Woburn Sands	5
OL10	13 Midland Road, Olney	1	WS8	521 Newport Road, Woburn Sands	1
OL11	Land adj to 94 Weston Rd, Olney	1	WS9	Land adj 31 Aspley Hill	1
OL12	Land at Corner of Lavendon Road, Olney	1	AST5	Three, Willows, Turvey Road	1
OL13	Land rear of 43 High Street, Olney	1	BB8	11 Church Road, Bow Brickhill	1
OL15	The Old Fire Station, Olney	1	CA4	Barn 3, Calverton Manor Farm	1
OL17	East Street Site 1, Olney	42	CS7	Land rear of 65 to 67 Station Road, Castlethorpe	1
Total rural uncertain sites					236

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 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
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	Land adj 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
		1,546	400	706	440	

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 ⁸		950			Proforma
Ex1b	Land at Lower End Road, Wavendon	25		25			Proforma
Ex1d	Smith Stuart Reynolds Site 1, Wavendon	159		159			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	849		849			Proforma
EX1k	Lodge Farm	42		42			Via solicitor
Ex1l	Crabtree Farm, Cranfield Road	299		299			Letter from agent
Ex1m	Land with uncertain ownership	492		492			Council identified
Ex1n	Land south of Newport Road	149		149			Letter from agent
Ex1o	Land adjacent to Wavendon Lodge	71		71			Proforma
			0	750	3000	1050	

⁸ Figures in grey form part of the total for EX1- they should not be double counted. They are indicative figures based on 35 dph/50% housing yield.

SHLAA Table 14: 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
MK43	Plot 1, Ashford Crescent, Grange Farm	1	1			Site visit- under construction
MK44	Plot 2, Ashford Crescent, Grange Farm	1	1			Site visit- under construction
MK45	Plots 11, 12 & 13, Asford Crescent, Grange Farm	1	1			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	1	1			Site visit- under construction

	Farm					
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 Linford	2	2			Site visit- under 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
		59	59			

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.

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	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.
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	The density zones follow those set out in the Local Plan and represent approximate densities in

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		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 too early to make this assumption? There are probably other density patterns appropriate for a city originally conceived as a multi-centred city.	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 approach.
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.	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,	The SHLAA methodology should not exclude Greenfield sites	The assessment needs to look primarily at the next

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	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 new free standing settlement will not be the most appropriate solution to meet future housing needs?	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.
	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

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	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.	<p>stage.</p> <p>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 in the assessment. This may change in future years and be part of future assessments.</p>
	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>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>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	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.	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.
	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.

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	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 suggested in the submission.</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.
	Paragraph 8.10	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?	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,

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
			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.
	Paragraph 10.6	Strongly support the statement that in assessing broad locations, Bletchley and Wolverton will be two of the primary areas of assessment.	Noted. Additional broad areas will only be assessed where the SHLAA shows a need to find more potential housing sites.
Anglian Water		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 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	Noted- details of sites to be provided to Anglian Water to enable additional site constraints to be identified.

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
Aspley Guise Parish Council		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.	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.
		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.	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.
		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.	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.
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 " <i>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.</i> " Paragraph 21 of the same states that " <i>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</i> " It is Bidwells view that the proposed methodology is therefore contrary to the Practice Guidance particularly where it has been "amended to reflect	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

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		local circumstances" as states on page 5 of the methodology.	identified would be likely to be unsustainable (i.e. 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.
	Excluding sites based on local planning policy.	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.	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.
		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.	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.
	Preclusion of sites on size	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	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

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>on the basis that "<i>the majority of housing is expected to be delivered on large sites</i>" is without justification. There is no 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.</p>	<p>to be found, it is not felt that even if 100 additional sites for 1 home were to be included, the 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.</p>
	<p>Preclusion of sites on basis of location</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Woburn Sands and District Society</p>		<p>Supportive of the parameters set out in para 2.10</p>	<p>Noted</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		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 unitary authorities boundaries	It should have been made clearer in both the methodology 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.	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 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.
	lack of consultation	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	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

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>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 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>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>
Berkeley Strategic	Intro	<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>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>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 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"> • 44,560 dwellings be delivered in and around the Milton Keynes Urban Area • 2,400 dwellings be delivered in the rural areas / rest of Milton Keynes <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</p>	

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>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>	
	<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"> • Identify specific, deliverable sites for the first five years of a plan that are ready for development; • Identify specific, developable sites for years 6-10, and ideally years 11-15, in plans; • Where it is not possible to identify specific sites for years 11-15 of the plan, indicate broad locations for future growth; and • 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 <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. 15 Year Supply of Land</p> <p>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</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>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, 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</p>	

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		robust. This will enable the most thorough understanding of the Milton Keynes housing land supply position that will underpin the emerging Milton Keynes LDF.	
	Assessing Deliverability	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 / 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.	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 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.
	Windfall Allowance	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	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

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>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 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>whether any work on windfall needs to be included in the assessment will be undertaken.</p>
	<p>Review of the Assessment</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</p>	<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>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"> • 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) • Sites with planning permission – progress made to construct housing and the build rate at which dwellings are being / envisaged to be delivered • Planning applications – progress made on the submission and determination of planning applications for housing • Sites previously considered unsuitable for housing – have previously identified constraints 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 	

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	Publication, Consultation and the Core Strategy	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.	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.
RPS	Paragraph 1.1	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 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.	Noted- the wording will be altered to clarify the purpose.

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
	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 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</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 clarify that it is not a requirement to issue a call for sites, but it is done as best practice.</p>

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>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>	
	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>	Noted.
	Paragraph 3.3	<p>Response:</p> <p>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 should therefore be fully engaged within the SHLAA process in respect of the site at Newport Pagnell.</p> <p>Required Change:</p>	Noted. This has happened.

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<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 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</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>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 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</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
		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.	
	Stage 7C	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 such as the Current Milton Keynes Development Tariff, design requirements, energy efficient aspirations and	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.

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		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.	
	Stage 9	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.	Noted.
	Stage 8	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.	Noted.
	Stage 9	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 Bletchley as the foci for current regeneration activity. 3. Paragraph 10.6 confirms that these centres will be the	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 where appropriate.

Name	Summary	Comment	Our Response
		<p>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 DLG letter on this matter.</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 **18th 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)	
Site Details	
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
Details from Site Submission	
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.
Has the site been promoted/assessed before?	
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
Does it conform to policy?	
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?	
Known constraints/Local Plan policy	
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?	
Accessibility	
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.

Rule out of assessment on basis of flood risk.

Appendix 5- Rural windfall summary

Completions Outside the Designated Area

Settlement	99/00	%age	00/01	%age	01/02	%age	02/03	%age	03/04	%age	04/05	%age	05/06	%age	06/07	%age	07/08	%age	08/09	%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
Olney	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 Filgrave		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/Petsoe 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
Total	140	100.0%	141	100%	45	100%	50	100%	107	100%	114	100%	129	100%	180	1	254	1	135	100.0%	1295	582
Planned Sites	56	40.0%	32	22.7%	18	40.0%	18	36.0%	71	66.4%	55	48.2%	69	53.5%	104	57.8%	204	80.3%	86	63.7%	0	44.94%
Windfall	84	60.0%	109	77.3%	27	60.0%	32	64.0%	36	33.6%	59	51.8%	60	46.5%	76	42.2%	50	19.7%	49	36.3%	582	

Appendix 6- Developer workshop notes and attendance list

Milton Keynes Council - SHLAA Workshop Session

14th September 2009

1.0 Introduction & Context

Officers introduced the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the search for housing sites is not a new task, but the nature of study has changed. As with the new LDF process there is an emphasis on delivery and implementation of housing sites. SHLAA guidance states that there should be developer involvement in the process. Previously in Milton Keynes there was a Local Housing Strategic Partnership that would fulfil this role but this has been disbanded. This is the first meeting of a developer group in Milton Keynes and there may be scope for regular future meetings to discuss the issues affecting housing delivery.

Due to the recession there has been a fall in annual housing completions. In Milton Keynes there were 2,301 net completions in 2007/08 but this has dropped to 1,841 in 2008/09. It is projected that there will be approximately 1,000 completions in the current financial year and that completions will not reach over 2,000 dwellings until 2014/15. At present, starts in Milton Keynes are at their lowest level for 20 years. The economy and the availability of mortgages is the major impact on starts and completions as MK has almost 30,000 units with permission or allocated for development. Site availability does not appear to be an issue in Milton Keynes.

2.0 Housing figures

Officers clarified that Milton Keynes is required by the South East Plan (SEP) to deliver 41,360 net dwellings between 2006 and 2026. This equates to an annualised target of 2,068 completions per annum. The 41,360 is broken down in to 3 distinct spatial areas:

- 34,160 in the existing urban area;
- 4,800 in the South East Strategic Development Area (SESDA); and
- 2,400 in the rural area of MK Borough.

So far between 2006 and 2009 there have been 5,802 completions which is less than the delivery target for the first 3 years of the SEP allocation for Milton Keynes. Our housing trajectory shows that over the next five years completions there will be a drop significantly below the SEP annualised target. In order to achieve the overall plan target MK will have to deliver over 2,000 homes every year for a period of 12 years from 2014 onwards.

3.0 Discussion on assumptions and risks

3.1 Affordable Housing

- Developers⁹ suggested that affordable housing levels may not be able to be delivered in the future as there are concerns that future funding streams may

⁹ The term developers has been used in reference to those who attended the workshop. They included house builders, landowners, planning consultants and an RSL representative.

dry up. While it is welcomed that funding is being advanced now this raises questions about the availability of future funding. The increased level of affordable housing completions as a percentage of total completions can only go so far.

- Concerns were also raised by developers over how schemes can be made viable in the future given the high level of s106 contributions, especially affordable housing requirements. It was suggested by developers that smaller schemes may be more viable rather than large sites, given lower s106 costs.
- Much of previous affordable housing in MK has been delivered through the old SPG which required 25% shared ownership and 5% social rent. This tenure mix is reflected in many existing permissions. The new SPD changes this to 25% social rent and 5% equity share. Developers queried whether these previous requirements still deliverable and will they have an impact on completion levels?

3.2 Optimism Bias

- It was explained by Officers that the optimum bias injects a level of realism to forecasts, based on previous years delivery data, into housing projections for the future. The overall completions are usually 25% lower than the projected totals collated from individual sites. It was pointed out the 25% capacity lost in a single delivery year would be fed back in later years so is not lost. This was seen as reasonable by developers.

3.3 Joint Housing Delivery Team (JHDT)

- Officers explained that the purpose of the JHDT (which has been in place since 2004) is to produce a development timeline with each individual site examined. This can then be used to identify potential blockages to delivery, provide an early warning system and identify areas for intervention. It was commented that the JHDT monitoring undertaken in Milton Keynes is more advanced and robust than in many other districts.

3.4 Site Density and Capacity Assumptions

- Developers queried the assumption that for larger sites only 50% of a site area would be used for housing and the rest would be used for infrastructure, open space, etc. This 50% figure alongside density standards were used to assume the capacity of SHLAA sites. Officers explained that this was based on other urban extensions.
- It was challenged that this needs to be explained more succinctly and that in other urban extensions the housing area percentage was greater than 50%.
- Officers agreed to look at this, and the threshold at which the 50% housing yield would be applied, in future reviews of the report. Could also consider giving a capacity range. Officers also noted that where more detailed masterplanning work had been submitted with sites, this had been considered in setting the potential capacity.
- Developers agreed that there is currently a lack of demand for flat/apartment developments in the city centre and elsewhere. Agreed that this could however be a short term issue. Officers agreed and confirmed that this is recognised as a risk in the SHLAA report (*see later comments on CMK*).

3.5 MK Sustainable Construction Standards

- Developer discussion centred on the need for more specific advice on what code level will be required by when from the government. Developers agreed it would be easier and cheaper to deliver sustainable construction standards if the requirements were the same across the country rather than varying local requirements. Suggested that historically higher standards in Milton Keynes do cost more than in other areas but that this is not normally an issues within the local housing market local level. However, in a downturn it is more obvious and higher standards could have an impact development viability.
- Developers questioned whether many of the technologies promoted are deliverable for a reasonable cost and the maintenance requirements. Is there consumer demand for such products as it is likely that the costs will be pushed onto the housebuyer?
- Noted that there are management problems for RSLs regarding combined heat and power systems and other sustainability measures which is why they may not have been implemented as much as they could have been.
- Developers suggested that viability is a major issue and needs to be taken into account. Building to CSH level 4 may not add enough value to the home to justify the price to consumers.
- Developers highlighted that many land deals do not take into account increased costs of building, making some schemes where higher standards are required potentially unviable in the short term.

3.6 Smaller Sites & New Allocations

- Developers explained that because of long term land deals negotiated at the peak of the market many of the large sites may not come forward in the short term as they would not be financially viable given the current economic climate. They felt that infrastructure requirements on larger sites may also constrain development in the short term. It could be more viable to deliver newer, smaller sites that are yet to be allocated.
- Developers felt it was unrealistic to only include sites with planning permission in the 5 year land supply. There is a need for contingency with smaller unallocated sites.
- Officers explained that because of the nature of Milton Keynes there is a lack of suitable unallocated smaller sites within the urban area. There are only a handful of new sites identified in the SHLAA that could be included in the next 5 year projections. Officers explained that there would be potential for these smaller sites to come forward in the next 5 years, but they are currently in the 6-10 year period as there is no certainty that they are available in the short term. Therefore to put them in the 0-5 year period would make the 5 year land supply figure unrealistic. This does not mean that they cannot be developed in the next 5 years if they are available for development.

3.7 Varying Section 106

- The need to be flexible in the terms of s106 was seen by developers as key to ensuring development continues.

- Officers explained that a report was being presented to the Development Control Ctte (15th October) to present options for considering requests to vary section 106 agreements. However, this would only be in exceptional circumstances.
- The impact of extending planning permissions was also discussed by developers. Some developers felt that there is potential value in supporting the extension of planning permissions to enable them to be picked up at a later date.

4.0 Discussion of Potential in Specific Areas in Milton Keynes

4.1 South East SDA

- Developers raised questions over the start and delivery dates in the South East SDA. What assumptions and evidence was used to assume that it would start at these times?
- Felt that infrastructure trajectory is important for the SHLAA as it can be used to identify what development can come forward before infrastructure is required.
- Developers felt that as the SDA comprises such a large proportion of the overall housing figures, it is important that assumptions are robust and are tested/agreed with landowners and developers.
- Developers also suggested that there needs to be a better steer of what the employment requirements are in the SDAs.
- Officers confirmed that production of the Development Framework SPD was underway and it was not currently affected by delays to the Core Strategy.
- Additional detail of the assumptions made on start dates, infrastructure delivery and employment growth will be added to the SHLAA report.

4.2 Central Milton Keynes/urban area

- Developers discussed whether there is a need to adjust the build out rates set out for CMK and whether we may have to re-assess the house types planned for it.
- Developers suggested that apartments are not popular at the moment and they are struggling to be sold and let. The potential for more family housing is being explored in CMK. However, it was suggested that perhaps the long term objectives for CMK as a higher density, vibrant environment should not be compromised just because the market is demanding houses at present. These can be delivered in other areas of MK.
- It was also raised that many housing schemes in CMK are part of larger mixed use developments. Some housing projects would be stalled due to a lack of commercial development.
- Developers suggested that there could be a case for looking at small sites on the periphery of MK where small houses (which are currently in demand) could be built.
- They suggested there could also a case for assessing the viability of family apartments and scope for their development in CMK. Confirmed that Campbell Heights has been successful but was high-end. Could be scope for more development in the future.

- Officers confirmed that there are limited completions assumed in CMK in the short term given market constraints and the reasons outlined in the discussion. Also confirmed that a risk assessment has been carried out in the SHLAA report verifying that a lower level of completions (50% reduction) in CMK would not prevent the 15 year urban area requirement from being fulfilled.

4.3 Rural

- Officers explained that there is a shortfall of approximately 1,000 units in the rural area of Milton Keynes based on the SEP requirements of 2,400 dwellings. The rural settlement hierarchy of focussing development in the 3 key settlements and selected villages was also presented.
- Discussion centred on whether when potentially identifying sites for the forthcoming Allocations DPD the framework for assessing sites should be available for developers to frame their submissions. This was seen as sensible.
- Parish plans could identify smaller sites within settlements. However, at present there are only a handful of plans prepared.
- Developers saw a more thorough search for rural brownfield sites as essential as part of the work on the Allocations DPD. Suggested that there could be suitable brownfield sites on the edges of many settlements that would benefit from redevelopment.
- There is a need for a study of the potential for windfall development in Milton Keynes (particularly the rural area). This will be covered as part of the work on the Allocations DPD.

5.0 Future Developer Involvement in the SHLAA

- Discussion centred on the Developer Forum that is run through MKP. Officers also suggested that there could be scope to engage through the LSP. However, no ongoing commitments were made at this stage and attendees should put forward their views on the feedback forms.

6.0 What happens next

- Expected that the SHLAA Report would be completed by the end of October.
- Responses will be sent to those who put forward sites in the SHLAA process and the report published on the website for comment on consistency, clarity and factual correctness. Full consultation on the various sites would take place through the Site Allocations DOD next year.
- This note of the meeting to be included as an annex to the SHLAA report.

Summary of agreed actions

- Flag affordable housing completions as a potential constraint to completion rates
- Reconsider the 50% development yield on larger sites in the next review of the SHLAA.

- Explain more clearly in the report where the current 50% development yield for larger sites came from.
- Flag sustainable construction standards as a variable that could impact on development viability in the risk section.
- Identify the potential for small urban sites to make a contribution to the short-term housing supply in the review of the assessment.
- Make reference to the report to the Development Control Committee on varying s106 agreements in the risk assessment section.
- Add details of where the assumptions about the SE SDA start date and build out rates have come from. May need to review and up date these figures in the next review of the SHLAA once more detailed work has been carried out on the Development Framework for the area.
- Recognise the need for a more thorough site search in the rural area as part of the Site Allocations DPD.

Name	Company
Brain Harding	Connolly Homes PLC
Gary Tucker	George Wimpy
Dan Hallett	Berkeley Strategic
Darren Farmer	Gallagher Estates
Pippa Cheetham	O&H Properties
Jason Hill	Savills
Ross Leal	Kirkby and Diamond
Peter Steel	McCann Homes
Adrian Cattell	Paul Newman Homes
Neil Osborn	DLP Planning
John Cross	Bedford Pilgrims HA
Ian Haynes	MKC
Mark Harris	MKC
Diane Webber	MKC
Graham Hyslop	MKP
Lindsey Richards	MKP
Chris Woolf	GOSE

Appendix 7- Email panel members

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

Appendix 8- Indicative timetable for SE SDA delivery

Timeframe for commencement of Development on South East Strategic Development Area

The predicted timeframe for adopting the planning policy for the South East SDA and commencing development is set out below. Assumptions have been made based on previous experience of commencing urban expansion in Milton Keynes.

The assumptions of land availability in the SHLAA also include a contingency to take into account potential delays in work on the Development Framework. Delays could be caused by the relatively complex nature of the SE SDA, with a number of landowners to manage and cross boundary issues to address.

Stage	Eastern Expansion Area (actual date)	SE SDA (predicted)
Development Framework Adopted	October 2005	December 2010
Outline planning permission approved	July 2005	
Strategic infrastructure consent	March 2006	May 2011
Work begins on infrastructure	January 2007	March 2012
1 st reserved matters approved	July 2007	Sept 2012
Housing construction starts	January 2008	March 2013
1 st house completed	May 2008	July 2013
1 st house occupied	October 2008	December 2013

Appendix 9- Housing yield research

Urban Extensions/major sites- Housing Yield

Urban Extension	Gross Area (ha)	Housing area (ha)	Housing yield (% of Gross site area)	Source and notes
WEA	367	148	40%	Development Framework. Includes significant areas of structural landscaping on conservation grounds.
EEA	405	93	23%	Development Framework. Contains significant site specific requirements (see revised example below)
EEA (excluding site specific requirements ¹⁰)	215	93	43%	Development Framework.
SE SDA (GVA Grimley)	734 ¹¹	297 ¹²	40%	Based on the GVA Grimley study methodology. Not based on specific site area but assumptions of the land use budget in the area. Range in the report from 43% (at 30 dph) to 35% (at 50dph)
SE SDA (MK2031 Strategy for Growth- Annex 2)	385.4 ¹³	179.9 ¹⁴	47%	Based on MK2031 Growth Strategy methodology. The land use budget gives residential as 62% of net developable area. Figures in this table include potential linear and district park, the additional 15% (of gross developable area) for infrastructure and 19% for constrained land, which were removed in the MK2031

¹⁰ Site specific requirements include a noise bund, junction 14 gateway area, flood plain and balancing lakes and a large footprint employment area.

¹¹ This figure is derived from the total land required to develop 10,400 homes (at 35dph) in the SE SDA, and other use, across the whole of the SE SDA area (inc Strategic reserves and land in Central Bedfordshire). It includes land for structural landscaping or buffer areas.

¹² The land required for housing is based on delivering 10,400 in the SE SDA at a density of 35 dph.

¹³ Figure is gross land area in the SDA area, as defined in the MK2031 report. Excludes the strategic reserve areas and the golf course.

¹⁴ Based on 62% of net developable area being required for housing.

			assumptions in the study, as part of the gross developable area ¹⁵ .
Other examples	GVA Grimley SW SDA	40% housing	
	Luton/South Beds	40-70% housing	Based on work carried out on indicative land use budgets for potential development areas
	Corby	56%	LDF background paper
	North Northants Urban Extension Study	51/53%	Based on notional land budgets for a 1,000 home extension at 40 and 35 dph.
	Taunton Urban Extension Study	50%	Based on the indicative requirements for a mixed use urban extension including 4,000 homes.
	South Gloucester – West M62 Urban Extension	48/49%	Based on notional land use budgets for two Core Strategy options.
	North West Cambridge AAP	50%	Based on land use budget paper for AAP. Specific requirement for student accommodation has been removed from the calculation. 50% based on built development plus required open space.

¹⁵ Areas are included so housing yield can be seen as a percentage of all identified land.

Major Site	Gross site area	Approved housing numbers	Housing yield (% of gross site area)¹⁶
NEA	21.5 hectares	455	13 ha- 60%
Stantonbury Park Farm	25 hectares ¹⁷	500	14 ha- 56%
Newton Leys	99.1 hectares	1650	47 ha- 47%
Ashland	16.2 hectares ¹⁸	364	10.4 ha- 64%
Nampak	14.7 hectares	299	8.5 ha- 58%

¹⁶ Land take calculated by applying the SHLAA methodology density of 35 dph (net) to the approved housing number. This is then calculated as a percentage of the gross site area. Remaining land in non-housing use will include open space, strategic infrastructure, schools, employment land, local shops and so on.

¹⁷ Approximate site area excluding the County Park which is individual to this site

¹⁸ Approximate site area excluding balancing lakes but including surrounding greenspace