Site Name	Belvedere Farm
Reference Number	U1
	Bletchley/Fenny
Settlement	Stratford
Size (Ha)	4.29

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history and is not covered by any Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	Yes	Site ruled out at stage 1.
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.			
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies'			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits		

Impact of neighbouring uses			
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit			
suitability or marketability of the			
site? Would the site adversely			
impact neighbouring uses?			
Site Visits/mapped information			
Is the site a logical extension to a			
settlement - where a site is in the			
open countryside, would it form a			
logical extension to a settlement in			
terms of enclosure character?			
011.0			
Site visits			
Environmental constraints			
Environmental constraints			
		1	
Landscape character- would			
development harm the landscape			
character of the area it lies in,			
including areas outside the borough			
boundary (if applicable)?			
Site visit/Landscape Character			
Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or	<u> </u>		
geological importance - would			
development cause harm?			
GIS/Internal consultation			
langed on weath Pa	<u> </u>		
Impact on public open space -			
would development of the site lead			
to the loss of publicly accessible			
open space or physical education			
facilities.			
Local Plan Proposals Map			
Impact on archaeological and			
heritage assets - would there be			
potential harm through			
development of the site or would it			
provide an opportunity to enhance			
Lan area?			
an area?			
an area? GIS/internal consultation			
GIS/internal consultation	ts		
	ts		
GIS/internal consultation	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work			
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with	ts		
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of			
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with			
<ul> <li>GIS/internal consultation</li> <li>Deliverability/availability constrain</li> <li>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</li> <li>Site visit/developer feedback</li> <li>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> <li>Site visit/desktop work</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</li> </ul>			
GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constrain Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation			
<ul> <li>GIS/internal consultation</li> <li>Deliverability/availability constrain</li> <li>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</li> <li>Site visit/developer feedback</li> <li>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> <li>Site visit/desktop work</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</li> </ul>			
GIS/internal consultation  Deliverability/availability constrain  Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?  Site visit/developer feedback  Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?  Site proforma/consultation  Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?  Site visit/desktop work  Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?  School Organisation			

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?			
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
1 2			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty	•	
ł			

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options. GIS	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Distance to primary school         *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of both stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		

	Total score	X (Y)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade 3b - 3 50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
Distance to play area	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
Desktop study/GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS			
<b>Distance to secondary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS			

 STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

 Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)

<b>C</b> (1)	
Has the site been identified locally	
as in need of improvement?	
Other supporting factors	
Conclusion	

**Overall conclusions and recommendations** 

Site Name	Former MFI unit
Reference Number	U2
	Bletchley/Fenny
Settlement	Stratford
Size (Ha)	0.7

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is currently allocated and used for retail purposes. Its planning history is restricted to signage. It is not covered by any neighbourhood plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created	
Physical constraints				
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		The site is already served by an access onto Watling Street. Given the level of existing traffic on this road though, the scale of residential development in any specific scheme will influence whether any increase in vehicle movements is acceptable.		
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?				
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		The site is already serviced.		
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		The site is already served by drainage. It is extensively hard-surfaced already so redevelopment is unlikely to increase risk of flooding and may actually reduce it.		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		Development could revitalise this area of Bletchley. However, noise from the railway could limit development. Similarly, although previous use was nominally retail, the nature of the goods stored on site (e.g. paint) and possible ancillary activities (e.g. wood treatment) means that contamination cannot be ruled out at this stage.		

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the			
site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?		Noise from the railway could inhibit the marketability of the site for residential use.	
Site Visits/mapped information Is the site a logical extension to a			
<b>settlement</b> - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a			
logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?			
Site visits		The site is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape		The landscape character of the surrounding area is urban.	
character of the area it lies in,		is uban.	
including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?			
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?			
GIS/Internal consultation		The site would not impact any areas of biological	
Impact on public open space -		or geological importance.	
would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible			
open space or physical education			
facilities.		Development on the site would not lead to the	
Local Plan Proposals Map		loss of publicly accessible open space.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be			
potential harm through development of the site or would it			
provide an opportunity to enhance an area?			
GIS/internal consultation		There would be no impact on archaeological and heritage assets.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing			
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current		The site is allocated for commercial uses and is	
development potential?		still used for this purpose. However, its location outside the town centre means that availability for	
Site visit/developer feedback		residential development could potentially be	
		supported.	
<b>Ownership arrangements -</b> is there confirmation that the site is			
available for development, with a		SHLAA records indicate that site is under lease	
willing landowner?		for retail until 2017 after which the owner is happy	
Site proforma/consultation		to explore further uses.	
Is development of the site			
economically viable- are there any particular factors that would		Site preparation would require clearance and	
limit the viability of development?		demolition. There may also be remediation required.	
Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have			
<b>capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with		According to the schools sufficiency and access	
the provision of education?		team, there is potential to mitigate the potential	
School Organisation		pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	
Framework/education team		exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	
		inaiiseu.	

			Г
Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?		According to NHS England, the nearest health	
		centre has capacity.	
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)			
development)		The site is unlikely to be large enough to generate	
Deckton study/internal consultation		The site is unlikely to be large enough to generate	
Desktop study/internal consultation		significant levels of infrastructure.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		Site in general is brownfield
	Weighting x 2	8	although is edged by verges/small patches of green space.
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	3	Nearest bus stop is at the train station.
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Red House Surgery
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	2	Knowles Drimon Cohool
preferred options.		3	Knowles Primary School

I	1	1	1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS	Linden 500m 5	1	Sir Herbert Leon Academy
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	4	Bletchley/Fenny Stratford
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
615		5	Tesco Watling Street
	Under 500m - 5	<u> </u>	
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
Docktop study/CIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Desktop study/GIS		5	Denbigh East
	Under 200m - 5	0	
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
		1	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	1	
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1	5	
		-	Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	50	score for larger sites that could
		50	deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

 STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

 Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)

 The site could have some regenerative benefit.

Ony)	The site bolid have some regenerative benefit:	
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	Νο	
·		
Other supporting factors	None	
Conclusion: There is limited added value to allocating the site.		

**Overall conclusions and recommendations** 

Site Name	Land off Hampstead Gate
Reference Number	U3
Settlement	Bradwell Common
Size (Ha)	0.4

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is allocated as a reserve site in the Local Plan with market or specialist housing listed as two possible uses. A mixed use scheme was designed for the site (and won an architectural award) but was never brought forward as an application. The site has no planning history and is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		The site can be accessed along most of its perimeter.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		The site is surrounded by plots that are already fully serviced.	
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		The site has a sloping topography, which may need to be reflected in the drainage provision, however this should not fundamentally increase the risk of flooding.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site has a sloping topography although this would not unduly constrain development.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		There is a grid road within reasonable proximity suggesting noise could be an issue although there is equivalent development either side.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?		The site is not in open countryside.	
Site visits			
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character		The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?		Development of the site would not impact upon any area of biological or geological importance.	
GIS/Internal consultation			
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map		The site is currently left as open space and is publically accessible. Public opinion indicates it has some amenity value although in terms of Policy L2 it is not clear whether this relates to appearance, landscaping (the site is bare with views directly across it), wildlife (there are no recorded habitats on the site) or recreation (which would be limited by its topography).	
		It is not designated either formally or informally as open space and is instead a reserve site with both housing and open space listed as a potential use. The principle of development is therefore already acceptable in policy terms. However, if amenity uses have become established then these should be reflected in the design of any potential scheme where possible.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact upon any designated heritage or archaeological assets.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site is allocated as a reserve site on the proposals map, with commercial, residential and community uses all listed as potential uses. According to public feedback it also has existing value as open-space, which is also listed as potentially appropriate in the Local Plan. Despite not being formally designated for this use, maintaining the site as open space would limit the development potential.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site is owned and promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		The levels of the site may necessitate more earthworks than usual although this is not expected to limit viability.	

Do the local schools have		
capacity? Would development of		
the site cause particular issues with	According to the schools sufficiency and acc	ess
the provision of education?	team, there is capacity to accommodate exp	
School Organisation	pupil yield from the development.	
Framework/education team		
Do local healthcare facilities		
have capacity? Would		
development of the site cause	According to NHS England, the nearest hea	lth
particular issues with the provision	centre has capacity.	
of healthcare?	centre has capacity.	
CCG		
Health Partnerships team		
Are there any other local		
infrastructure needs that could		
be accommodated on the site as		
part of a mixed use		
development? (e.g. local play area	The site is probably too small to contribute	
deficiency, a community facility,	significantly to local infrastructure needs.	
International Sporting City enabling		
development)		
Desktop study/internal consultation		
What level of recent housing		
development has there been in		
the local area? Is there still		
capacity in the local market?		
Would the development of the		
site for residential use impede		
the delivery of any known		
infrastructure projects?		
Desktop study/internal consultation		
Overall conclusions on deliverability		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		4	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.		4	CMK Medical Centre

GIS			
Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
GIS		5	Summerfield School
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5	<u> </u>	
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		1	Stantonbury campus
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	4	Central Milton Keynes
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	4	Aldi Bradwell Common
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Desktop study/GIS		4	Rooksley
Distance to play area	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	5	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade 3b - 3 50% or more is grade 3a - 2	2	
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	Drocketed access reflects restantial
	Total score	50	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is an	y added value to the allocation of the site over and a	bove supporting the delivery of housing targets

Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors	Land is already identified as a reserve site for housing/specialist housing.
Conclusion: There is little added v	alue to allocating this site.

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Site Name	Land at Broughton Atterbury
Reference Number	U4
Settlement	Broughton
Size (Ha)	4.5

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is currently allocated for employment use. It is not within any neighbourhood plan area nor does it have any planning history. However, it does have an approved Development Brief.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		There are access points readily available into the site.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?	Anecdotally there are surface-water flooding issues on the site, it is expected that development would represent an opportunity to relieve these though appropriate drainage improvements.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits	Part of the site forms an informal buffer zone for the Bedford-Milton Keynes waterway, which could limit development.	

Impact of neighbouring uses		
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit		
suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely	The site is bordered on 2 sides by grid roads,	
impact neighbouring uses?	which could present noise issues on the periphery	
impact hoigh bearing accor.	without appropriate mitigation.	
Site Visits/mapped information		
Is the site a logical extension to a		
settlement - where a site is in the		
open countryside, would it form a		
logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?		
Site visits		
	The site is not in open countryside	
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape	The landscape character of the surrounding area	
character of the area it lies in,	is predominantly urban.	
including areas outside the borough		
boundary (if applicable)?		
Site visit/Landscape Character		
Assessment Impact on areas of biological or		
geological importance - would		
development cause harm?		
GIS/Internal consultation	Development of the site would not impact upon	
	any known area of biological or geological importance.	
Impact on public open space -		
would development of the site lead		
to the loss of publicly accessible		
open space or physical education		
facilities.	The site is currently open space and partially	
Local Plan Proposals Map	accessible to the public however amenity value appears to be minimal.	
Impact on archaeological and		
heritage assets - would there be		
potential harm through		
development of the site or would it		
provide an opportunity to enhance		
an area?		
GIS/internal consultation		
	Development of the site would not impact on any	
	designated archaeological or heritage asset.	
Deliverability/availability constraint		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing		
employment) - is there any	The site is allocated for employment purposes.	
activity that would limit current	According to the Council's Employment Land	
development potential?	Study, its relative value for this use is in the	
Site visit/developer feedback	bottom 50% of employment sites across the	
	Borough (97 <sup>th</sup> out of 118). Therefore a change of	
	use to residential may be acceptable.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is		
available for development, with a	The site is owned by MKDP who have confirmed	
willing landowner?	its availability and have commissioned a	
, ř	development brief to guide the principles of any	
Site proforma/consultation	potential development.	
Is development of the site		
economically viable- are there		
any particular factors that would		
limit the viability of development?		
Site visit/deal/ten wark		
Site visit/desktop work		
Do the local schools have		
capacity? Would development of	Assembles to the set of the set of the set	
the site cause particular issues with	According to the schools sufficiency and access	
the provision of education?	team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be	
School Organisation	confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	
Framework/education team	exact number and location of all allocations are	
	finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?		The site is potentially large enough to accommodate a degree of local infrastructure on-site.	
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?		The site would lead to the loss of designated	
Desktop study/internal consultation Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty	employment land.	

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	<u>Weighting x 2</u>		
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>	2	
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Milton Keynes Village Practice
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		3	Broughton Fields School

Under 500m - 5		
501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
1501m - 2000 - 2		
over 2000m -1		
	2	Oakgrove School
501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
over 2000m -1	2	Kingston
Under 500m - 5	2	Kingston
501 - 1000m- 4		
1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
over 2000m -1		
Linder 500m - 5	2	Kingston
501 - 1000m- 4		
over 2000m -1		
Linder 200m - E	2	Northfield
200m-300m - 4		
300m-400m- 3		
Over 500m - 1	4 (5)	
Under 400m - 5	1 (5)	
400m-500m - 4		
600m-700m- 2		
Over 700m - 1	5	
50% or more in non-		
50% or more is grade 4		
or 5 - 4		
3b - 3		
50% or more is grade		
50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
	5	
Total score	43 (47)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	$501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 200m - 5 $200m - 300m - 4$ $300m - 400m - 3$ $400m - 500m - 1$ Under 400m - 5 $400m - 500m - 1$ Under 400m - 5 $400m - 500m - 4$ $500^{\circ}$ or more in non- $agricultural - 5$ $50\%$ or more is grade 4         or 5 - 4 $50\%$ or more is grade 3 $50\%$ or more is grade 4 $a - 2$ $50\%$	501 - 1000m - 4 $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ $2$ Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ $over 2000m - 1$ $2$ Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ $over 2000m - 1$ $2$ Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ $over 2000m - 1$ $2$ Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ $over 2000m - 1$ $2$ Under 200m - 5 $2000 - 2$ $over 2000m - 1$ $2$ Under 200m - 5 $2000m - 3$ $300m - 400m - 3$ $400m - 500m - 4$ $300m - 400m - 3$ $400m - 500m - 4$ $500 - 600m - 3$ $600m - 700m - 2$ $Over 500m - 1$ $5$ $50%$ or more in non-agricultural - 5 $50%$ or more is grade 4 $or 5 - 4$ $50%$ or more is grade 3 $50%$ or more is grade 3 $5$ $50%$ or more is grade 1 $5$ $50$

**STAGE 4 -** Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting The site is of sufficient size that it could support the delivery of its own play areas or other necessary infrastructure. City...)

No
None
-

Site Name	Land off Gurnards Avenue
Reference Number	U5
Settlement	Fishermead
Size (Ha)	0.36

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is currently allocated for employment purposes on the proposals map. It has no planning history and is within the designated area of the emerging Campbell Park Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are			
there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
Constraints?		Access should be achievable from Gurnards	
In consultation with the Highways		avenue or, depending on layout, individually by	
Team and Highways Agency.		plot.	
Utilities - is there capacity to			
provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits	The site is flat and free of constraint.	

Impact of neighbouring uses		
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit		
suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely		
impact neighbouring uses?	The site is adjacent to existing residential	
	development, which is considered to be a	
Site Visits/mapped information	compatible use.	
Is the site a logical extension to a		
<b>settlement</b> - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a		
logical extension to a settlement in		
terms of enclosure character?		
Site visits		
	The site is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would	The landscape character of the surrounding area	
development harm the landscape	is predominantly urban.	
character of the area it lies in,		
including areas outside the borough		
boundary (if applicable)?		
Site visit/Landscape Character		
Assessment		
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would		
development cause harm?		
GIS/Internal consultation	Development of the site would not impact upon	
	any areas of biological or geological importance.	
Impact on public open space -		
would development of the site lead		
to the loss of publicly accessible		
open space or physical education facilities.	The site is currently publically accessible open space but it appears to have limited amenity	
lacinities.	value.	
Local Plan Proposals Map		
Impact on archaeological and		
heritage assets - would there be		
potential harm through		
development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance		
an area?		
GIS/internal consultation		
	Development of the site would not impact upon	
Deliverability/availability constraint	any known archaeological or heritage asset.	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing		
employment) - is there any	The site is allocated for employment purposes.	
activity that would limit current	According to the Council's Employment Land	
development potential?	Study, its relative value for this use is in the	
Site visit/developer feedback	bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential	
one visit/developer recuback	may be acceptable.	
Ownership arrangements - is		
there confirmation that the site is		
available for development, with a		
willing landowner?	The site was promoted as part of a previous	
-	SHLAA exercise.	
Site proforma/consultation		
Is development of the site		
economically viable- are there any particular factors that would		
limit the viability of development?		
Site visit/desktop work		
Do the local schools have		
capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with	According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential	
the provision of education?	pupil yield from site although this will need to be	
	confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	
School Organisation	exact number and location of all allocations are	
Framework/education team	finalised.	
•		

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?			
CCG		According to NHS England data, the site does not	
Health Partnerships team		have a health centre with capacity within 1km	
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)		The site is not likely to be large enough to	
developmenty		accommodate significant levels of on-site	
Desktop study/internal consultation		infrastructure.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
capacity in the local market:			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		5	Fishermead Medical Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	3	lubilee Wood/The Willows
preferred options.		3	Jubilee Wood/The Willows

			1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.			
GIS		3	Milton Keynes Academy
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	5	Central Milton Keynes
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5	-	
-istanos to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	4	Oldbrook Lid
	Under 500m - 5	4	Oldbrook Lidl
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 200m - 5	4	Central Milton Keynes
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	5	
	Under 400m - 5	5	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4		
	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	4	
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade 3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1		
	or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
	Total score	55	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

 STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

 Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)

 Potentially some regeneration value

Olty)	
Has the site been identified locally	
as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors	None
Other supporting factors	None
n. There is limited adds	ad value to allocating the site
Conclusion: There is limited adde	a value to anocating the site.

Overall conclusions and recommendations
---

Site Name	Land off Singleton Drive
Reference Number	U6
Settlement	Grange Farm
Size (Ha)	0.55

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is allocated as a reserve site, with housing listed as one potential use in the Local Plan. It has no planning history and is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		The site is readily accessed along most of its perimeter	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
IDB			
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?			
Site Visits		The site appears developable without any specific constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses	
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the	
site? Would the site adversely	The site is next to a grid road and some retail
impact neighbouring uses?	services, however there is an abundance of
Site Visits/mapped information	equivalent development that does not seem to suffer from noise.
Is the site a logical extension to a	
settlement - where a site is in the	
open countryside, would it form a	
logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?	
Site visits	
	The site is not in open countryside.
Environmental constraints	
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape	The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.
character of the area it lies in,	
including areas outside the borough	
boundary (if applicable)?	
Site visit/Landscape Character	
Assessment	
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would	
development cause harm?	
	Development of the site would not impact upon
GIS/Internal consultation	any designated area of biological or geological
	importance.
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead	
to the loss of publicly accessible	
open space or physical education	The site is open space that is accessible to the
facilities.	public, however it appears to be of limited amenity
Local Plan Proposals Map	value and lies at the edge of the grid square.
Impact on archaeological and	
heritage assets - would there be	
potential harm through	
development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance	
an area?	
GIS/internal consultation	Development of the site would not impact upon
	any known archaeological or heritage assets.
Deliverability/availability constrain	5
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing	
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current	
development potential?	The site currently has no existing use. It is
	allocated as a reserve site with a range of
Site visit/developer feedback	possible uses listed.
Our of the second se	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is	
available for development, with a	
willing landowner?	The site was formally promoted as part of a
Site proformalizance literian	previous SHLAA exercise.
Site proforma/consultation	
Is development of the site	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there	
any particular factors that would	
limit the viability of development?	
Site visit/desktop work	
Do the local schools have	
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of	According to the schools sufficiency and access
the site cause particular issues with	team, there is potential to mitigate the potential
the provision of education?	pupil yield from site although this will need to be
School Organisation	confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are
Framework/education team	finalised.

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision of healthcare?			
or healthcare?			
CCG		According to NHS England data, the site does not	
Health Partnerships team		have a surgery with capacity within 1km.	
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
<b>development?</b> (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)		The site is not likely to be large enough to	
,		accommodate any additional infrastructure on-	
Desktop study/internal consultation		site.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		2	Watling Vale Medical Centre
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	5	Christ the Sower Ecumenical primary school

	1		
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
GIS		5	Hazeley Academy
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
010	over 2000m -1	5	Grange Farm local centre
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	5	Crongo Form Budgono
	Under 500m - 5	5	Grange Farm Budgens
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1	4	Crownhill
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	5	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	~	
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade 3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
	Total score	58	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	None
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value in alle	None

Site Name	Woodlands off
Site Name	Breckland
Reference Number	U7
Settlement	Linford Wood
Size (Ha)	0.6

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is allocated for employment purposes. It has no planning history. It is within the area of the emerging Stantonbury neighbourhood plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways			
Team and Highways Agency.		Access should be achievable from Breckland.	
Utilities - is there capacity to			
provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	The site itself is developable without any specific	
Site Visits	constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses	
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the	The site is set amongst an existing business park.
site? Would the site adversely	This is not necessarily an incompatible use but
impact neighbouring uses?	given the lack of any other residential
	development the suitability of the site is
Site Visits/mapped information	questionable.
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the	
open countryside, would it form a	
logical extension to a settlement in	
terms of enclosure character?	
Site visits	
	The site is not in open countryside.
Environmental constraints	
Landscape character- would	
development harm the landscape	The landscape character of the surrounding area
character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough	is predominantly urban with the exception of Linford Wood to the south.
boundary (if applicable)?	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment	
Impact on areas of biological or	
geological importance - would	
development cause harm?	
GIS/Internal consultation	The site is adjacent to Linford Wood, which is an
	important habitat with several notable species that
Impact on public open space -	are recorded close to the site.
would development of the site lead	
to the loss of publicly accessible	The site is open space that is technically
open space or physical education	publically accessible; the loss of this would be
facilities.	likely to be of negligible harm though given the
Local Plan Proposals Map	more significant Linford Wood to the south.
Impact on archaeological and	
heritage assets - would there be	
potential harm through	
development of the site or would it	
provide an opportunity to enhance an area?	
GIS/internal consultation	
	Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.
Deliverability/availability constraints	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing	The site is allocated for employment purposes.
employment) - is there any	According to the Council's Employment Land
activity that would limit current	Study, its relative value for this use is in the top
development potential?	50% of employment sites across the Borough
Site visit/developer feedback	(35 <sup>th</sup> out of 118). Therefore a change of use to
	residential is likely to be unacceptable.
Ownership arrangements - is	
there confirmation that the site is	
available for development, with a	The site was made evaluable as not of a maximum
willing landowner?	The site was made available as part of a previous SHLAA exercise.
Site proforma/consultation	
Is development of the site	
economically viable- are there	
any particular factors that would	
limit the viability of development?	
Site visit/desktop work	
Do the local schools have	
capacity? Would development of	According to the schools sufficiency and access
the site cause particular issues with	team, there is potential to mitigate the potential
the provision of education?	pupil yield from site although this will need to be
School Organisation	confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are
Framework/education team	finalised.

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?		According to NHS England data, the site does not	
or noutrouro.		have a surgery with capacity within 1km.	
CCG		have a cargory man capacity mann ham	
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)		The site is unlikely to be large enough to	
. ,		accommodate any additional infrastructure on-	
Desktop study/internal consultation		site.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
		Development would impede the delivery of any	
Desktop study/internal consultation		further employment development that the site is	
		allocated for.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
	2	
Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
	10	
under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
	4	Purbeck Health Centre
Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	1	Stanton School
	100% brownfield- 5         75-99% brownfield- 3         25-49%brownfield- 2         0-24% brownfield- 1         Weighting x 2         Weighting x 2         Within settlement- 5         Edged on three sides- 4         Edged on 2 sides- 3         Edged on 1 side- 2         No relationship- 0         Weighting x 2         under 200m - 5         200m - 400m - 4         400m - 800m - 3         800m - 1000m - 2         over 1000m - 1         Under 500m - 5         501 - 1000m - 4         1001 - 1500m - 3         1501m - 2000 - 2         over 2000m - 1	Scoring         outcome           100% brownfield-5         75-99% brownfield-4           50-74% brownfield-3         25-49%brownfield-2           0-24% brownfield-1         2           Weighting x 2         2           Within settlement-5         Edged on three sides-4           Edged on 2 sides-3         Edged on 2 sides-3           Edged on 1 side-2         10           Worder 200m - 5         10           Under 200m - 5         200m - 400m -4           400m - 800m - 3         800m - 1000m - 2           over 1000m - 1         4           Under 500m - 5         501 - 1000m - 4           1001 - 1500m - 3         1501m - 2000 - 2           over 2000m -1         4

[			1
GIS			
Distance to accordant achord	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to secondary school	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Stantonbury campus
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	2	Stantonbury local centre
	Under 500m - 5	-	
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1		
GIS		2	Neath Hill Co-Op
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
defined on the proposals map)	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
		5	Linford Wood
	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	1	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5		
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	5	
	50% or more in non-	0	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
	or grade 2-1		
GIS		5	
	Total score	45	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	L	ı	4

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets				
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο			
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	Νο			
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value in allo	None			

Site Name	Land North of Vernier Crescent
Reference Number	U8
Settlement	Medbourne
Size (Ha)	0.4

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is allocated for commercial purposes on the proposals map but has not come forward for this purpose. It has no planning history and is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways			
Team and Highways Agency.		The site should be easily accessible.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies'			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB	The site is slightly sloping although this should not constrain drainage provision.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits	The site appears developable without any specific constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g., noise, small, small, and yinning site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information is the site a logical extension to a open countrylade, would if form a bigical extension to a satisment in terms of enclosure character? Site visits Environmental constraints Landscape character - would character - would and the site is not in open countrylade. Environmental constraints Landscape character - would character - would and the site is not in open countrylade. Environmental constraints Landscape character - would character - would and the site is not in open countrylade. Environmental constraints Landscape character - would character - would and the site is not in open countrylade. Environmental constraints Landscape character - would character - would and the site is not whith but is close to a widtle or geological importance - would development cause family GiSInternal consultation The site is not whith but is close to a widtle orridor. Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause family GiSInternal consultation The site is not whith but is close to a widtle orridor. Impact on subtactor and then public open space - mother basis of publicity accessible open space of publicity accessible accessible of the site or outfamily accessible of the site or outfamily accessible of the site or outfamily accessible of the site or outfamily accession		
sulability or markatebility or the side 200 dut be a development, which is considered a compatible use. The site is adjacent toexisting residential development, which is considered a compatible use. File visits a logical extension to a settlement - where a statis in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement and development and the assettlement - where a statis in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement - where a statis in the constraints Environmental constraints Environmental consultation Environmental consul	Impact of neighbouring uses	
site? Would the site adversely impact inejthoung uses? The site is adjustent of the site adversely impact inejthoung uses? The site is adjustent to existing residential development, which is considered a compatible use. The site is not in open countryside, Environmental constraints Landscape character? Site Visits Environmental constraints Landscape character would demonstraints the issue in site in one inclusing areas on biological or geological importance - would development constraints GiSAInternal consultation The site is not within but is close to a wildlite impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development consultation The site is not within but is close to a wildlite impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development consultation Local Pin Proposals Map Empact on areas of biological or development consult is provident an opposition of the site would is provident apposition of the site would is provident apposition of the site would in terrent envidy the visco of maximum and the site would in terrent would provident an opposition of the site would be fo		
development, which is considered a compatible use. development, which is considered a compatible use. The site is not in open countryside. Environmental constraints Environmental consultation Environmental consultation Environmental consultation Environmental consultation Environmental consultation Environmental consultation Environmental consultation Development of the site lead to the loss of publicy accessible propose. Environmental consultation Development of the site lead to the loss of publicy constraints Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any accessible to the public of manufacturon environmental purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provides account of the site salicoated for commencial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provides account which there continuation path the site is environment of the site Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment - is there any a consultation Environment publicy consultation Environment publicy consultation Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment - is there any a consultation public open publ		
Site Visitalization production of a settlement in the oppon country side.	impact neighbouring uses?	
Is the site a logical actionation to a settlement in the open countryside, would if form a logical extendent with a settlement in the mask of enclosure character? Site visits The aits is not in open countryside. Ervironmental constraints Landscape character would development have been actively of the settlement of th	Site Visits/mapped information	
open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of anclosure character?       The site is not in open countryside.         Environmental constraints       Indexage character, would development met lendscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.         Environmental constraints       The landscape character, would development met lendscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.         Environmental constraints       The landscape character, would development houses harm?         Gis vield, andscape Character - would development could be available be brough boundary (if applicable)?       The site is not within but is close to a wildife         Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development could be site head to the site head to the site head to the loss of public accessible to the public, however it papers to hare imited amenty value is not formally analyzed and publicably accessible to the public, however it papers to hare imited amenty value is not formally analyzed and publicably accessible to the public, however it papers to hare imited amenty value is not formally analyzed and publicable accessible to the public, however it papers to hare imited amenty value is not formally analyzed and publicable accessible to the public, however it papers to hare imited amenty value is not formally and accessible to the public, however it papers to hare imited amenty value is not formally and character amenty value is not formally and character ament?         Gis/Internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological of nettage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocatof fo		
logical section to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?       The site is not in open countryside.         Environmental constraints       Indiscape character of the surrounding area character of the surrounding area character of the area this in, including areas outside the borough boundary (flappicable)?       The indiscape character of the surrounding area character of the surrounding area character of the area this in, including areas outside the borough boundary (flappicable)?         Site visit/Landscape Character       The indiscape character of policitable?         Site visit/Landscape Character       Impact on areas of biological or geological importance is not within but is close to a wildlife condox.         GiSintemal consultation       The site is currently open space and publicably open space on physical education character of the site lead for this purpose.         Local Flap Proposals Map       The site is currently open space and publicably open space on physical education character of the site lead for this purpose.         Deletion flap Proposals Map       The site is currently open space and publicably open space on physical education character of the site lead for this purpose.         Impact on archaeological and heritage asset - would there by open space on would it draw there on thread there on the solution of the site would not impact upon are shown it is not sense on a rate of the site lead for this purpose.         Development of the site or thread there on the site or the site would not impact upon are shown ithe metage asset. <td></td> <td></td>		
terms of enclosure character? Site visits The site is not in open countryside. Ervironmental constraints Landscape character-would development ham the lendscape character-would development of the site is outside the torough boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicy accessible popension or physical aducation tacilles. Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and potential ham through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GiSrinternal consultation Deliverability/availability constraints Eristing uses (c.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development operation The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been bound to the site or the site is provide a set of the site or would the site or would the site provide the site or would the site provide the site or would the provide and the site or would there be protomate has not been been been been been been been bee		
Environmental constraints         Landscape character: would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?       The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.         Site visitLandscape Character Amaget on areas of biological or poological importance - would development cause harm?       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife condor.         Site visitLandscape Character Amaget on public open space - inpact on prhysical education facilities.       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife condor.         Impact on archaeological and heritage asset: would there be potential harm through development of the site would to potential harm through development of the site would to impact upon an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at harm to upon a charge to reason with the site is available for development, with a willing iandowner?         Site proformal/consultation       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.		
Environmental constraints         Landscape character: would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas of biological or operation and cause barrow       The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.         Site visit/Landscape Character Associater of the area it lies in, including areas of biological or operation areas of biological or have limited amonity value is not formally alocated for this purpose.         Constraints       The site is allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological and have limited amonity value is not formally alocated for this purpose.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been torough torward this purpose on the existing provision within reasonable proximity at the atternet of the development of the site would here the potential harm through development portunity constraints         Existing uses (e.g. opgoing mployment) - is there any activity that would intervent development portunity.       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. Howeveri thas not been torought forward this purpose		
Environmental constraints         Landscape character - would development harm the landscape character of the area it like in including areas outside the borough boundary (tapplicable)?         Site visit) andscape Character Assessment         Assessment         Impact on areas of biological or geological importance + would development cause harm?         GiS/Internal consultation         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public accessible open space or physical ducation ficatilities.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public) accessible open space or physical ducation ficatilities.         Impact on archaeological and hortage assets - would there be potential term through development of the site or would it provide an orportunity to enhance an area?         GiS/Internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been tought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reachange to readontial allocation within reactivity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been tought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reachange to readontial allocation may be appropriete.         Correship arangements - is there contimation that the site is available for development, with a witing landowurer?       The site was made availa	Site visits	
Landscape character - would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in including areas outside the borough boundary (if spliciable)?       The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.         Site visit/Landscape Character       Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.         GIS/Internal consultation       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.         Impact on public open space - would development close is a surrently open space and publically accessible to the public hypersetsible appen space or physical education facilities.       The site is currently open space and publically calities.         Local Pian Proposels Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be polential harm through development of the site or would it provides an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been torough torward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Fam. Therefore a change to residential allocation within the continuation with its existing landowner?         Diversitip arangements - is there continuation that the is is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.		The site is not in open countryside.
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?       is predominantly urban.         Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment       is predominantly urban.         Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife         GISInternal consultation       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space and publically accessible to the public, however it appears to hare limited amenty value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brough flow and approximity to enhance an area?         GIS/internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a charge to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Deliverability/developer faedback       The site was made available a	Environmental constraints	
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?       is predominantly urban.         Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment       is predominantly urban.         Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?       is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.         GIS/Internal consultation       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.       is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public pace space or physical education facilities.       The site is currently open space and publically accessible to the public, however it appears to have limited amenity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Impact on archaeological and tevelopment of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.         Site visit/developer faedback       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.         Offenent development potential?       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.		
character of the area it lies in, including areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public) accessible of the public, however it appears to have limited amenity value is not formally allocated for the site lead to the loss of public) accessible of the site of the site lead to the loss of public) accessible of the site lead to the site area of the site lead to the site of the site lead to the site of the site lead to the site of the site of the site or would the set or would th		
boundary (if applicable)?       Site visit/Landscape Character         Assessment       Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?         GIS/Internal consultation       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publically accessible open space or physical education facilities.       The site is currently open space and publically accessible on the public, however it appears to have limited arrenity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map       Impact on archaeological and heritage asset.         Impact on archaeological and heritage asset.       Development of the site would not impact upon an area?         GIS/Internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximits of the site volut of the provise and there existing provision may be appropriate.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is the ready available of evelopment, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proformation that the site is advelopment? <td< td=""><td></td><td></td></td<>		
Site visit/andscape Character Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?       Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.       The site is currently open space and publically accessible to the public, however it appears to have limited amenity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.		
Assessment       Impact on reas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?         GIS/Internal consultation       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to be public, however it appears to physical education facilities.       The site is currently open space and publically accessible to the public, however it appears to have in through accessible to the public, however it appears to physical education facilities.         Local Plan Proposals Map       Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/Internal consultation       Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Fam. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development protential?       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Fam. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.	boundary (if applicable)?	
Assessment       Impact on reases of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?         GiS/Internal consultation       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to lead to public accessible or physical ducation facilities.       The site is currently open space and publically accessible to the public, however it appears to have indiced amenity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map       Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would there be potential harm through development of the site or would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development or the site is any how marchaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development protential?         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Fam. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is any available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proformation that the site is any available for development, with a willing landown	Site visit/Landscape Character	
geological importance - would       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife         GIS/Internal consultation       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible to the public, however it appears to have limited amenity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map       The site is currently open space and publically accessible to the public, however it appears to have limited amenity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map       Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an a rea?         GIS/internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.         Bit visit/developer feedback       accessible to residential allocation may be appropriate.       appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there continguiton in the is is available to development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       It development of the site       SHLAA exercise.	Assessment	
development cause harm?       GIS/Internal consultation       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible to the public, however it appears to have limited amenity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.       The site is currently open space and publically accessible to the public, however it appears to have limited amenity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map       Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/Internal consultation       Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any current would intic reasonable provision within reasonable provision may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.		
GIS/Internal consultation       The site is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public/ accessible on the public, however it appears to have initiated amenity value is not formally accessible to the public, however it appears to have initiated amenity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map       Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/Internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment potential?       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.         However it has not been brought forward this purposes and three scisting provision within reasonable provision within reasonable provision within reasonable provision within treasonable provision within seasonable provision within set as a search development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Is development of the site       Interse asset available of the site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.		
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.       The site is ourrently open space and publically accessible to the public, however it appears to have limited amenity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map       Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it growthat here be potential harm through development of the site or would it growthat be an area?         GIS/internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Periverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment potential?       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.         However it has not been brough forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there any with a willing landowner?       The site is was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Is development to fit he site       The site proformal/consultation       The site site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.	· ·	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.       The site is currently open space and publically accessible to the public, however it appears to have limited amentity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map       Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Is development of the site       Important development of the site       Important of the site	GIS/Internal consultation	The site is not within but is close to a wildlife
would development of the site lead open space or physical education racilities.       The site is currently open space and publically accessible to the public, however it appears to have limited amenity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map       Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through         Deliverability/availability constraints       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.		
In the loss of publicly accessible of the public, however it appears to have limited amenity value is not formally facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would here be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constraints Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there constrained and the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site		
open space or physical education facilities.       have limited amenity value is not formally allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map       impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site or would it moves an area?         GIS/internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing rowision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Its development of the site       Its development of the site		
facilities.       allocated for this purpose.         Local Plan Proposals Map       impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Its development of the site       Its development of the site		
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Is development of the site       Image: site site site site site site site site		allocated for this purpose.
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Is development of the site       Image: site site site site site site site site	Local Plan Proposals Man	
heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site or would it improvide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site		
development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for commercial purposes.         However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site velopment of the site       Is development of the site       It as a site	heritage assets - would there be	
provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site		
an area?       GIS/internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Is development of the site       Image: site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.		
Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation		
Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation		
Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site	GIS/internal consultation	Development of the site would not impact upon
Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation		
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site       Image: test of the site	Deliverability/availability constraint	
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is allocated for commercial purposes. However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.		
activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is anotated for commercial provision within purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Is development of the site       Is development of the site       Is development of the site	Existing uses (e.g. ongoing	
activity that would limit current development potential?       However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site       However it has not been brought forward this purpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.		The site is allocated for commercial purposes.
Site visit/developer feedback       pulpose and there existing provision within reasonable proximity at Grange Farm. Therefore a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site       Is development of the site		However it has not been brought forward this
Site Visit/developer feedback       a change to residential allocation may be appropriate.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site       Is development of the site		
<b>Ownership arrangements -</b> is         there confirmation that the site is         available for development, with a         willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site	Site visit/developer feedback	
there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site		
there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site		
available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site		
willing landowner?       The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site		
Site proforma/consultation       SHLAA exercise.         Is development of the site       Image: SHLAA exercise.		
Is development of the site	-	
	Site proforma/consultation	
any particular factors that would		
limit the viability of development?		
Site visit/desktop work	Site visit/desktop work	
Do the local schools have		According to the aphenic sufficiency and accord
capacity? Would development of According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential		
the provision of education? pupil yield from site although this will need to be		pupil yield from site although this will need to be
confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	· · ·	confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the
School Organisation exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	School ()raphisation	
	Framework/education team	

<b>Do local healthcare facilities</b> <b>have capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?			
CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England data, there is no health centre with capacity within 1km.	
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling		The side is wet likely to be leave an event to	
development)		The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure on	
Desktop study/internal consultation		site.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?		Development would mean the current commercial	
initiastructure projects :		allocation is lost, although this does not currently	
Desktop study/internal consultation		appear to be harmful it would be a permanent impediment if required in the future.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	<u>10</u> 5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		2	Watling Vale Medical Centre
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	5	Christ the Sower Ecumenical primary school

GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		5	Hazeley Academy
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	5	Grange Farm local centre
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	5	Grange Farm Budgens
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		Oneurshill
	Under 200m - 5	4	Crownhill
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	3	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	5	
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade 3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	Drockstod score reflects retartic
	Total score	56	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)       No         Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?       No	STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets				
	other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting	Νο			
		No			
Other supporting factors     None       Conclusion: No added value to allocating					

Site Name	Land off Ladbroke Grove
	Glove
Reference Number	U9
Settlement	Monkston
Size (Ha)	0.71

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is allocated for commercial use on the proposals map. It has no planning history and is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access should be achievable from Ladbroke Grove.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?	The site adjoins a watercourse although it is expected that any flood-risk could be easily	
IDB	mitigated through appropriate drainage measures.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits	The site has no site-specific constraints.	

res	sidential uses, both of which are considered	
Tł	he site is not in open countryside	
De	art of the site is in a wildlife corridor	
Sides	ite is currently open space although is not signated as such and seems to have only	
S		
pu	rposes although there is an alternative centre	
tea puj cor exa	am, there is potential to mitigate the potential pil yield from site although this will need to be infirmed on a case-by-case basis when the fact number and location of all allocations are	
	re co T T T S S de din S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	Image:

Do local healthcare facilities				
have capacity? Would				
development of the site cause				
particular issues with the provision				
of healthcare?		According to NHS England data, the site does not		
		have a surgery with capacity within 1km.		
CCG				
Health Partnerships team				
Are there any other local				
infrastructure needs that could				
be accommodated on the site as				
part of a mixed use				
development? (e.g. local play area				
deficiency, a community facility,				
International Sporting City enabling development)				
development)		The site is not likely to be large enough to deliver		
Desktop study/internal consultation		any additional infrastructure on-site.		
What level of recent housing				
development has there been in				
the local area? Is there still				
capacity in the local market?				
Would the development of the				
site for residential use impede				
the delivery of any known				
infrastructure projects?				
		Development of the site would mean the current		
Desktop study/internal consultation		commercial uses it is allocated for cannot be		
Overall conclusions on deliverability				
	Ly .			

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
	<u></u>	2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	4	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	T	
GIS		1	Walnut Tree Health Centre
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		2	Monkston Primary School

Oakgrove School Kingston
Kingston
Tesco Kingston
Tesco Kingston
Tesco Kingston
Kents Hill
Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets				
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No			
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No			
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value to alle	No			

	Land off Lilleshall
Site Name	Avenue
Reference Number	U10
Settlement	Monkston
Size (Ha)	0.69

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is a reserve site, for which housing is listed as one potential use. An application for 26 affordable dwellings was refused in 2011. It is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area although it does have an approved development brief that is intended to guide the principles of any potential development.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access should be readily available from Lilleshall Avenue.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?	Consultation feedback suggests that surface water drainage could be an issue, although this should be easily rectified with appropriate mitigation measures.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits	The site has no site-specific constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?		The neighbouring uses are residential and therefore compatible.	
Site visits		The site is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact upon any area designated for biological or geological	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.		The site is not designated as open space, however, representations received during the plan's Issues & Options consultation suggests that the land does have an amenity value.	
Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?			
GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site has no existing use. It is allocated as a reserve site with housing and open space listed as potential uses.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site is owned and promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it is available for development.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?			
CCG		According to NHS data the site does not have a	
Health Partnerships team		surgery with capacity within 1km.	
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)		The site is not likely to be large enough to	
		accommodate significant amounts of new	
Desktop study/internal consultation		infrastructure.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>	2	
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	-	
GIS		2	Milton Keynes village practice
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	2	Mankatan Drimany Sahaal
preferred options.		3	Monkston Primary School

	I		1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to secondary school	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
GIS		5	Oakgrove School
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
010	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	2	Kingston
	Under 500m - 5	3	Kingston
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Kingston
	Under 500m - 5	5	Kingston
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
Desktop study/GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Deskiop study/GIS		4	Kents Hill
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
010	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	Over 500m - 1		
	Under 400m - 5	5	
Distance to park/publically	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2		
	Over 700m - 1	4	
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
	or grade 2-1		
GIS		5	
	Total score	51	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	L	I	4

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	Νο
Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: No added value to all	ocating

Site Name	Galleon Wharf	
Reference Number	U11	
Settlement	Old Wolverton	
Size (Ha)	0.59	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is currently used for employment purposes although it is allocated as a rail and canal freight site on the proposals map. Its planning history consists of change of uses from commercial to employment uses. It is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is likely to be a fundamental constraint to delivery with a narrow entrance to the site and its long thin nature making adequate parking etc. difficult to provide.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric,			
broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
IDB		Development would need to respect the canal- side location.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would			
prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		The size and shape of the site may limit development although canal-side setting would potentially be marketable. Depending on previous commercial uses, contamination may be an issue	
Site Visits		too.	

Impact of neighbouring uses			
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit			
suitability or marketability of the			
site? Would the site adversely		There is a nucleating the southern and of the	
impact neighbouring uses?		There is a pub towards the southern end of the site may present noise issues.	
Site Visits/mapped information		site may present holde issues.	
Is the site a logical extension to a			
settlement - where a site is in the			
open countryside, would it form a			
logical extension to a settlement in			
terms of enclosure character?		The site represents an illogical long and thin	
Site visits		extension into open countryside, however it is	
		brownfield and redevelopment would not necessarily result in any additional harm.	
		necessarily result in any additional nami.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would		The landscape character of the area is urban/rural	
development harm the landscape		fringe, which development would not necessarily	
character of the area it lies in,		harm. The site is also already developed,	
including areas outside the borough		redevelopment could represent an opportunity to	
boundary (if applicable)?		implement more appropriate design.	
Site visit/Landscape Character			
Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would			
development cause harm?			
GIS/Internal consultation			
		The cite is in a wildlife corridor	
Impact on public open space -		The site is in a wildlife corridor.	
would development of the site lead			
to the loss of publicly accessible			
open space or physical education			
facilities.			
Leeel Dien Dresses is Ma		The site is not sublic succession	
Local Plan Proposals Map		The site is not public open space.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be			
potential harm through			
development of the site or would it			
provide an opportunity to enhance			
an area?			
		The site overlaps partially with a heritage site	
GIS/internal consultation		although redevelopment may represent an	
		opportunity to enhance the historic canal.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing			
employment) - is there any		The site is currently in use for employment	
activity that would limit current development potential?		purposes. Due to its small size the value of this	
actorophient potential:		use was not assessed as part of the recent	
Site visit/developer feedback		Employment Land Study but the requirement to	
		relocate any businesses currently using the site would be likely to limit development.	
Ownership arrangements - is			
there confirmation that the site is			
available for development, with a			
willing landowner?		The site has been promoted as part of a previous	
-		SHLAA exercise.	
Site proforma/consultation			
Is development of the site			
economically viable- are there			
any particular factors that would		Site preparation would be likely to be costly	
limit the viability of development?		although the value of canal-side dwellings would	
Site visit/decktop work		be likely to offset this.	
Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
capacity? Would development of		According to the schools sufficiency and access	
the site cause particular issues with		team, the expected pupil yield from the	
the provision of education?		development cannot be adequately accommodated within the existing education	
School Organisation		system even with the contribution the site itself	
Framework/education team		would be expected to make towards addressing	
		this.	

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?		According to NHS England data, the site does not	
		have a surgery with capacity within 1km.	
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)		The state is a filler to the base of the state	
Desister study/internal consultation		The site is not likely to be large enough to	
Desktop study/internal consultation		accommodate additional infrastructure on site.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Dealston atudu/internal concultation		Development of the site would impede its	
Desktop study/internal consultation		currently allocation as a rail/canal freight site.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		10	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
	under 200m – 5	4	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	400m - 400m - 4 400m - 800m - 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	3	
Distance to health centre/doctors	Under 500m - 5	3	
(inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		2	Wolverton Health Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		1	Queen Eleanor Primary School

GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	The Radcliffe School
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	3	Wolverton
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to a supermarket	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Wolverton Tesco
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
defined on the proposals map)	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 200m - 5	5	Wolverton Mill
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
	Under 400m - 5	2	
Distance to park/publically	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
	50% or more in non-	3	Ouse Valley Park
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
	or grade 2-1	5	
GIS		5	Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	45	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	L	1	- 1

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whethe	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value to allo	None

Site Name	Manifold Lane reserve site
Reference Number	U12
Settlement	Shenley Brook End
Size (Ha)	0.52

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is a reserve site with housing listed as a potentially suitable use in the Local Plan. The site's planning history is partially linked to the other reserve site (owned by the Community Foundation) directly to the north. Both sites have been subject to applications for a community centre at various points in time. The parcel to the north has recently been given permission for a similar proposal.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		The site should be easily accessible from the surrounding network. However, arrangements should take account of the access to the proposed community centre to the north.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		There is a low risk of surface water flooding on a small part of the site. This is likely to be easily mitigated by appropriate SUDS.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site does not appear to have any site- specific issues.	

ice_noise, site() - void any limit safe livity on activation of the starting of the safe livity on activation of the starting of the safe livit has a starting of the starting of the starting livit has a starting of the starting of the starting of the starting livity is a starting of the starting of the starting of the open country livit, would if from a ligital activation to a software in the starting livity is a starting of the open country livit, would if from a ligital activation to a software in the ligital activation the limit like ligital ligital ligital activation are ligital light lig		
subjecting or matchedulity of the single and the advected of the set observed of the set observed of the advected of the adve	Impact of neighbouring uses	
sito? Would the site adversely impact nightcomy sees? Site Vetsionapped information settlement - whole a data is in the open county data would from a topical adversion is a settlement in terms of enclosure character. Site visits Ervironmental constraints Landscape character - would development from the indicating development and the indicating character - would development is is a settlement in the site is not in open county data to settlement in the indicating development from the indicating development of the site of the indicating development of the site of the indicating development from the indication development from the indicating development from the indication development from the indicat		
Impact on public open space - would have some and the sum of the selection		
Site Visite/Imaged information       consideration         Site The site Site Site Site American to a softwarm in the site in the indicate character?       indicate character in the site in the indicate character?         Site Visits       The site is not in open countryside.       Image: Site Visits         Environmental constraints       Image: Site Visits       Image: Site Visits         Site Visits       Image: Site Visits       Image: Site Visits         Image: Site Visits       Image: Site Visits       Image: Site Visits         Site Visits       Image: Site Visits       Image: Site Visits       Image: Site Visits         Site Visits       Image: Site Visits       Image: Site Visits       Image: Site Visits       Image: Site Visits         Cisits       Image: Site Visits       Image: Site Visi	impact neighbouring uses?	
Is the site is a logical extension to a settement - where a site is in the open countryside, would inform a logical consolution to acceleration in terms of endocume character? Site visits The site is not in open pountryside. Environmental constraints is environmental constraint		
settlement - where a site in the open countryside, would it orm a hydral activation is a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits  Environmental constraints  Each accesse character would development in terms of enclosure character of the surrounding area is each site in the index period development of the site is not in open countryside.  Environmental constraints  Each accesse character would development is provided and the surrounding area is each site is a site is an each site is proton accurate the surrounding area is each site is a site is an each site is a site is a site is an each site is a si		
open contryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement of the set is not in open countryside.  Exvices character? Site visits  Exvices character would development and the barrough boundary (if applicable)? Site visits  Exvices character would development of the set is not in open countryside.  Exvices character would development of the set is not in open countryside.  Exvices character would development of the set is not in open countryside.  Exvices character would development of the set is not include to the not inc		
terms of enclosure character?       Ite visits         Site visits       The site is not in open countryside.         Environmental constraints       Ite landscape character would development mere landscape character of the surrounding area development mere landscape character of the area it lies in, including area cases of biological or geological importance = would development areas of biological or geological importance = would development areas of biological or geological importance = would development areas of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any would development areas of biological or geological importance.         Impact on areas of biological or geological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible or gene space or physical advication.         Concern Pan Proposite Map       The site is currently open space of the publically accessible afford on accessible or gene space or physical advication.         Isolitics.       Contracting a map of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible afford on a character of the site or would a site or map of the site accessible afford on accessible advication.         Isolitics.       The site would have no impact on any designated archeorological or information.         Impact on archaeological and here accessible or accessible or archaeological or information.       The site would have no impact on any designated archeorological or info	open countryside, would it form a	
Sile visits       The site is not in open countryside.         Environmental constraints       Indicage character would development harm the landscape character of the surrounding area character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough conditionating visite and scape Character Assessment       Is predominantly urban.         Site visit andscape Character Assessment       Assessment       In pact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance.       Development of the site outperformation and the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance.       The site is currently open space that is publically accessible shough it does not appear to serve a useful operose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Load Plan Proposals Map       The site is owned there on any designated area?         Gis/Internal consultation       The site would have no impact on any designated area?         Development of the site or would it proval in the regard and is not formally designated area?       The site is owned by Miton Keynes Development previous in the segment and any designated area?         Gis/Internal consultation       The site is owned by Miton Keynes Development partners is these continuation would be accomment partners asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is owned by Miton Keynes Development partners is these contimmark would initing unadower?         S		
Environmental constraints         Environmental constraints         Landscape character would development fam be landscape character of the surrounding area is prodominantly urban.         Impact on areas of biological or geological importance.         Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development consultation         Development and subscape character of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance - would development cosen to appear to biological or geological importance.         Impact on areas of biological or geological importance.         Impact on archaeological and the biological or geological importance.         Impact on archaeological and there be area would it provide durater and there be area area?         GIS/internal consultation       The site is currently open space that is publically accessible alrough it does not appear to a serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Impact on archaeological and horitage assets - would it provide advocted or the site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site has no oxisting use.         Existing uses (e.g. ongolon empresis is mereas an area?       The site	terms of enclosure character?	
Environmental constraints         Environmental constraints         Landscape character would development fam be landscape character of the surrounding area is prodominantly urban.         Impact on areas of biological or geological importance.         Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development consultation         Development and subscape character of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance - would development cosen to appear to biological or geological importance.         Impact on areas of biological or geological importance.         Impact on archaeological and the biological or geological importance.         Impact on archaeological and there be area would it provide durater and there be area area?         GIS/internal consultation       The site is currently open space that is publically accessible alrough it does not appear to a serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Impact on archaeological and horitage assets - would it provide advocted or the site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site has no oxisting use.         Existing uses (e.g. ongolon empresis is mereas an area?       The site	Site visits	
Environmental constraints         Landscape character would development him the indicape character of the area is lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?         Site visibl.andscape Character Approximation to a biological of development cause harm?         GiSInternal consultation         Development and consultation         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public vaccessible and development of the site lead to the loss of public vaccessible and development of the site lead to the loss of public vaccessible and development of the site lead to the loss of public vaccessible and theritage assets - would there be ported an approximative there be provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GiSInternal consultation       The site is currently open space that is publically accessible strough does not appear to serve a useful approse in this regard and is not formally designated.         Impact on archaecological and heritage assets - would there be provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site would have no impact on any designated archaecological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is owned by Miton Keynes Development Particarchaeconsultation         Cwareship arrangements - is there continnation that the site is would guardowner?       The site is owned by Miton Keynes Development Particarchaeconsultation         Site visit/developer for deback       The site is owned by Miton Keynes Development Particarchaeconsultation         Is development of the site recomment? Site proforma.consultation       The site is		The site is not in open countryside
Landscape character - would development harm the landscape character of the area it les in, including areas outside the borough boundary (it pointscale)? Site visik/Landscape Character Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GiS/Internal consultation Impact on public open space would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or hysical education facilities. Use a state of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance. Impact on public open space would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or hysical education facilities. Use a state or physical education facilities. GiS/Internal consultation The site is currently open space that is publically accessible although it does not pometa accessible although it does not pometa accessible although it does not appeare useful purpose in this regard and is not formally development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GiS/Internal consultation The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset. Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visik/development with a willing landowner? Site visik/development, with a willing landowner? Site visik/development? Site visik/desktop work Do the local schools have		
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (it papicabello)?       is predominantly urban.         Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment       is predominantly urban.         GitSinternal consultation       Development of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space.       The site is currently open space and biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space or physical education facilities.       The site is currently open space that is publically accessible although it dates not appear to save a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaelogical and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an arca?       The site would have no impact on any designated archaelological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site has no existing use.       Site visit/daveloper feedback         Cownership arrangements - is there confirmation that is a is available if doublicpment, with a willing indicomner?       The site is owned by Miton Kaynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site available if doublicpment?       The site is owned by Miton Kaynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Deliverability development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local school	Environmental constraints	
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (it papicabello)?       is predominantly urban.         Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment       is predominantly urban.         GitSinternal consultation       Development of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space.       The site is currently open space and biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space or physical education facilities.       The site is currently open space that is publically accessible although it dates not appear to save a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaelogical and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an arca?       The site would have no impact on any designated archaelological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site has no existing use.       Site visit/daveloper feedback         Cownership arrangements - is there confirmation that is a is available if doublicpment, with a willing indicomner?       The site is owned by Miton Kaynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site available if doublicpment?       The site is owned by Miton Kaynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Deliverability development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local school	Landscape character- would	The landscape character of the surrounding area
including areas outside the borough boundary if Applicable? Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause ham? GIS/Internal consultation Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public accessible and development of the site lead to the loss of public accessible and the site lead to the site lead to the loss of public accessible and the site lead to the site lead to the loss of public accessible accessible allowage in this regard and is not formally designated. The site scurrently open space that is publicably useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated. The site would here be potential ham through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/Internal consultation Deleterability/availability constraints Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would immic current development of the site any activity that would immic current development potential? Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would immic current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Comership arrangements - is there continnation that the site is availabile for development. The site is owned by Miton Keynes Development extension the site is availabile for development. Bite visit/desktop work De the local schools have		
boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harn? GiS/Internal consultation Development of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance. Impact on public open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposal Map Impact on archaeological and facilities. Local Plan Proposal Map Impact on archaeological and facilities. Colled an Opportunity to enhance an area? GiS/Internal consultation Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GiS/Internal consultation Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GiS/Internal consultation Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? Composition of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? Composition of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? Site visit/developer feetback Composition of the site or would it provide an opportunity of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? Site visit/developer feetback Commership arrangements - is there colimitation that the site is available for development. The site is owned by Miton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development. Development of the site or sectority table - archaeological of the site or sectority table - archaeological of development. Site visit/development of the site sectoritical y development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have Development of the site sectoritical y development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have Development of the site sectoritical y development? Site visit/desktop work Development of the site sectoritical y development? Site visit/desktop work Development of the site sectoritical y table - archaeological of the sectoritical y table - archaeological of the		
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development consultation Development of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance. Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the less of public accessible open space or physical education accessible atthough if does not appear to serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated. Impact on archaeological and histigates - would development of the site would it accessible atthough if does not appear to serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated. Impact on archaeological and histigates - would development of the site would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constraints Existing uses (e.g. ongoing omployment) = is three any activity that would imit current development of potential? Site visit/developer feedback Deliverability/availability constraints Existing uses (e.g. ongoing omployment) = is three any particular factors that would imit the visiting of development? Site visit/developer of the site is available for development, with a Willing landownar? Site visit/developer feedback Deliverability/availability does at three any particular factors that would imit the visiting of development? Site visit/development? Site visit/devel		
Assessment       Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?         GISInternal consultation       Development of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any consultation       Development of the site is publically consultance.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site is currently open space that is publically consultance.       The site is currently open space that is publically consultance.         Impact on archaeological and heritage asset.       The site is currently open space to serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Local Plan Proposals Map       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Periverability/availability constraints       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would intervent development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback       The site has no existing use.         Ownership arrangements - is in there ontimate the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Miton Keynas Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development?         Is development of the site recomment, with a willing is addowner?       Existing use is is available for development?         Site rol	boundary (if applicable)?	
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?       Development of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible and development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible and though it does not appear to serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Impact on reherelogical and horizon and the site is current development of the site or would it performed to the site or would it performed to the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the set or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would it performed and horizon and the site or would have no impact on any designated and horizon and the site any activity that widd limit current development potential?         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site has no existing use.         Commership arrangements - is there only matching and would have no impact on any designated available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirme	Site visit/Landscape Character	
gelogical importance - would development cause harm?       Development of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space or bysical education tables and publicly accessible athough it does not appear to serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally accessible athough it does not appear to serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Local Plan Proposals Map       Impact on archaeological and her tage assets - would there be provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GiS/internal consultation       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would in proteinal?       The site is owned by Miton Keynes Development de site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proformation       The site is owned by Miton Keynes Development partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development?         Site proforma/consultation       The site is owned by Miton Keynes Development paraneeship who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site common of the site or would it in the viability of development?       The site is owned by Miton Keynes Development paraneeship who have confirmed the site is available for development?         Site proforma/consultation       Extension bave       Development.         I	Assessment	
development clause harm?       Development of the site would not harm any know narea of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site is currently open space of physical education facilities.       The site is currently open space that is publically accessible atthough it does not appear to serve a useful puppose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Local Plan Proposals Map       The site is currently open space or physical education facilities.         Impact on archaeological and here be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site has no existing use.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is owned by Mitton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Site proforma/consultation       It is to would it mit the viability of development?         Site visit/development of the site expression       would have confirmed the site is available for development?		
GIS/Internal consultation       Development of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.       The site is currently open space or physical education facilities.         Local Plan Proposals Map       Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provides an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/Internal consultation       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site has no existing use.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would ling indiverse proved an opportunity to enhance asset.       The site has no existing use.         Site visit/development potential?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Pathership who have confirmed the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Pathership who have confirmed the site is available for development?         Is development of the site consultation       Existing use is owned by Milton Keynes Development Pathership who have confirmed the site is available for development?         Site proforma/consultation       Existing usexi		
Impact on public open space -       Wnown area of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space -       Nown area of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space or physical education facilities.       The site is currently open space that is publically accessible although it does not appear to serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development of the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development area is available for development.         Site proformation the site is available for development?       Site visit/development, with a would and the site is available for development.         Is development of the site commically viable are there any available for development.       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Pannership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site economically viable are there any available for development.       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Pannership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site economically viable are there any available for development.       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Dev		
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space of physical education facilities.         The site is currently open space that is publically accessible although it does not appear to serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.           Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be pondenta hyme through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.           Deliverability/availability constraints         The site has no existing use.         The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?           Site proformat/or to the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would imit the viability of development?         The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.           Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would imit the viability of development?         The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.	GIS/Internal consultation	Development of the site would not harm any
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible       The site is currently open space that is publically accessible although it does not appear to serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site is currently open space that is publically accessible although it does not appear to serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development, bits here any activity that would limit current development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development end as it is available for development.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development available for development.         Is development of the site economically viables are three any particular to would the would limit the viability of development?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site economically viables are three any particular to development?       The site is belowned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development?       Site visit/desktop work       De the local schools have </td <td></td> <td></td>		
In the loss of publicly accessible open space that is publically accessible although it does not appear to serve a useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.  Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and haritage assets - would there be patential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an a nea?  GIS/internal consultation  The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.  Deliverability/availability constraints  Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?  Site visit/development set is available for development, with a willing landowner?  Site proforma/consultation  Is development of the site economically viable.  Commership arrangements - is there any available for development, with a willing landowner?  Site proforma/consultation  Is development of the site economically viable. are there any particular the void limit the viability of development?  Site visit/desktop work  Do the local schools have	Impact on public open space -	
open space or physical education facilities.       accessible although it does not appear to serve a useful upropose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         GIS/internal consultation       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site has no existing use.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site has no existing use.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development potential?         Site proforma/consultation       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development parameters - is here any activity thab would limit current development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development parameters available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation       available for development?         Is development of the site expression       available for development?         Site visit/desktop work       pot the site is available for development?		
facilities.       useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Local Plan Proposals Map       useful purpose in this regard and is not formally designated.         Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site would have no existing use.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment / is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site has no existing use.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       Do the local schools have		
Local Plan Proposals Map       designated.         Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         GIS/internal consultation       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/developer net?         Site visit/development?         Site visit/desktop work		
Impact on archaeological and horitage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site has no existing use.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site has no existing use.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/dexktop work       Site visit/dexktop work		
heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         GIS/internal consultation       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback       The site has no existing use.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landware?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Site visit/destop work       Is development of the site is available for development?         Site visit/desktop work       Is development?		
potential harm through       development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/internal consultation       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site has no existing use.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site has no existing use.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Pattnership who have confirmed the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have       Do the local schools have       Example to the site is available for development?		
development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback       The site has no existing use.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would imit the viability of development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have       Image: Site visit/desktop work       Image: Site visit/desktop work		
provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Image: Consultation       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site has no existing use.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have       Image: Constraint of the site economically viable have		
an area?       The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work		
The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have	an area?	
The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have	CIS/internal consultation	
archaeological or heritage asset.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have	GIS/Internal consultation	The site would have no impact on any designated
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have		
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site has no existing use.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site has no existing use.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have       Do the local schools have       Example to the site is available to available	Deliverability/availability constraint	
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site has no existing use.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site has no existing use.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have       Do the local schools have       Example to the site is available to available		
activity that would limit current       The site has no existing use.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site has no existing use.         Ownership arrangements - is       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development         available for development, with a       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development         Partnership andowner?       Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site       available for development.         Is development of the site       available for development.         Site visit/desktop work       Do the local schools have		
development potential?       The site has no existing use.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site has no existing use.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have       Do the local schools have       set the site is owned by Milton Keynes Development		
Site visit/developer feedback       The site has no existing use.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       Do the local schools have		
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       Do the local schools have		The site has no existing use.
there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       Do the local schools have	Site visit/developer feedback	
there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       Do the local schools have		
there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       Do the local schools have		
available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       Do the local schools have		
willing landowner?       Ine site is owned by winton regress bevelopment         Site proforma/consultation       Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have       Do the local schools have       Example to the site is available for development.		
Site proforma/consultation       Pathership who have commed the site is available for development.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have       Do the local schools have       Do the local schools have		
Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site         economically viable- are there       any particular factors that would         limit the viability of development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have       Image: Site visit/desktop work		
Is development of the site       Is development of the site         economically viable- are there       any particular factors that would         limit the viability of development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have       Image: Site visit/desktop work	Site proforma/consultation	available for development.
economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have		
economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have	Is development of the site	
limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have	economically viable- are there	
Site visit/desktop work       Do the local schools have	any particular factors that would	
Do the local schools have	limit the viability of development?	
Do the local schools have	Site visit/desktop work	
	Do the local schools have	
	capacity? Would development of	According to the schools sufficiency and access
the site cause particular issues with team, there is potential to mitigate the potential	the site cause particular issues with	team, there is potential to mitigate the potential
the provision of education? pupil yield from site although this will need to be		pupil yield from site although this will need to be
School Organisation confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are	School Organization	
Framework/education team		

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate significant amounts of new infrastructure.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		Development would need to respect the proposed community centre to the north although is not likely to directly impede this.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		5	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	-	
GIS		4	Westcroft Health Centre
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	2	Longmoodow ophool
preferred options.		3	Longmeadow school

		1	
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to secondary school	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		5	Shaploy Brook End school
GIS	Under 500m - 5	5	Shenley Brook End school
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
010	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	4	Westcroft
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
		4	Westcroft
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 200m - 5	2	Shenley Wood
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	Over 500m - 1		
	Under 400m - 5	4	
Distance to park/publically	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	2	Howe Dork Wood
	50% or more in non-	3	Howe Park Wood
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1	5	
GIS		5	Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	46	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets				
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο			
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No			
Other supporting factors None Conclusion: No added value to allocating.				

Site Name	Independent School site off Daubeney Gate
Reference Number	U13
Settlement	Shenley Church End
Size (Ha)	2.6

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is allocated for educational purposes on the proposals map. It is has no planning history and is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access should be achievable from Daubeney gate.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits	The site appears developable without any site- specific constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses	
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit	
suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely	
impact neighbouring uses?	The site is set amongst existing residential
	development, which is considered a compatible
Site Visits/mapped information	USE.
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the	
open countryside, would it form a	
logical extension to a settlement in	
terms of enclosure character?	
Site visits	
Site visits	The site is not in open countryside
	The site is not in open countryside.
Environmental constraints	
Landscape character- would	The landscape character of the surrounding area
development harm the landscape	is predominantly urban.
character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough	
boundary (if applicable)?	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment	
Impact on areas of biological or	
geological importance - would	
development cause harm?	
GIS/Internal consultation	Development of the site would not impact upon
	any known area of biological or geological
Impact on public open space -	importance.
would development of the site lead	
to the loss of publicly accessible	The site is currently open space and is accessible
open space or physical education	to the public however it is not formally designated
facilities.	for this purpose and its amenity value appears to
Local Plan Proposals Map	be limited.
Impact on archaeological and	
heritage assets - would there be	
potential harm through	
development of the site or would it	
provide an opportunity to enhance an area?	
GIS/internal consultation	
	The site overlaps partially with an archaeological notification area.
Deliverability/availability constraint	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any	
activity that would limit current	The site has no existing use. It has an existing
development potential?	allocation for education purposes. Although this
	has not been required to date, changing the
Site visit/developer feedback	allocation to residential would make it unavailable
	for future requirements.
Our and the second	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is	
available for development, with a	
willing landowner?	The site is owned by MKDP who have confirmed
-	they support its availability for development.
Site proforma/consultation	
le development of the site	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there	
any particular factors that would	
limit the viability of development?	
Site visit/deal/ten wark	
Site visit/desktop work	
Do the local schools have	
capacity? Would development of	
the site cause particular issues with	
the provision of education?	
School Organisation	According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is capacity to accommodate expected
Framework/education team	pupil yield from the development.

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?			
000		According to NUIC Encloyed data, the site data and	
CCG		According to NHS England data, the site does not	
Health Partnerships team		have a health centre with capacity within 1km.	
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)		The site would likely be large enough to	
		accommodate a degree of additional	
Desktop study/internal consultation		infrastructure on-site.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?		Development would preclude the delivery of the	
		site for education purposes as currently	
Desktop study/internal consultation		designated.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabilit	ty		
	-		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Watling Vale Medical Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	3	Christ the Sower Ecumenical Primary School

Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
1001 - 1500m - 3		
over 2000m -1		
	4	Denbigh School
501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
over 2000m -1	4	Shenley Church End local centre
Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
over 2000m -1		
Linder 500m 5	4	Grange Farm Budgens
501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
over 2000m -1	E	Crownhill
Under 200m - 5	5	Crownini
200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
400m-500m - 2		
	3	
400m-500m - 4		
500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
Over 700m - 1	4	
50% or more in non- agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade 3b - 3		
50% or more is grade		
50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
	5	
Total score	53	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	501 - 1000m - 4 $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 200m - 5 $200m - 300m - 4$ $300m - 400m - 3$ $400m - 500m - 1$ Under 400m - 5 $400m - 500m - 1$ Under 400m - 5 $400m - 500m - 3$ $600m - 700m - 2$ Over 700m - 1 $50%$ or more in non- $agricultural - 5$ $50%$ or more is grade 4 $or 5 - 4$ $50%$ or more is grade 3a - 2 $50%$	501 - 1000m - 4 $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ $2$ over 2000m -1 $4$ Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1 $4$ Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1 $4$ Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1 $4$ Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1 $5$ Under 200m - 5 $200m - 3$ $300m - 400m - 3$ $300m - 400m - 3$ $400m - 500m - 4$ $300m - 400m - 3$ $400m - 500m - 1$ $3$ Under 400m - 5 $400m - 500m - 4$ $500 - 600m - 3$ $600m - 700m - 2$ $0ver 500m - 1$ $4$ $50%$ or more in non-agricultural - 5 $50%$ or more is grade 4 $0r 5 - 4$ $50%$ or more is grade 3a - 2 $50%$ or more is grade 3a - 2 $50%$ or more is grade 1 $5$

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value to allo	None

Site Name	Former Gas Works	
Reference Number	U14	
Settlement	Stony Stratford	
Size (Ha)	0.17	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is within the designated area of Stony Stratford Neighbourhood Plan. It is washed over by residential notation on the proposals map. Its planning history consists of a live application that relates to remediation work.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	Yes	Site ruled out at stage 1.
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.			
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
IDB			
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?			
Site Visits			

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit		
suitability or marketability of the		
site? Would the site adversely		
impact neighbouring uses?		
Site Visite/manned information		
Site Visits/mapped information		
Is the site a logical extension to a		
settlement - where a site is in the		
open countryside, would it form a		
logical extension to a settlement in		
terms of enclosure character?		
Site visits		
Sile visits		
	1	
En de seu setal seu stadada		
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would		
development harm the landscape		
character of the area it lies in,		
including areas outside the borough		
boundary (if applicable)?		
Site visit/Landscape Character		
Assessment		
Impact on areas of biological or	1	
geological importance - would		
development cause harm?		
GIS/Internal consultation		
Gio/Internal consultation		
	ļ	
Impact on public open space -		
would development of the site lead		
to the loss of publicly accessible		
open space or physical education		
facilities.		
Local Plan Proposals Map		
Impact on archaeological and		
heritage assets - would there be		
potential harm through		
development of the site or would it		
provide an opportunity to enhance		
an area?		
GIS/internal consultation		
	[	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing		
employment) - is there any		
activity that would limit current		
activity that would limit current		
activity that would limit current development potential?		
activity that would limit current		
activity that would limit current development potential?		
activity that would limit current development potential?		
activity that would limit current development potential?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		
activity that would limit current development potential?Site visit/developer feedbackOwnership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?Site proforma/consultationIs development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?Site visit/desktop workDo the local schools have		
activity that would limit current development potential?Site visit/developer feedbackOwnership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?Site proforma/consultationIs development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?Site visit/desktop workDo the local schools have		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation		

Do local healthcare facilities		
have capacity? Would		
development of the site cause		
particular issues with the provision		
of healthcare?		
CCG		
Health Partnerships team		
Are there any other local		
infrastructure needs that could		
be accommodated on the site as		
part of a mixed use		
development? (e.g. local play area		
deficiency, a community facility,		
International Sporting City enabling		
development)		
. ,		
Desktop study/internal consultation		
What level of recent housing		
development has there been in		
the local area? Is there still		
capacity in the local market?		
Would the development of the		
site for residential use impede		
the delivery of any known		
infrastructure projects?		
Desktop study/internal consultation		
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty	

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options. GIS	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Distance to primary school         *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of both stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		

	1	Γ	1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*apposity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS			
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1		
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to a supermarket	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
Distance to play area	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
	or grade 2- 1		
GIS			Prockated appro-reflects actor
	Total score	X (Y)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	L	I	

 STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

 Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)

Gity)	
Has the site been identified locally	
as in need of improvement?	
Other supporting factors	
Conclusion:	

Site Name	Land to the rear of Hayes	
Reference Number	U15	
Settlement	Stony Stratford	
Size (Ha)	0.35	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is washed over by a residential notation on the proposals map and directly adjoins a recently completed housing development, which its planning history is also associated with. It is within the designated area of the emerging Stony Stratford neighbourhood plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access would be available through the existing development to the south.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits	The site is relatively unconstrained although is heavily planted.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in		The site is set amongst existing residential development, which is considered a compatible use.	
terms of enclosure character? Site visits			
		The site is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?		Development of the site would not impact upon	
GIS/Internal consultation		any areas designated for biological or geological importance, although consultation feedback has indicated the site has a degree of value to wildlife.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.		The site is publically accessible open space. It is not designated for this purpose and is best characterised as amenity open space. Given it is surrounded entirely by existing residential development, it is likely to be fulfilling a useful purpose in terms of either appearance, landscaping, wildlife or recreation, which	
		development would potentially harm.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?			
GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site has no existing use.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The owner has indicated the site may not be available for development.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is unlikely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure on site.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Nature of site       100% brownfield-5         75-99% brownfield-3       2         Site visit/mapped information       Weighting x 2         Relationship with settlement boundary       2         Site visit/mapped information       Weighting x 2         Vithin settlement boundary       2         Site visit/mapped information       Weighting x 2         Vithin settlement boundary       2         Site visit/mapped information       Weighting x 2         It vith settlement boundary       10         Site visit/mapped information       Weighting x 2         It vith settlement boundary       10         Under 200m -5       10         Site visit/mapped information       Under 200m -5         Site visit/mapped information       10         Under 200m -5       200m -400m -4         200m - 400m -4       400m -8         900m - 1000m - 1       5         Distance to health centre/doctors       Under 500m - 5         (inc proposed facilities)       1001 - 1500m - 3         *capacity issues are dealt with in stage swill be used to determine preferred options.       4       Stony Medical Centre         Distance to primary school       Under 250m - 5       250 - 500m - 4       500 - 100m - 3         *capacity issues ar	Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Relationship with settlement boundary       Within settlement - 5         Edged on three sides- 4       Edged on three sides- 4         Edged on 1 side- 2       No relationship- 0         Site visit/mapped information       Weighting x 2         10       10         Distance to bus stop or train station –       200m - 400m - 4         GIS       200m - 1000m - 2         ver 1000m - 1       5         Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)       Under 500m - 5         *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of both stages will be used to determine preferred options.       Under 250m - 5         GIS       4       Stony Medical Centre         Distance to primary school       Under 250m - 5         stage 2 – the outcomes of both stage 2 – the outcomes of both       500 - 1000m - 4         1001 - 1500m - 3       500 - 1000m - 3         1501 m - 2000 - 2       over 2000m - 1		75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
Relationship with settlement boundary       Within settlement-5 Edged on three sides-4 Edged on 1 side-2 No relationship-0         Site visit/mapped information       Weighting x 2 No relationship-0         Distance to bus stop or train station –       under 200m – 5 200m - 400m - 4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1         Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)       Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m - 1         GIS       5         Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)       Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m - 1         GIS       4         Stony Medical Centre         Distance to primary school       Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1500m - 3 1500m - 3			2	
Distance to bus stop or train station -under 200m - 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m - 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1GIS5Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1J*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 - the outcomes of both preferred options.Under 250m - 5 200m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -14GISUnder 250m - 5 200m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 24Stance to primary schoolUnder 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2	boundary	Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Distance to bus stop or train station -under 200m - 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m - 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1GISDistance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 - the outcomes of both preferred options.Under 250m - 5 201 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -14GISUnder 250m - 5 200 - 1000m - 1Bistance to primary schoolUnder 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2			10	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1*capacity issues are dealt with in stages will be used to determine preferred options.1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1GIS4Stony Medical CentreDistance to primary school stage 2 - the outcomes of both 1001 - 1500m - 3 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 24	station –	200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2	5	
Distance to primary schoolUnder 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 - the outcomes of both500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2	(inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
*capacity issues are dealt with in       250 - 500m- 4         *capacity issues are dealt with in       500 - 1000m - 3         stage 2 – the outcomes of both       1000m - 1500 - 2	GIS		4	Stony Medical Centre
preferred options. 3 Queen Eleanor Primary School	*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3	2	

GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to secondary school	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		1	The Radcliffe School
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	5	Stony Stratford
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5		
	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
00		3	Stony Stratford Budgens
Distance to employment area (as	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 200m - 5	2	Wolverton Mill
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
		2	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2		
	Over 700m - 1	1	
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1	5	
		0	Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	43	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets				
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο			
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	Νο			
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value to alle	None			

Site Name	Land off Calverton Road
Reference Number	U16
Settlement	Stony Stratford
Size (Ha)	1.7

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is designated as linear park on the proposals map. It is currently subject to a live planning application, the determination of which may preclude its inclusion in the Site Allocations Plan. It is within the designated area of the Stony Stratford neighbourhood plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access would be from Calverton Road. There was no objection on highways grounds to the recent application but any junction will need to be designed sensitively to take into account the bend and entrance/exit to the town at this point of Calverton Road.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		Site is partially in Flood Risk Zone 2. This could potentially be mitigated through appropriate drainage measures or developing on only part the site.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		Site is adjacent to a linear park and wildlife corridor. It is also overlooked extensively by neighbouring properties.	

Impact of neighbouring uses			
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit			
suitability or marketability of the			
site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?		The site is bordered by existing residential	
Impact neighbouring uses :		development, which is considered a compatible	
Site Visits/mapped information		use.	
Is the site a logical extension to a			
settlement - where a site is in the			
open countryside, would it form a			
logical extension to a settlement in			
terms of enclosure character?			
Site visits		The site would represent a logical 'rounding off'	
		of the settlement with the river representing a natural boundary to development	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would		Depending on the screening and landscaping any	
development harm the landscape		potential scheme incorporates, development	
character of the area it lies in,		could harm the landscape to the west and south,	
including areas outside the borough		particularly as immediately adjoining the site is an	
boundary (if applicable)?		attractive linear park setting.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or			
geological importance - would			
development cause harm?			
GIS/Internal consultation		There are notable species recorded on the site	
		and an adjacent wildlife corridor.	
Impact on public open space -		The site itself is not publically accessible,	
would development of the site lead		however, development would enclose the path	
to the loss of publicly accessible		that runs along its boundary and make the	
open space or physical education		immediate area less open. The amenity value of	
facilities.		the site in terms of its appearance would therefore	
Least Dian Dranasala Man		potentially be harmed by development.	
Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and			
heritage assets - would there be			
potential harm through			
development of the site or would it			
provide an opportunity to enhance			
an area?			
GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact any	
		Development of the site would not impact any known archaeological or heritage assets.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing			
employment) - is there any			
activity that would limit current			
development potential?		The site has no existing use.	
Site visit/developer feedback			
Our or other of the second sec			
<b>Ownership arrangements -</b> is there confirmation that the site is			
available for development, with a			
willing landowner?		The site super base and the state of the	
		The site owner has confirmed it is available now.	
Site proforma/consultation			
Is development of the site			
economically viable- are there			
any particular factors that would			
limit the viability of development?			
Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have			
capacity? Would development of		According to the schools sufficiency and access	
the site cause particular issues with		team, there is potential to mitigate the potential	
the provision of education?		pupil yield from site although this will need to be	
		confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	
School Organisation		exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	
Eromowark/advantion toom			
Framework/education team			

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is not large enough to accommodate significant levels of new infrastructure on site.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	Weighting x 2		
	Within settlement- 5	2	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		6	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Distance to health centre/doctors	Under 500m - 5	3	
<ul> <li>(inc proposed facilities)</li> <li>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</li> </ul>	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Stony Medical Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		2	Queen Eleanor Primary School

GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		1	Radcliffe School
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	4	Stony Stratford
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
		3	Stony Stratford Budgens
Distance to employment area (as	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1	2	Makartan Mill
	Under 200m - 5	2	Wolverton Mill
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
	Under 400m - 5	4	
Distance to park/publically	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1		
Quality of agricultural land	or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
	Total score	41	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value to allo	None

Site Name	Land at Towergate	
Reference Number	U17	
	Wavendon Gate	
Settlement	(Expansion)	
Size (Ha)	5.6	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is allocated as employment land. An application for B2 use was refused in 2009, there is no other planning history. The site is within the designated area of the Walton Neighbourhood Plan although also adjoins the Wavendon Neighbourhood Plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is available from Groveway to the north or alternatively could be achievable from Ortensia Drive to the west. However, the suitability of any access point would need to be considered in the context of the SLA, including improvements to the Kingston Roundabout that are currently being undertaken.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
IDBSite specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?			
Site Visits		The site is relatively unconstrained.	

(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marktability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?       The site is neighboured by employment uses, open countryside and existing residential development, which should generally be compatible uses.         Site Visits/mapped information settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it from a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?       The site is not in open countryside but does sit between the edge of the built-up area and the settlement boundary. It could potentially be considered a logical extension to the settlement atthough this conclusion will be strengthened when the SLA parcel to the east has been completed.         Environmental constraints       The landscape character of the area is defined by the rural/urban fringe, which should potentially be character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?         Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development of the site lead to the loss of public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicy accessible open space or physical education facilities.       Development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geological importance.			
subality or marketability of the constraints which is a single source by experiment uses. The site is neighbourd by experiment uses. Site values source by experiment of the site of t	Impact of neighbouring uses		
Sile Value and advectory of the sele advectory of the sele and of the great of the sele advectory of the sele and the great of the sele advectory of the sele and the great of			
inpact ones as a public organization of the site would not harm any arcsed braining with density on the site would not harm any arcsed braining with a density of the site would not harm		The site is neighboursd by employment uses	
Site Valetarequel Information         compatible uses.           enterment-venere state is in the open control (see the control (see the state))         compatible uses.           enterment-venere state is in the open control (see the control (see the state))         compatible uses.           if get a reference in the state in the interment of the state)         control (see the state)           if get a reference in the state in the interment of the state.         control (see the state)           if get a reference in the state interment of the state.         control (see the state)           if get a reference in the state.         control (see the state)           if get a reference in the state.         control (see the state)           if get a reference in the state.         the state is the state.           if get a reference in the state.         the state.           if get a reference in the state.         the state.           if get a reference in the state.         the state.           if get a reference in the state.         the state.           if get a reference in the state.         the state.           if get a reference in the state.         the state.           if get a reference in the state.         the state.           if get a reference in the state.         the state.           if get a reference in the state.         the state.           if get			
Site Visits impact information Exception Excep	impact heighbouring uses:		
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - which are lise is not in open countryside but does sit butween the edge of the bulk-purate and the content in the set has been a country should be bulk-purate and the content in the set has been an end of the bulk-purate and the content is the set has been an end of the set has been and the content is the set has been and the content is the set has been and t	Site Visits/mapped information		
open countypide, would from a lipsical extrained to a sufferment biological extrained to the settement coundwy. It could pointably be considered a figural extrained to the settement coundwy. It could pointably be considered a figural extrained to the settement coundwy. It could pointably be considered a figural extrained to the settement coundwy. It could pointably be considered a figural extrained to the settement coundwy. It could point and the set and the settement coundwy. It could point and the set	Is the site a logical extension to a		
Open during of a volution of the set builty parse and the digital during of a set during the during of the set during the during of the set during the during of the set during of		The site is not in open countryside but does sit	
terins of onclosure character? Site visits considered a logical extension to the settlement altrough this conclusion will be strengthered when the SLA parent to the cast has been completed. Environmental constraints Landscape character, would development of the site is a result of the area is defined by the area will be in the binduing areas outside the brough boundary (if applicable)? Site visits.andscape Charanter Assessment including areas outside the brough boundary (if applicable)? Site visits.andscape Charanter Assessment including areas outside the brough boundary (if applicable)? Site visits.andscape Charanter Assessment including areas outside the brough boundary (if applicable)? Site visits.andscape Charanter Assessment impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause hum? Clisiteness a hum? Clis			
Site visits     advoct this conduction will be strangthmed in completed.       Environmental constraints     completed.       Environmental constraints     The landcape character - would download of the asset has been completed.       Environmental constraints     The landcape character - would download of the asset has been completed.       Site with andscape Character - would download of the asset has been completed.     The landcape character - has a like in, how we completed.       Site with andscape Character - would download of the asset has been completed.     design.       Best with andscape Character - would download of the asset has been completed.     design.       Impact on public open space - would download of the asset has been completed.     design.       Impact on public open space - would download of the asset has been completed.     design.       Impact on public open space - would asset has been completed.     design.       Intract on solution     Development of the site would not harm any arcs of biological or goological importance.       Intract on solution     Development of the site would not impact on any archeological or poological importance.       Intract on solution     Development of the site would not impact on any archeological or information.       Development of the site would not impact on any archeological or information.     Development of impact as iteration.       Development of the site would not impact on any archeological or information.     Development of impact assets.       Development of the si		settlement boundary. It could potentially be	
Site Veills when the SLA parent to the usast has been completed. Environmental constraints Landscope character - would development and the landscope character of the area is defined by the fursivity on frage, which should not be advelopment and the landscope character of the area is defined by the fursivity on frage, which should not be advelopment and the source of the area is defined by the fursivity on frage, which should not be advelopment and the source of the area is defined by the fursivity on frage, which should not be advelopment and the source of the area is defined by the fursivity of the source of the area is defined by the fursivity of the source of the area is defined by the fursivity of the source of the area is defined by the fursivity of the source of the area is defined by the propriate design.  Finged on area adveloped of function of the site lead to the lead to	terms of enclosure character?		
Environmental constraints           Landscape character - would thracked of the avea it like in, including areas outside the brough boundary (if applicable)?         The landscape character area its defined by the narrow it like in, including areas outside the brough boundary (if applicable)?           Site visit Aurdicape Character Assessment         as relatively integrated open rate, impact should be minimed with appropriate design.           Site visit Aurdicape Character Assessment         as relatively integrated open rate, impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?           GIS Internal cansulation         Development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geological importance.           Impact on public open space - would development of the site would not be provide development of the site would into the provide more opportunity to enhance an area?           Used Plan Proposalb Map development of the site would into the provide more opportunity to enhance an area?         Development of the site would in impact on any archaeological or heritizgu assets.           Etimation         Development of the site would into the provide more opportunity to enhance an area?         The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the frage assets.           Etimation         Development of the site would into row in the site is available on development.         The site is available on therise browould welopment of the site area available of development	Site visits		
Environmental constraints Landscape character of the area is defined by the urad/urban finge, which should not be harmed in projeb by development on the site. However, as a restury by targe and open area. Impact of active the barrow of the set of biological the differenc			
Landscape character - would development harm the indiscippe character of the area its do in houndary (if applicable)?       The landscape character of the area is defined by the runkfulse fringe, which should not be impact on areas of biological or development cause harm?         Site visit/undecape Character Assessment development cause harm?       Development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or generative and the site would not harm any areas of biological or generative development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or generative development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or generative development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or generative provide development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or generative provide development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or generative provide accessible caused provide accessible cause of any rights of way.         Impact on arbitic open space - would development of the site would not impact on any provide accessible caused of any rights of way.         Impact on arbitic open space and mark       The site is allocated of any rights of way.         Impact on arbitic open space and mark       The site is allocated for omployment purpose. According to the character of the site would not impact on any archeological of heritage assets.         Development potential ?       The site is allocated for omployment purpose. According to the character of the site south where we hard and ward         Corresting arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development.       The site is allocated for omployment purpose. According to the cound of the site south we areas particaler framework we hard accoustific in the vi			
development harm the landscape character of the area is defined by         including areas outside the borough         boording (facipation)?         Site visit/undecape Character         Assessment         gelogical importance - would be minimised with appropriate design.         Break Character / Assessment         Gis/Internationace - would development on the site.         Development cause harm?         Gis/Internationace - would development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geotogical importance.         impact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geotogical importance.         mact on public open space - would more the site and to be be openation of the site would not impact on archaeological and provide advactant the site and to be be openation and the site would not impact on any inplate advactant the site and to be be openation and the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Local Plan Proposals Map <ul> <li>publically accessible outside of any rights of way.</li> <li>machine be opontally the enhance an area?</li> <li>Gis/Internal consultation</li> <li>Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.</li> <li>Development is in the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.</li> <li>Development is the reak in the site is and the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.</li> <li>Development is the reak in the site is an area?</li> <li>Site visit/ waveloper feedback</li> <li>Development of the site is owned by</li></ul>	Environmental constraints		
development harm the landscape character of the area is defined by         including areas outside the borough         boording (facipation)?         Site visit/undecape Character         Assessment         gelogical importance - would be minimised with appropriate design.         Break Character / Assessment         Gis/Internationace - would development on the site.         Development cause harm?         Gis/Internationace - would development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geotogical importance.         impact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geotogical importance.         mact on public open space - would more the site and to be be openation of the site would not impact on archaeological and provide advactant the site and to be be openation and the site would not impact on any inplate advactant the site and to be be openation and the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Local Plan Proposals Map <ul> <li>publically accessible outside of any rights of way.</li> <li>machine be opontally the enhance an area?</li> <li>Gis/Internal consultation</li> <li>Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.</li> <li>Development is in the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.</li> <li>Development is the reak in the site is and the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.</li> <li>Development is the reak in the site is an area?</li> <li>Site visit/ waveloper feedback</li> <li>Development of the site is owned by</li></ul>			
character of the area it lies in, including areas cuickle the borough Stor visit Antocape Character Associational geological importance - vould development of the site - thouse the including areas obvious the including area impact of an area of biological or geological importance - vould development of the site lead to the loss of public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public development of the site or would it provide an approximation Development of the site or would it provide an approximation Development provide an app			
Including areas outside the borough bording (if appliedbe)? Site visit/Landscape Character impact on areas of biological or geological improvement on the site. However, as a relatively firing and open area, impact on areas of biological or geological improvement on the site would not harm any areas of biological or geological importance - would development of the site and development of the site and to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical double. The site is currently open athough is not publically accessible on any rights of way. Impact on archaeological and horizon accessible on archaeological and horizon accessible on any rights of way. Impact on archaeological and horizon accessible outside of any rights of way. Impact on archaeological and horizon accessible outside of any rights of way. Impact on archaeological and horizon accessible outside of any rights of way. Impact on archaeological and horizon accessible outside of any rights of way. Impact on archaeological and horizon accessible outside of any rights of way. Impact on archaeological and horizon accessible outside of any rights of way. Impact on archaeological and horizon accessible outside of any rights of way. Impact on archaeological or heritage assets. Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) is there any accessible outside of any rights of use. Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) is there any accessible of the site or would find current development of the site or would find current Site visit/development of the site construction accessible accessible of the site or would find accessible of development, with a withing landowner? Site visit/development of the site construction accessible accessible for development, with a withing landowner? Site visit/development of the site construction that accessible accessible and accessible accessible for development of the site davelopment of the site construction that accession Site visit/development of the site construction th			
boundary (if applicable)?       However, is a relatively large and open area, impact on areas of biological or design.         Site visitLandscape Charatter Assessment       Impact on areas of biological or design.         GISI not areas of biological or design.       Development of the site would not harm any saves of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any saves of biological or geological importance.       Impact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any saves of biological or geological importance.         Local Dan Proposals Map       The site is currently open although is not publicable accessible outside of any inpits of way.         Development of the site would in the bap optimal on achaeological or heritage assets.       Development of the site would not impact on any achaeological or heritage assets.         DeliverabilityAvailability constraints       Development of the site would not impact on any achaeological or heritage assets.         DeliverabilityAvailability constraints       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the site would not impact on any achaeological or heritage assets.         Overseribit arrangements - is three composition with a current development of the site owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site visibility dovelopment?       Site visibility of development?       According to the schools softiciency and access after the sub any panticular factors that would in the visible or developm			
Site visit/advances of biological or design. Assessment impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development of the site would not harm any areas of biological importance. Impact on public open space - impact on archeological and heritage assets - would there be publicatly accessible outside of any rights of way. Impact on archeological and heritage assets - source of the site would not impact on any archeological of and heritage assets - source of the site would not impact on any archeological of any rights of way. Impact on archeological and heritage assets - source of the site would not impact on any archeological of the for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment and Study, its relative value for this use is arcos the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable. Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation is development of the site event Site visit/developer feedback Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable. Detwelopment of the site economically visite. Site visit/development of the site prevential consultation Site visit/development of the site prevential consultation Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable. Detwelopment of the site economically visite. Site visit/development of the site prevential consultation Site visit/development of the site prevential consultation Borough. Therefore a change of the provintion Sit			
Sile visitilandscape Character Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would a geological importance - would a make of public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of public open space of public open spac	boundary (in applicable):		
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation Impact on public open space - myolical expension would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical ducation facilities. Local Plan Proposale Map provide development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible outside of any rights of way. Impact on archaeological and herritage assets. Weaker would first of the site or would in provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/Internal consultation Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or herritage assets. Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or herritage assets. Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or herritage assets. Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or herritage assets. Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or herritage assets. Development of the council's Employment jurposes, According to the Council's Employment purposes, According to the Council's Employment and Study, its relative value for the use to residential may be acceptable. Ownership arrangements - is there confirmed in the site is available for development with a withing indowner? Site visibideveloper feedback	Site visit/Landscape Character		
gelogical importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation Development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geological importance. Impact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geological importance. Impact on public open space - would development of the site is currently open although is not the loss of public all and here the development of the site is currently open although is not publically accessible outside of any rights of way. Impact on archaeological and here the development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets - would not any archaeological or heritage assets. Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) is there any archaeological or heritage assets. Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any archaeological or heritage assets. Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any archaeological or heritage assets. Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any archaeological or heritage assets. Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any access the Borough. The site is allocated for employment part across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable. Ownership arrangements - is there any activative the would provem it has assets. Site visit/developer feedback. Development of the site is available or development? Site visit/development with a willing landowner? Site visit/development? Site visi	Assessment		
development clause harm?       Development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space - would there is lead to the loss of publical development of the site lead to the loss of publical development of the site lead to the loss of publical development of the site or would its provide an opposite of development of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site or would its provide an opposite of the site is available for development?	Impact on areas of biological or		
GIS/Internal consultation       Development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space - would the site lead to be or proposal state of public additional importance.         Impact on archaeological and herritige assets.         Impact on archaeological and herritige assets.         Impact on archaeological and herritige assets.         Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/Internal consultation         Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/Internal consultation         Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/Internal consultation         Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/Internal consultation         Development of the site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the claunol's Employment purposes. According to the site or work the brow any adjubit or or brows the brow adjubit or or brows the brows adjubit or or brows the brows adjubit or or brows the brows adjubit or or brows the br			
Impact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geological importance.         impact on public open space - mysical education facilities.         Local Pian Proposals Map         impact on archaeological and here be potential harm through development of the site would in the site outside of any rights of way.         Impact on archaeological and here be potential harm through development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Ownership arrangements - is there any available for development purposes. According to the Counci's Employment purposes. According to the counci's Employment Land Study. The relie is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proformal consultation       According to the schools sufficiency and access team. there is potentia	uevelopment cause narm?		
Impact on public open space - would development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geological importance.         impact on public open space - mysical education facilities.         Local Pian Proposals Map         impact on archaeological and here be potential harm through development of the site would in the site outside of any rights of way.         Impact on archaeological and here be potential harm through development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Ownership arrangements - is there any available for development purposes. According to the Counci's Employment purposes. According to the counci's Employment Land Study. The relie is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proformal consultation       According to the schools sufficiency and access team. there is potentia	GIS/Internal consultation		
Impact on public open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets. Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets. Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets. Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets. Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets. Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets. Development of the site across the Brough. The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Brough. The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now. Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would inthe wiablify of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Could development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Solud development of the site across particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Finamework/education team			
would development of the site lead to the loss of publical scales of the site of any rights of way. The site is currently open although is not publically accessible outside of any rights of way. The site is currently open although is not publically accessible outside of any rights of way. The site is currently open although is not publically accessible outside of any rights of way. The site is currently open although is not publically accessible outside of any rights of way.		areas of biological or geological importance.	
to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. The site is currently open atthough is not publically accessible outside of any rights of way. Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation Development of the site would not impact on archaeological or heritage assets. The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable. Confirmed it is available now. Site proforma/consultation Exploring to the stellation and there are any archaeological or heritage assets. Site visit/developer feedback Site visit/developer feedback Site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Site visit/developer feedback Site proforma/consultation Site visit/development? Site visit			
open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constraints Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development of the site is available for development, with a willing handowner? Site visit/developer feedback Do the local schools have constitute of the site economically viable- are there available for development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cacab sufficiency and access team. there is potential to mitigate the potential According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential publically access taken would the provision of education? School Organisation External content of all allocations are area in the and because of all allocations are area in the any area and because of all allocations are area in the any area and because of all allocations are area in the any area and because of all allocations are area in the any area in the any area any area in th			
facilities. The site is currently open although is not publically accessible outside of any rights of way. Impact on archaeological and hertage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets. Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets. Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets. Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets. Development of the site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Counci's Employment purposes. According to the Counci's Employment Land Study. Its relative value for this use is in the bottom GV/o employment bits as arcss the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.			
Lead Plan Proposals Map       The site is currently open although is not publically accessible outside of any rights of way.         Impact on archaeological and herritage assets - would here be potential harm through development of the site would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Estimation of the site would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there any valiable for development of the site is available for development of the site or exonfirmed in the site is any particular fissues with the site is available for development of the site are three any aratibulity value- are three any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/developement of the site econdimically value- are three confirmed in the site is available for development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team y particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/development of the site econdimically value- are three any particular factors that would limit the site is available for development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential to mitigate the potential to mitigate the potential to puly puly is the site and the site and the site or any particular is available or development of the site coconfirmed on a case-by-case basis when the e			
Local Plan Proposals Map       publically accessible outside of any rights of way.         Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         OB/s/internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site visit/developer of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential for mail to the potential pup liyield form site athough this will need to be confirmed in the stete access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pup liyield form site athough this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are		The site is currently open although is not	
heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment tand Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site visit/developer for the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential for site apotential pupil yield for site atologs have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         Data blocal schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield for site athouch the potential pupil yield for site athouch the apotential pupil yield for site athouch of all allocations are	Local Plan Proposals Map		
potential harm through development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.       Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         GiS/internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any accidence of employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative values as the bottom 50% of employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative values to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site visit/development of the site economically viable- are three any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential to mitigate the potential to mitigate the potential pupily idable are three any acceleration?         Date local schools have capacitor?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential to mitigate the potential pupily idable from site athough this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocation of all allocation are leaved to be	Impact on archaeological and		
development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom S0% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there would relate would into the value would into the value would into the value would by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proforma/consultation       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential			
provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Demership arrangements - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Downership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have capaent(or factors that would by the schools sufficiency and access the steam, there is potential to migue the potential pupil yield from site action?         School Organisation Framework/deducation feam			
an area? GIS/Internal consultation Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets. Deliverability/availability constraints Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Downership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Firamework/deducation team			
GIS/internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there any available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site visit/development of the site economical by viable - are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/development of the site economical by viable - are there any particular factors that would inmit the viability of development?         Site visit/development of the site score that by one consistence on the site score that would inmit the viability of development of the site confirmed it is available now.         Site visit/desktop work         De the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cation?         School Organisation         School Organisation			
Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Downership arrangements - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Downership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a site is available for development, with a silling landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any any particular factors that would limit the viability of development of the site economically viable- are there any any particular factors that would limit the viability of development of the site economically viable are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development of the site economically viable are there any particular issues with the provision of education?         Ste visit/desktop work       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by case basis when the econfirmed on a case-by case basis when the exercision of all allocations are exercised by the schools sufficiency and location are exercised by the provision of an acase-by case basis when the exercised by the provision of an acase-by case basis when the exercised by the provision of all allocations are exercised by the provision of all locations are exercised by the provision of allocation are exercised by the protential to an iteratin th			
archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints	GIS/internal consultation		
Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Downership arrangements - is there only activity in the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation         School Organisation			
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proforma/consultation       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are			
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proforma/consultation       Its available are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site ecouse particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation Framework/education team       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are	Deliverability/availability constraint	i de la constante de la constan	
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proforma/consultation       Its available are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site ecouse particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation Framework/education team       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are			
activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is anotated to employment puppess.         Site visit/developer feedback       According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proforma/consultation       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and locations of all allocations are	Existing uses (e.g. ongoing		
activity that would limit current development potential?       According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proforma/consultation       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site altough this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are		The site is allocated for employment purposes	
Gevelopment potential?       Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proforma/consultation       Its development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are			
Site visit/developer feedback       bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proforma/consultation       Its development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are	development potential?		
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       Image: Construction of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be construction team	Site visit/developer feedback	bottom 50% of employment sites across the	
Ownership arrangements - is         there confirmation that the site is         available for development, with a         willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site         economically viable- are there         any particular factors that would         limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have         capacity? Would development of the site exace particular issues with         the site cause particular issues with         the provision of education?         School Organisation         Framework/education team			
there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		may be acceptable.	
there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team			
available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       Image: Construct of the site site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are			
willing landowner?       The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.         Site proforma/consultation       Image: Confirmed it is available now.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       Image: Confirmed it is available now.         Site visit/desktop work       Image: Confirmed it is available now.       Image: Confirmed it is available now.         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are			
Site proforma/consultation       confirmed it is available now.         Is development of the site       confirmed it is available now.         Is development of the site       confirmed it is available now.         Is development of the site       confirmed it is available now.         Is development of the site       confirmed it is available now.         Is development of the site       confirmed it is available now.         Image: state of the site cause particular factors that would limit the viability of development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are		The site is owned by the HCA who have	
Site proforma/consultation       Image: Constraint of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       Image: Constraint of the site economical schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation Framework/education team       According to the schools sufficiency and access the exact number and location of all allocations are			
Is development of the site         economically viable- are there         any particular factors that would         limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have         capacity? Would development of         the site cause particular issues with         the provision of education?         School Organisation         Framework/education team	Site proforma/consultation		
economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?Image: Constant of the viability of development?Site visit/desktop workSite visit/desktop workDo the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are			
economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?Image: Constant of the viability of development?Site visit/desktop workSite visit/desktop workDo the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are	lo dovolonment of the site		
any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team			
limit the viability of development?Site visit/desktop workDo the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?School Organisation Framework/education team			
Site visit/desktop work       Image: Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are			
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are			
capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are	Site visit/desktop work		
capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are			
capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are	Do the local schools have		
the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are			
the provision of education?team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are		According to the schools sufficiency and access	
School Organisationpupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are			
Framework/education team exact number and location of all allocations are		pupil yield from site although this will need to be	
Tinalisea.	Framework/education team		

			[]
Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?			
CCG		The site is over 1km away from a surgery that has	
Health Partnerships team		capacity.	
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)		The site is potentially large enough to	
		accommodate a degree of additional	
Desktop study/internal consultation		infrastructure on-site.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		·

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		6	
<b>Distance to bus stop or train station –</b> GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Walnut Tree Health Centre
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		Waxaadan Qata ashaal
preferred options.		3	Wavendon Gate school

	1		
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		3	Walton High
	Under 500m - 5	0	vvalori i ligit
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
		3	Kingston
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to a supermarket	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	3	Tesco Kingston
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 200m - 5	5	Brinklow/Wavendon Tower
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	4 (5)	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5		
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	4 (5)	Wavendon Gate
	50% or more in non-	4 (3)	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
		-	Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	46 (48)	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: Limited added value t	Early allocation could allow build-out alongside or shortly after SLA, minimising construction disruption.

Site Name	Land to the rear of Morrisons supermarket
Reference Number	U18
Settlement	Westcroft
Size (Ha)	0.63

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is allocated for commercial purposes on the proposals map with supporting text in the Local Plan indicating a hotel may be one suitable use. A scheme for a residential care home was recently refused, with a later appeal dismissed. It is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are			
there any local or strategic highway			
constraints?		Access should be achievable from either	
In consultation with the Highways		Wimborne Crescent or Barnsdale Drive (but not	
Team and Highways Agency.		both).	
Utilities - is there capacity to			
provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?	Anglian Water requested conditions to deal with drainage as part of recent care home application. This is not expected to be a significant constraint though.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits	Development needs to carefully reflect the site's nature as a 'buffer' between the local centre and adjacent housing. Specifically concerns regarding noise from the adjacent delivery bays will need to be addressed.	

Impact of neighbouring uses	
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the	
site? Would the site adversely	Supermarket service road could lead to noise and
impact neighbouring uses?	traffic issues (depending on where access is
	taken).
Site Visits/mapped information Is the site a logical extension to a	
settlement - where a site is in the	
open countryside, would it form a	
logical extension to a settlement in	
terms of enclosure character?	
Site visits	
	The site is not in open countryside.
Environmental constraints	
Landscape character- would	
development harm the landscape	
character of the area it lies in,	
including areas outside the borough	The landscape character of the surrounding area
boundary (if applicable)?	is predominantly urban.
Site visit/Landscape Character	
Assessment Impact on areas of biological or	
geological importance - would	
development cause harm?	
GIS/Internal consultation	Planning history suggests appropriate mitigation
GIS/Internal consultation	measures would need to be incorporated for great
	crested newts and other birds and mammals.
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead	
to the loss of publicly accessible	
open space or physical education	
facilities.	The site is undeveloped but does not appear to
	serve any open space or amenity purpose.
Local Plan Proposals Map	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be	
potential harm through	
development of the site or would it	
provide an opportunity to enhance	
an area?	
GIS/internal consultation	
	Development of the site would not harm any
Deliverability/availability constrain	known heritage asset.
	2
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing	
employment) - is there any	The site is allocated for commercial purposes on
activity that would limit current development potential?	the proposals map as part of the wider District Centre. However it has not come forward for this
	purpose and was recently characterised as
Site visit/developer feedback	'backland' by a planning inspector, indicating that
	commercial use may no longer be appropriate or
	viable.
<b>Ownership arrangements -</b> is	
there confirmation that the site is	
available for development, with a	The site was unsuccessfully brought forward for
willing landowner?	an alternative scheme, indicating that the owner is
Site proforma/consultation	open to the principle of development.
one protorma/consultation	
Is development of the site	
economically viable- are there	
any particular factors that would	The design of the site may need to incorporate
limit the viability of development?	extra measures to mitigate against noise from the supermarket service yard, this may limit the
Site visit/desktop work	amount of developable land and therefore
	viability.
Do the local colors is how	
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of	According to the schools sufficiency and access
the site cause particular issues with	team, there is potential to mitigate the potential
the provision of education?	pupil yield from site although this will need to be
	confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the
School Organisation Framework/education team	exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.

Do local healthcare facilities		
have capacity? Would		
development of the site cause		
particular issues with the provision		
of healthcare?		
	Although within reasonable proximity, according	
CCG	to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare	
Health Partnerships team	facilities are approaching capacity.	
Are there any other local		
infrastructure needs that could		
be accommodated on the site as		
part of a mixed use		
development? (e.g. local play area		
deficiency, a community facility,		
International Sporting City enabling		
development)	The site is not likely to be large enough to	
	accommodate significant amounts of new	
Desktop study/internal consultation	infrastructure.	
What level of recent housing		
development has there been in		
the local area? Is there still		
capacity in the local market?		
Would the development of the		
site for residential use impede		
the delivery of any known		
infrastructure projects?	Developing the site for residential purposes would	
	preclude the provision of commercial uses on the	
Desktop study/internal consultation	site, although this has not come forward for that	
	purpose and is unlikely to do so in future.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabilit	ý l	

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	Weighting x 2		
	Within settlement- 5	2	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Distance to health centre/doctors	Under 500m - 5	5	
(inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		5	Westcroft Health Centre
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		3	Oxley Park Academy

Under 500m - 5		
501 - 1000m- 4		
over 2000m -1		
	3	Shenley Brook End School
Under 500m - 5		
1001 - 1500m - 3		
1501m - 2000 - 2		
	5	Westcroft
1001 - 1500m - 3		
	5	Westcroft Morrisons
Under 500m - 5	-	
1501m - 2000 - 2		
over 2000m -1		
Under 200m - 5	1	Shenley Wood
200m-300m - 4		
Over 500m - 1	Л	
Under 400m - 5	4	
400m-500m - 4		
600m-700m- 2		
Over 700m - 1	5	
50% or more in non-		
or 5 - 4		
50% or more is grade		
3a - 2		
or grade 2- 1		
-	5	
Total score	53	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1 Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1 Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1 Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1 Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m - 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1 Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m - 2 Over 700m - 1 50% or more in non- agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade 3 a - 2 50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1	

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value to alle	No

Site Name	Reserve site 3 (east of Snellshall Street)
Reference Number	U19
Settlement	Westcroft
Size (Ha)	0.54

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is a reserve site that also has an adopted development brief. It is not within any neighbourhood plan area. It has no planning history.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is readily available from Cranborne Avenue.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or		
elsewhere?	The site's sloping topography may influence the most appropriate sustainable urban drainage system for the site.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing		
issue?	There is a grid road reserve adjacent to the site that may limit development; there is also a slope	
Site Visits	towards the southern corner of the site.	

Impact of neighbouring uses			
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the			
site? Would the site adversely			
impact neighbouring uses?			
		oouring uses are predominantly	
Site Visits/mapped information	residential,	which is considered compatible.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the			
open countryside, would it form a			
logical extension to a settlement in			
terms of enclosure character?			
Site visits			
	The site is	not in open countryside.	
		not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would			
development harm the landscape		ape character of the surrounding area	
character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough	is predomi	nantly urban.	
boundary (if applicable)?			
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or			
geological importance - would			
development cause harm?			
GIS/Internal consultation	Developme	ent of the site would not impact upon	
Clo/memar consultation		area of biological or geological	
Impact on public open opene	importance	).	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead			
to the loss of publicly accessible			
open space or physical education		not allocated as public open space but	
facilities.		le and potentially has a degree of	
Local Plan Proposals Map	amenity va	lue.	
Impact on archaeological and			
heritage assets - would there be			
potential harm through			
development of the site or would it			
provide an opportunity to enhance an area?			
GIS/internal consultation			
		ent of the site would not impact upon	
Deliverability/availability constrain		ated archaeological or heritage asset.	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing			
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current			
development potential?	The site d	pes not have an existing use although	
		as a reserve site with housing listed	
Site visit/developer feedback	as one pot		
Ownership arrangements - is			
there confirmation that the site is			
available for development, with a		owned by Milton Keynes Development owno have confirmed its availability	
willing landowner?		issioned a development brief to guide	
Site proforma/consultation		es of any potential development.	
Is development of the site			
economically viable- are there			
any particular factors that would			
limit the viability of development?			
Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local askes is have			
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of			
the site cause particular issues with	Accordina	to the schools sufficiency and access	
the provision of education?	team, there	e is potential to mitigate the potential	
		from site although this will need to be	
		on a case-by-case basis when the	
School Organisation	avaat num		
School Organisation Framework/education team	exact num finalised.	per and location of all allocations are	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is unlikely to be large enough to provide significant on-site infrastructure.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		There is a grid-road reserve corridor near the site, if this is respected though it is unlikely the site will impede further infrastructure delivery.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	<u>Weighting x 2</u>		
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2	2	
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	4	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	<del>۲</del>	
GIS		4	Westcroft Health Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	2	Ovlov Park Academy
preferred options.		3	Oxley Park Academy

	1	1	
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
-	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		1	Shenley Brook End School
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
615	over 2000m -1	3	Westcroft
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
		3	Westcroft
Distance to employment area (as	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1	3	Shenley Wood
	Under 200m - 5	5	
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
GIS	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
615	Over 500m - 1	3	
	Under 400m - 5	0	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	5	Westcroft
	50% or more in non-	<u> </u>	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1	5	
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	46	score for larger sites that could
			deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

 STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

 Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)

 No

City)	
Has the site been identified locally	
as in need of improvement?	No
<b>I</b>	
Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: No added value in al	locating
	looding.

Site Name	Wolverton Railway works
Reference Number	U20
Settlement	Wolverton
Size (Ha)	14.3

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is a large brownfield area that is part of the railway heritage of Wolverton. Its redevelopment has been suggested for a considerable length of time and the Wolverton Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan contains policies that should influence this. There is also a live planning application that may preclude allocation in the Site Allocations Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are			
there any local or strategic highway			
constraints?			
		The site covers a large area in a historic town	
In consultation with the Highways		centre that would be likely to increase congestion	
Team and Highways Agency.		without appropriate design and mitigation.	
Utilities - is there capacity to			
provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			
broadband companies'			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans	Site is already serviced	
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB	Site is brownfield land with opportunity to improve current drainage.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits	Potentially contamination.	

Impact of neighbouring uses	
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit	The site is located between the existing town
suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely	centre, commercial and retail uses and the canal to the north. These are expected to be compatible
impact neighbouring uses?	uses, particularly as the site appears large
impact holghoodning dood.	enough to be able to accommodate buffers where
Site Visits/mapped information	necessary.
Is the site a logical extension to a	
settlement - where a site is in the	
open countryside, would it form a	
logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?	
Site visits	
	The site is not in open countryside.
Environmental constraints	
Landscape character- would	
development harm the landscape	
character of the area it lies in,	
including areas outside the borough	The landscape character of the surrounding area
boundary (if applicable)?	is predominantly urban.
Site visit/Landscape Character	
Assessment	
Impact on areas of biological or	
geological importance - would	
development cause harm?	
GIS/Internal consultation	
GIG/Internal consultation	There is a notable bird species recorded on the
	site.
Impact on public open space -	
would development of the site lead	
to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education	
facilities.	Redevelopment would not lead to the loss of
	public open space and may increase provision.
Local Plan Proposals Map	
Impact on archaeological and	
heritage assets - would there be	
potential harm through	
development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance	
an area?	
GIS/internal consultation	The site is within a conservation area and itself is
	an historic use with heritage value. This should be
Deliverability/availability constraints	incorporated into any redevelopment scheme.
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any	The site is allocated for employment purposes.
activity that would limit current	According to the Council's Employment Land
development potential?	Study, its relative value for this use is in the
	bottom 50% of employment sites across the
Site visit/developer feedback	Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential
	may be acceptable.
Ownership arrangements - is	
there confirmation that the site is	
available for development, with a	
willing landowner?	The site is subject to a live planning application
	and is therefore definitely available.
Site proforma/consultation	
Is development of the site	
economically viable- are there	
any particular factors that would	As a brownfield site the land is more likely to
limit the viability of development?	require remediation or other site preparation
Site visit/desktop work	expenditure.
De the least eshacis have	
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of	According to the schools sufficiency and access
the site cause particular issues with	team, the expected pupil yield from the
the provision of education?	development cannot be adequately
	accommodated within the existing education
School Organisation	system even with the contribution the site itself
Framework/education team	would be expected to make towards addressing
	this.

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision of healthcare?		According to NHS England, the nearest health	
or nearthcare?		<b>0 0 1</b>	
000		centre has capacity.	
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)			
		The site is likely to be large enough to	
Desktop study/internal consultation		accommodate additional infrastructure on site.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		·

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Nature of site       100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield- 3 50-74% brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1         Site visit/mapped information       Weighting x 2         Relationship with settlement boundary       10         Site visit/mapped information       Within settlement- 5 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0         Site visit/mapped information       Weighting x 2         Image: Non-algorithm of the settlement boundary       10         Site visit/mapped information       Weighting x 2         Image: Non-algorithm of the settlement boundary       10         Site visit/mapped information       Weighting x 2         Image: Non-algorithm of the settlement boundary       10         Distance to bus stop or train station -       under 200m - 5 200m - 400m - 4 400m - 800m - 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1       5         Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)       Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3       5         'ccapacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 - the outcomes of both stages will be used to determine preferred options.       3       Wolverton Health Centre         GIS       3       Wolverton Health Centre         Distance to primary school       Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4       3	Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Relationship with settlement boundaryWithin settlement - 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0Site visit/mapped informationWeighting x 2 10Distance to bus stop or train station - GISunder 200m - 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m - 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1Bistance to primary schoolUnder 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4		75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
Relationship with settlement boundaryWithin settlement-5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0Site visit/mapped informationWeighting x 2 10Distance to bus stop or train station - (IIS)under 200m - 5 200m - 400m -4 			10	
Distance to bus stop or train station -under 200m - 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m - 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 110GIS5Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -15*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 - the outcomes of both stages will be used to determine preferred options.Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 43GISUnder 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 43	boundary	Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Distance to bus stop or train station -under 200m - 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m - 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1GIS5Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 			40	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 - the outcomes of both stages will be used to determine preferred options.1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1GIS3Wolverton Health CentreDistance to primary schoolUnder 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4	station –	200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2		
Distance to primary school         Under 250m - 5           250 - 500m - 4         250	(inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
250 - 500m- 4			3	Wolverton Health Centre
"capacity issues are dealt with in500 - 1000m - 3stage 2 - the outcomes of both1000m - 1500 - 2stages will be used to determineover 1500m - 1preferred options.3	*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2	3	Www.m/Bushfield School

		1
Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
1001 - 1500m - 3		
over 2000m -1		
	4	The Radcliffe School
Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
over 2000m -1	5	Wolverton Town Centre
501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
over 2000m - 1	5	Wolverton Tesco/Asda
Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
over 2000m -1	5	Old Wolverton
Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	2 (5)	
Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
Over 700m - 1	1 (5)	Wolverton sports ground
50% or more in non- agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade 3b - 3 50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
	5	Bracketed score reflects potential
Total score	58 (65)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	$\begin{array}{c} 501 - 1000m - 4\\ 1001 - 1500m - 3\\ 1501m - 2000 - 2\\ over 2000m -1\\ \end{array}$ Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1 Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1 Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1 Under 200m - 5 200m -300m - 4 300m -400m - 3 400m -500m - 2 Over 500m - 1 Under 400m - 5 400m -500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m -700m - 2 Over 700m - 1 50% or more in non-agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1	501 - 1000m - 4 $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ $4$ Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1 $5$ Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1 $5$ Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1 $5$ Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1 $5$ Under 200m - 5 $200m - 30m - 4$ $300m - 400m - 3$ $400m - 500m - 4$ $300m - 400m - 3$ $400m - 500m - 4$ $300m - 400m - 3$ $400m - 500m - 4$ $300m - 700m - 2$ $2(5)$ Under 400m - 5 $400m - 500m - 3$ $600m - 700m - 2$ $0ver 500m - 1$ $1(5)$ $50%$ or more in non-agricultural - 5 $50%$ or more is grade 4 $0r 5 - 4$ $50%$ or more is grade 3a - 2 $50%$ or more is grade 3a - 2 $50%$ or more is grade 1 $0r$ grade 2- 1       <

 STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

 Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)

 Regeneration of Wolverton town centre

Gity)	
Has the site been identified locally	
as in need of improvement?	Yes
Other supporting factors	There is strong local support for sensitive redevelopment as indicated by the Neighbourhood Plan.

Site Name	Wolverton Mill site G
Reference Number	U21
Settlement	Wolverton Mill
Size (Ha)	4

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is allocated for employment purposes. It is not within any neighbourhood plan area. It has no planning history.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
<b>Access -</b> can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access should be achievable from Stratford road.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies'			

service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or		
elsewhere?	There is a watercourse on the site, which should be easily incorporated into appropriate drainage measures.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits	The site has no site-specific constraints.	

Ge_notes.emill - void any init:         Display or marked biological of the operation of the set			
Salability mark dealine of the set of the se	Impact of neighbouring uses		
Bite Watch estimation is advanced with estimation of the advance and protection of a microardinative description of the advance of the advan			
Site Visbelmapped information is the site a logical accession to a open countrylexic would in form a biglical accession to a biglical accession to a settlement in site accession accession accession accession accession accession accession biglical accession accessio	site? Would the site adversely		
Site Valishmappet information In Site Valishmappet information In Site Valishmappet information In Site Valishmappet information Interned inclusive character? Site Valis Interned inclusive character? Site Valishmappet information Interned info	impact neighbouring uses?		
is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where all site in the open countryside. In the site is not in open countryside. It is also have character? The site is not in open countryside. It is not in open country is not open country is nopen country is not open country is no	Site Visits/mapped information		
paper countryside, would it orm a tigged extension to settement of enclosure character? Site visits  Environmental constraints  E	Is the site a logical extension to a		
bigglad extension to a settement in terms of undexue character?       The site is not in open countryside.         Environmental constraints       The site is not in open countryside.         Environmental constraints       In discase character would consider of the sure is its in open country of the sure is the information of the sure would consider of the sure is the information of the sure would not impact upon any knew in areas of biological or geological importance - would doesoment of the site would not impact upon any knew interes of biological or geological inportance - would doesoment of the site would not impact upon any knew interes of biological or geological inportance - would doesoment country of the sure is an out of doesoment of the site is an inport on archeological and country inpact on archeological and country in arcs of public gram space is an out in a country of the sure is an out of the site and arcs?         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for engloyment public and arcs?         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for engloyment purposes. According to the Count's Employment is an arcs is the diversion of the site and arcs of encloyment is an arcs is the borrough intervent would and in args the access the borrough intervent on the site arcs is the borrough intervent arcs is in the borrough intervent archeological for the site arcs is advectopment of the site arcs is the borrough intervent archeological for the site arcs is advectopment in the valie and arcs is the advectopment is a sarcs is the borrough i			
Istimus of unclosure character?       The site is not in open countryside.         Environmental constraints       Image: character - would environmental constraints         Istimus of unclosure character - would environmental constraints       Image: character - would environmental constraints         Site visits and cope Character - would environmental constraints       Image: character - would environmental constraints         Site visits and cope Character - would downlopment cause harm?       Development of the site would not impact upon any thrown areas of biological or geological importance - would downlopment cause harm?         Gil/Internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any thrown areas of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public vaccessite on an environment of the site open space or project education impact on public vaccessite on an environment of the site open space or project education are any thrown areas of biological or geological importance.         Used in Portocals Map       Development of the site would not impact upon an environment of the site would not impact on publication         Development of the site would not impact upon an environment and expression.       Development of the site would not impact upon an environment and expression.         Site visitid values in the site is an environment an environment and expression.       The site is allocated for employment publication         Development of the site and expression.       Development of the site allocated for employment publication         Site visite and expression.			
Environmental constraints       Intersitie is not in open countryside.         Environmental constraints       Intersitie is not in open countryside.         Landscape characters would character data like in.       Intersitie is not in open countryside.         Indicating areas outside the borough country of sport data like in.       Intersitie is not in open countryside.         Site visit and coupo Character data like in.       Intersitie is open space of biological or geological in proceedings.         Giff-Internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known areas of biological or geological inportance.         Impact on public open space - would the data data data like is open space although not publically accessible.       Intersite is open space although not publically accessible.         Intersite is open space or hysical oducation faither on the pontoreal many fortown areas of biological or geological importance.       Intersite is open space although not publically accessible.         Intersite is open space although not publically accessible.       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archarological or heritage assets.         Intersite is open space although not publically accessible.       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archarological or heritage assets.         Intersite is open space although not publically accessible.       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archarological or heritage assets.         Intersite is open space although not publically accessible.       Development of the	terms of enclosure character?		
Environmental constraints       Intersitie is not in open countryside.         Environmental constraints       Intersitie is not in open countryside.         Landscape characters would character data like in.       Intersitie is not in open countryside.         Indicating areas outside the borough country of sport data like in.       Intersitie is not in open countryside.         Site visit and coupo Character data like in.       Intersitie is open space of biological or geological in proceedings.         Giff-Internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known areas of biological or geological inportance.         Impact on public open space - would the data data data like is open space although not publically accessible.       Intersite is open space although not publically accessible.         Intersite is open space or hysical oducation faither on the pontoreal many fortown areas of biological or geological importance.       Intersite is open space although not publically accessible.         Intersite is open space although not publically accessible.       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archarological or heritage assets.         Intersite is open space although not publically accessible.       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archarological or heritage assets.         Intersite is open space although not publically accessible.       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archarological or heritage assets.         Intersite is open space although not publically accessible.       Development of the	Site visits		
Environmental constraints Landcace haracter would development har his landcace haracter of the area files in his including area out the landcace haracter of the area files in his including area out the landcace haracter of the area files in his including area out the landcace haracter of the area files in his including area out the landcace haracter of the area files in his including area out the landcace haracter of the area files in his including area out the landcace haracter of the area files in his including area out the landcace haracter of the area files in his including area out the landcace haracter of the area files in his including area out the landcace haracter of the area files in his including area out the landcace haracter of the area files in his is out of public open space haracter of the area files in his is out of public open space haracter of the area files in his is out of public open space haracter of the area files haracter harac		The site is not in open countryside	
Landscape character - would development harm the landscape character of the surrounding area to prodominantly urban.       The fandscape character of the surrounding area to prodominantly urban.         Site visit.Landscape Character Assessment boundary (if applicable)?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known cess of biological or genetic acuse harm?         Site visit.Landscape of particle genetic acuse harm?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known cess of biological or genetic acuse harm?         Site visit.Landscape of particle gene space of physical double open space - would development of the site leads to he loss of physical double open space or physic	Environmental constraints		
development harm the landscape character of the set it les in, molding areas outside the borough coundry (if applicable)? She visitl andscape Character Assessment impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GiSfinternal consultation impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the lose harm? GiSfinternal consultation importance. Could prevent of the site lead to the lose harm? GiSfinternal consultation importance. Could prevent of the site lead to the lose of public open space - would development of the site lead to the lose of public open space - would development of the site lead to the lose of public open space - would development of the site lead to the lose of public open space - would development of the site lead to the lose of public open space - would development of the site lead to the lose of public open space although not publically accessible. Development of the site lead to the lose would not impact upon any known architeciogical of heritage assets. Development - is there any constraints Existing uses (ed, ongoing employment - is there any constraints			
hthracker of the area it lies in, in infinition of the solution of the solutio			
hickding areas outside the borough boordary (if applicable)? Site visitLandicope Character impact on areas of biological or geological impactance - would development dues harm? GIS/Internal consultation impact on public open space - would development dues harm? GIS/Internal consultation interaction public open space - would development dues has a public open space or public open space - would development dues has a public open space or public open space - would development dues has a public open space or public open space - would development dues has a public to the issue of public open space - mouth due to the site and to the issue of public open space a bloogh not publically accessible. The site is open space although not publically accessible. Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological of heritage assets. GIS/Internal consultation Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological of heritage assets. Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any accessible.			
Site visit.landscape Character Assessment impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development of the site would not impact upon any known areas of biological or geological importance.	including areas outside the borough		
Assessment	boundary (if applicable)?		
Impact on a reas of biological or geological progression of the site would not impact upon any known areas of biological or geological importance - would inter the site lead to the loss of publicy accessible open space or hybrical ducation the site and the site would not publically accessible open space or hybrical education tacilities. The site is open space or hybrical education tacilities would not publically accessible open space or hybrical education tacilities. The site is open space or hybrical education tacilities. The site is open space or hybrical education tacilities. The site is open space or hybrical education tacilities. The site is open space or hybrical education tacilities. The site is open space or hybrical education tacilities. The site is open space or hybrical education tacilities. The site is allocated for employment of the site would in the site or operforming to enhance an area? Gis/internal consultation Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets. Deliverability/availability constraints Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) is there any according to the cound's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 65% of employment sites accords the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable. Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is allocated for employment sites accords the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable. The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise. Site visit/developer feedback and the site is allocated for employment site accords the site analysite or development of the site exactly is visit/developer feedback and the site is allocated for employment site accords the site analysite or development of the site exactly of development of the site exactly of the schools sufficiency and access team, hyber or cound is advelopment of the site exactly of the schools sufficiency and access team, hyber or cound is advelopment of the se	Site visit/Landscape Character		
gelological importance - would       Development cause harm?         GIS/Internal consultation       Development cause harm?         Impact on public open space - would development of the site would not impact upon any known areas of biological or geological importance.         Impact on public open space - would development of the site is open space although not publically accessible.         Interlage assets - would nee to a schaeological and heritage assets - would nee to make a schema and the site is open space although not publically development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/Internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there any available of dovelopment?       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Site visit/development with a would inter there are any available of dovelopment?       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Site visit/development?       Site visit/development?       According to the schoek sufficiency and access the approximation for dovelopment?         Site visit/development?       According to the schoek sufficiency and access the approximation for dovelopment?         Site visit/development?       According to the schoek suff	Impact on areas of biological or		
GIS/Internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known areas of biological or geological         Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead open space athough not publicate deucation facilities.       The site is open space athough not publically accessible.         Impact on archaeological and heritage.       The site is open space athough not publically accessible.         Impact on archaeological and heritage asset.       Development of the site would not impact upon are when the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?         GIS/Internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon are when with a work is site accessible.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the offinge assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study. Its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therafore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there any available for development?       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Site visit/development?       Site visit/development?       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Site visit/desktop work       According to the schools sufficiency and access team of the site schools have coparation enow whet the controlutor may exercise access team of th	geological importance - would		
Order Hermiter Definition       any known areas of biological or geological importance.         impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.       The site is open space atthough not publically accessible.         Local Plan Proposals Map impact on archaeological and potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council 5 Employment tand Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there continuation that the ate is a available of development of the asite any baticular factors that would init the visibility of development?       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Site visibility of development?       Site visibility of development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development control to the site accommodated within the visiting gducation system even with the controls addressing	development cause harm?		
Importance.       importance.         would development of the site lead to the loss of public yacessitie open space or physical education tacilities.       The site is open space although not publically accessible.         Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land development to its for any known archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback       Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there continual value- are there any particular factors that would limit the visitibuits- are there any particular factors that would limit the visitibuit globacking work       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupi yield from the development cannot be adequately accommodated within the xistis f	GIS/Internal consultation		
Impact on public open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? CIS/internal consultation Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? CIS/internal consultation Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? CIS/internal consultation Development of the site and according to the Councit's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable. Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with as willing landowner? Site visit/development of the site economically viable are there arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity/ Would development of the site acuse particular factors have capacity who will be expected pupil yield from the development cannot be adequately accommodated with the existing education system even with the contribution the site first would be			
would development of the site lead to the loss of public vacessible open space or physical education tacilities. The site is open space although not publically accessible. The site is open space although not publically accessible. The site is open space although not publically accessible. The site is open space although not publically accessible. Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets. Delverability/availability constraints Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development of the site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment and Site visit/developer feedback Brough There and the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site visit/desktop work De the local school's have capacity? Would development? Site visit/dektop work De the local school's have capacity? Would development of the site access turfer any attrictuar factors that would imit the visitify of development? Site visit/dektop work De the local school's have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular factors that would int the visitify of development? Site visit/dektop work De the local school's have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular factors that would int the visitify development of the site cause particular factors that would int the visitify development of the site cause particular factors that would int the visitify development of the site cause particular factors that would the provision of education? School Organisation Finework/development do make saddressing	Impact on public open space -		
page space of physical education traditions. Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would here be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation Deliverability/availability constraints Existing uses (e.g. ongoing amploymonf) - is there any activity that would imit current development of the site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom GWO of employment sites across the Borrough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable. Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development of the site sources. Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause sufficiency and access there studied schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause sufficiency and access there is accousting Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause sufficiency and access there studied schools sufficiency and access there, the expected pupil yield from the development of the site across sufficiency and access the site access patient is sufficiency and access the site access patiencial Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause paticular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education the stam School Organisation Framework/education the stam Sufficiency and access the schools sufficiency and access the school sufficiency and access the schools sufficiency and access the schools sufficiency and access the schools sufficiency and access the schools sufficiency	would development of the site lead		
facilities. The site is open space although not publically accessible. The site is open space although not publically accessible. The site is open space although not publically accessible. The site is allocated for employment provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/Internal consultation Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets. Deliverability/availability constraints Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) is there any activity that would imit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Borough. The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Sue is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable. Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site visit/development of the site economically viable: are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause princlain sites are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the site cause particular issues with the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team			
Local Plan Proposals Map       accessible.         Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential ham through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         GlS/internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Site visit/desktop work       Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site executed on the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development of the site exact would more?         Site visit/desktop work       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development of the site action?         School Organisation       System even with the contribution the existing education system even with the contribution the site is team	facilities.		
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would https://would.com/impact	Less Dieg Dresses la Mag		
heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         GIS/Internal consultation       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is svailable for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/developer feedback         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation Framework/development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation Framework/development of the spected pupil yield from the development of the site field issues and be expected to make towards addressing			
development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints       Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback       The site is allocated for employment tand Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Site evelopment of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development of the site efficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development and the existing education?         School Organisation       System even with the contribution the site itself would be expected to make towards addressing	heritage assets - would there be		
provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Downership arrangements - is there any activity that would limit current development, with a willing landowner?         Site visit/developer feedback         Downership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is accost the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/development of the site is according to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development?         Site visit/desktop work       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development of pupility is ducation?         School Organisation       System even with the contribution the site iself essing	potential harm through		
an area? GIS/internal consultation Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets. Deliverability/availability constraints Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Downership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would imit the viability of development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation School Ocal School School School School School School S			
Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Downership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site visit/developer of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         Solut Organisation School Organisation Framework/education team	an area?		
Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.         Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Downership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site visit/developer of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         So the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation Framework/education feam	CIS/internal consultation		
Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?         development potential?         development potential?         Site visit/developer feedback         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any part factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation         School Organisation	GIS/Internal consultation	Development of the site would not impact upon	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development cannot be adequately accommodated within the existing education system even with the contribution the site itself would be expected upil yield from the development cannot be adequately accommodated within the existing education system even with the contribution the site itself	Delivershility/evoilshility/eenstrainte	any known archaeological or heritage assets.	
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Image: Site visit/development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pull yield from the development of the site accuse particular issues with the provision of education?         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pull yield from the development cannot be adquately accommodated within the existing education system even with the contribution the site itself			
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there experted back       The site is available for development, with a willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pull yield from the development of the site accurrent site accurs particular issues with the provision of education?         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of method and the provision of education?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pull yield from the development cannot be adequately accommodated within the existing education system even with the contribution the site itself would development for the site itself	Existing uses (e.g. ongoing	The site is allocated for ampleument surrange	
development potential?       Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Its development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation Framework/education team       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development of system even with the contribution the site itself would while the contribution the site itself would access team.	employment) - is there any		
Site visit/developer feedback       bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       If development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development of evelopment of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation Framework/education team       According to the schools sufficiency and access teal			
Ownership arrangements - is         there confirmation that the site is         available for development, with a         willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site         economically viable- are there         any particular factors that would         limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have         capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation         School Organisation         Framework/education team			
Ownership arrangements - is         there confirmation that the site is         available for development, with a         willing landowner?         Site proforma/consultation         Is development of the site         economically viable- are there         any particular factors that would         limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have         capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation         School Organisation         Framework/education team	Site visit/developer feedback		
there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		may be acceptable.	
there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team	Our or other of the second sec		
available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       Image: Comparision of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development cannot be adequately accommodated within the existing education system even with the contribution the site itself would be expected to make towards addressing			
Site proforma/consultation       exercise.         Is development of the site       economically viable- are there         any particular factors that would       imit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have       According to the schools sufficiency and access         capacity? Would development of       team, the expected pupil yield from the         development cannot be adequately       accommodated within the existing education         School Organisation       system even with the contribution the site itself         Framework/education team       would be expected to make towards addressing	available for development, with a		
Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site         economically viable- are there       any particular factors that would         limit the viability of development?       Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have       According to the schools sufficiency and access         capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?       According to the schools sufficiency and access         School Organisation       system even with the contribution the site itself would be expected to make towards addressing	willing landowner?		
Is development of the site         economically viable- are there         any particular factors that would         limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have         capacity? Would development of         the site cause particular issues with         the provision of education?         School Organisation         Framework/education team	Site proforma/consultation		
economically viable- are there         any particular factors that would         limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have         capacity? Would development of         the site cause particular issues with         the provision of education?         School Organisation         Framework/education team			
economically viable- are there         any particular factors that would         limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have         capacity? Would development of         the site cause particular issues with         the provision of education?         School Organisation         Framework/education team	Is development of the site		
limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?         School Organisation Framework/education team	economically viable- are there		
Site visit/desktop work       Image: Site visit/desktop work         Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development cannot be adequately accommodated within the existing education system even with the contribution the site itself would be expected to make towards addressing			
Do the local schools have       According to the schools sufficiency and access         capacity? Would development of       According to the schools sufficiency and access         the site cause particular issues with       According to the schools sufficiency and access         team, the expected pupil yield from the       development cannot be adequately         accommodated within the existing education       system even with the contribution the site itself         Framework/education team       would be expected to make towards addressing			
capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development cannot be adequately accommodated within the existing educationSchool Organisationsystem even with the contribution the site itself would be expected to make towards addressing	Site visit/desktop work		
capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development cannot be adequately accommodated within the existing educationSchool Organisation Framework/education teamSchool Organisation would be expected to make towards addressing	Do the loop ophosis have		
the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?team, the expected pupil yield from the development cannot be adequately accommodated within the existing education system even with the contribution the site itself would be expected to make towards addressing		According to the schools sufficiency and access	
School Organisationaccommodated within the existing educationSchool Organisationsystem even with the contribution the site itselfFramework/education teamwould be expected to make towards addressing	the site cause particular issues with	team, the expected pupil yield from the	
School Organisation       system even with the contribution the site itself         Framework/education team       would be expected to make towards addressing	the provision of education?		
Framework/education team would be expected to make towards addressing	School Organisation		
this.	Framework/education team	would be expected to make towards addressing	
		this.	

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision		According to NUIC England, the present health	
of healthcare?		According to NHS England, the nearest health	
		centre has capacity.	
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)		The site is potentially large enough to	
developmenty		accommodate a degree of additional	
Desktop study/internal consultation		infrastructure on-site.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
		Development of the site for residential purposes	
Desktop study/internal consultation		would preclude any opportunity to deliver the site	
		for its current employment allocation.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Nature of site       100% brownfield-5         Site visit/mapped information       50-74% brownfield-3         Weighting x 2       2         Relationship with settlement boundary       Within settlement-5         Edged on 1 side-2       2         Weighting x 2       2         Within settlement-5       Edged on 2 sides-3         Edged on 1 side-2       2         No relationship       Weighting x 2         Under 200m - 5       Edged on 1 side-2         No relationship-0       Weighting x 2         10       10         Distance to bus stop or train station -       200m - 400m - 4         GIS       10         Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)       Under 500m - 5         stages will be used to determine preferred options.       501 - 1000m - 4         Itoti - 1500m - 3       100 - 5         Itoti - 1500m - 3       100 - 5         Itoti - 1500m - 3       501 - 1000m - 4         Itoti - 1500m - 3       100 - 5         Itoti - 1500m - 3       100 - 5         Itoti - 1500m - 3       100 - 5         Itoti - 1500m - 3       100 - 1         Stages will be used to determine preferred options.       2         GIS       2	Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Relationship with settlement boundary       Within settlement - 5         Relationship with settlement boundary       Edged on three sides- 3         Site visit/mapped information       Weighting x 2         No relationship-0       10         Distance to bus stop or train station –       under 200m - 5         GIS       200m - 400m - 4         Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)       Under 500m - 3         *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of both stages will be used to determine preferred options.       Under 250m - 5         GIS       2       Wolverton Health Centre/         Vor 2000m - 1       5         Distance to paint with in stage 2 – the outcomes of both stages will be used to determine preferred options.       2       Wolverton Health Centre         GIS       2       Wolverton Health Centre       2         Vor 2000m - 1       5       5       501 - 1000m - 4         100 - 1500m - 3       1501m - 2000 - 2       0ver 2000m - 1       5         GIS       2       Wolverton Health Centre         Vor 2000m - 4       5       500 - 5       5         GIS       2       Wolverton Health Centre       25         Vor 2000m - 1       5       5       5         Obstance to primary school		75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
Relationship with settlement boundaryEdged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0Site visit/mapped informationWeighting x 2 10Distance to bus stop or train station -under 200m - 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m - 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 110Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 			2	
Distance to bus stop or train station -under 200m - 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m - 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 110GISUnder 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 35Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -15*capacity issues are dealt with in stages will be used to determine preferred options.Under 250m - 5 200m - 4 500 - 1000m - 32GISUnder 250m - 5 200 - 20 over 2000m -12	boundary	Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Distance to bus stop or train station –under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1GIS5Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 				
(inc proposed facilities)501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 - the outcomes of both stages will be used to determine preferred options.1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1GIS2Wolverton Health CentreDistance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with inUnder 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3	station –	200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2		
Distance to primary schoolUnder 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3*capacity issues are dealt with in	(inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
250 - 500m- 4 *capacity issues are dealt with in 500 - 1000m - 3			2	Wolverton Health Centre
stage 2 - the outcomes of both1000m - 1500 - 2stages will be used to determineover 1500m -1preferred options.2	*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2	2	Queen Eleanor school

	1		1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Linder 500m 5		
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Radcliffe school
615	Under 500m - 5	5	
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	4	Stony Stratford
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5		
	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1		
GIS		2	Wolverton Tesco
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
defined on the proposals map)	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
		5	Wolverton Mill
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	Over 500m - 1		
	Under 400m - 5	2	
Distance to park/publically	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2		
	Over 700m - 1	5	
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1		
	or grade 2-1		
GIS		5	
	Total score	47	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	μ	1	- 1

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whethe	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value to allo	None

Site Name	Land West of Brickhill Street
Reference Number	U22
Settlement	Bow Brickhill/Caldecotte (expansion)
Size (Ha)	35.4

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history. It is within the designated area of the emerging Bow Brickhill Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are			
there any local or strategic highway		Access is achievable from various points although	
constraints?		development is likely to have a strategic impact	
		on the level crossing at the northeast tip of the	
In consultation with the Highways		site and the major trunk road (A5) junction to the	
Team and Highways Agency.		south.	
Utilities - is there capacity to			
provide all required utilities?			

Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits	The site is flat and relatively unconstrained.	

Impact of neighbouring uses	
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit	
suitability or marketability of the	
site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?	The site is bordered by roads and the railway,
impact heighbouring uses?	both of which could present noise and pollution
Site Visits/mapped information	issues along the edge of the site.
Is the site a logical extension to a	
settlement - where a site is in the	Whilst the boundaries of the site may represent a
open countryside, would it form a	logical 'triangle' of land between existing roads
logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?	(particularly when considered alongside adjoining
	parcels), there is very little enclosure character in
Site visits	relation to the existing settlement. The site would therefore represent an harmful intrusion into open
	countryside.
Environmental constraints	
Landscape character- would	The landscape character of the area is rural/urban
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in,	fringe, which would not necessarily be harmed in principle by development although there is an
including areas outside the borough	area of attractive landscape directly to the south
boundary (if applicable)?	of the site, which may be impacted.
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment	
Impact on areas of biological or	
geological importance - would	
development cause harm?	
GIS/Internal consultation	Development of the site would not impact on any
GIS/Internal consultation	areas designated for biological or geological
	importance.
Impact on public open space -	
would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible	
open space or physical education	
facilities.	
	The site is open space although not publically
Local Plan Proposals Map	accessible other than via rights of way.
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be	
potential harm through	
development of the site or would it	
provide an opportunity to enhance	
an area?	
GIS/internal consultation	The site is partially covered by an archaeological
	notification area.
Deliverability/availability constrain	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing	
employment) - is there any	
activity that would limit current development potential?	
asterophicit potential:	The site has no existing use other than
Site visit/developer feedback	agriculture.
<b>Ownership arrangements -</b> is	
there confirmation that the site is	
available for development, with a	
willing landowner?	The site has been promoted through the SHLAA
	process.
Site proforma/consultation	
Is development of the site	
economically viable- are there	
any particular factors that would	
limit the viability of development?	
Site visit/desktop work	
Do the local schools have	
capacity? Would development of	According to the schools sufficiency and access
the site cause particular issues with	team, there is potential to mitigate the potential
the provision of education?	pupil yield from site although this will need to be
	confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the
School Organisation Framework/education team	exact number and location of all allocations are
	finalised.
Framework/education team	

<b>Do local healthcare facilities</b> <b>have capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?			
CCG Health Partnerships team		There are no health facilities within 1km.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)			
Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is large enough to accommodate a significant amount of infrastructure on-site.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		Access or small quantities of land may be required along the site's northern edge to facilitate the East-West Rail upgrades. However, this is likely to affect a relatively small portion of the site's area and be completed before any potential residential development.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty	· · ·	

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
	<u></u>	2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>	2	
		4	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
<b>-</b>		4 (5)	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		1 (5)	The Red House Surgery
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		2 (5)	Bow Brickhill C of E School

GIS			
	Linder 500m 5		
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
GIS		1	Walton High
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	1	Bletchley/Fenny Stratford
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5		
	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	1	Bletchley Tesco
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Desktop study/GIS	0ver 2000m - 1	4 (5)	Caldecotte/Tilbrook
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
010	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	Over 500m - 1	2 (5)	
	Under 400m - 5	2 (5)	
Distance to park/publically	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1		<b>_</b>
	50% or more in non-	5	The site adjoins open countryside.
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1		
weating of agricultural failu	or grade 2-1		
GIS		3	
	Total score	30 (42)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

ner there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
No.
No.
None.

Site Name	Land at Eaton Leys	
Reference Number	U23	
	Bletchley/Fenny	
Settlement	Stratford (expansion)	
Size (Ha)	40.5	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is part of a larger area that straddles the Milton Keynes border with Aylesbury Vale. It is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area. It is currently subject to a live planning application, the determination of which may preclude its inclusion in the Site Allocations Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	Still partially within floodplain
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	Yes	Scheduled Ancient Monument covers a large part of the north of the site.

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.			
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies'			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits		

Impact of neighbouring uses		
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit		
suitability or marketability of the		
site? Would the site adversely		
impact neighbouring uses?		
Site Visits/mapped information		
Is the site a logical extension to a		
settlement - where a site is in the		
open countryside, would it form a		
logical extension to a settlement in		
terms of enclosure character?		
Site visits		
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would		
development harm the landscape		
character of the area it lies in,		
including areas outside the borough		
boundary (if applicable)?		
, , , ,		
Site visit/Landscape Character		
Assessment	<b> </b>	
Impact on areas of biological or		
geological importance - would		
development cause harm?		
GIS/Internal consultation		
	ļ	
Impact on public open space -		
would development of the site lead		
to the loss of publicly accessible		
open space or physical education		
facilities.		
Local Plan Proposals Map		
	<u> </u>	
Impact on archaeological and		
heritage assets - would there be		
potential harm through		
development of the site or would it		
provide an opportunity to enhance		
an area?		
GIS/internal consultation		
	1 -	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing		
employment) - is there any		
activity that would limit current		
development potential?		
Site visit/developer feedback		
	<b> </b>	
Ownership arrangements - is		
there confirmation that the site is	Ì	
available for development, with a		
available for development, with a willing landowner?		
available for development, with a		
available for development, with a willing landowner?		
available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		
available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		
available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		
available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there		
available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would		
available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there		
available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would		
<ul> <li>available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> </ul>		
available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would		
<ul> <li>available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> <li>Site visit/desktop work</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> <li>Site visit/desktop work</li> <li>Do the local schools have</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> <li>Site visit/desktop work</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> <li>Site visit/desktop work</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> <li>Site visit/desktop work</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> <li>Site visit/desktop work</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> <li>Site visit/desktop work</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> <li>Site visit/desktop work</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> <li>Site visit/desktop work</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</li> <li>School Organisation</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>available for development, with a willing landowner?</li> <li>Site proforma/consultation</li> <li>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</li> <li>Site visit/desktop work</li> <li>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</li> </ul>		
available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation		

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?			
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabilit	V	1	

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options. GIS	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Distance to primary school         *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of both stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		

[	1		
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS			
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
Docktop study/GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Desktop study/GIS			
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	Over 500m - 1		
	Under 400m - 5		
Distance to park/publically	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1		
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	¥ (V)	score for larger sites that could
	i ulai score	X (Y)	deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

 STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

 Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)

Gity)	
Has the site been identified locally	
as in need of improvement?	
Other supporting factors	
Conclusion:	

Site Name	Land at Linford Lakes
Reference Number	U24
	Great Linford
Settlement	(expansion)
Size (Ha)	11

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is currently in open countryside designated as a linear park extension. The site has been subject to an EIA screening request but has no other planning history. It is not part of any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	Yes	Site is ruled out at stage 1.
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	Yes	Site is ruled out at stage 1.

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.			
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies'			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits		

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit		
suitability or marketability of the		
site? Would the site adversely		
impact neighbouring uses?		
Site Visite/manned information		
Site Visits/mapped information		
Is the site a logical extension to a		
settlement - where a site is in the		
open countryside, would it form a		
logical extension to a settlement in		
terms of enclosure character?		
Site visits		
Sile visits		
	1	
En de seu setal seu stadada		
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would		
development harm the landscape		
character of the area it lies in,		
including areas outside the borough		
boundary (if applicable)?		
Site visit/Landscape Character		
Assessment		
Impact on areas of biological or	1	
geological importance - would		
development cause harm?		
GIS/Internal consultation		
Gio/Internal consultation		
	ļ	
Impact on public open space -		
would development of the site lead		
to the loss of publicly accessible		
open space or physical education		
facilities.		
Local Plan Proposals Map		
Impact on archaeological and		
heritage assets - would there be		
potential harm through		
development of the site or would it		
provide an opportunity to enhance		
an area?		
GIS/internal consultation		
	[	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing		
employment) - is there any		
activity that would limit current		
activity that would limit current		
activity that would limit current development potential?		
activity that would limit current		
activity that would limit current development potential?		
activity that would limit current development potential?		
activity that would limit current development potential?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		
activity that would limit current development potential?Site visit/developer feedbackOwnership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?Site proforma/consultationIs development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?Site visit/desktop workDo the local schools have		
activity that would limit current development potential?Site visit/developer feedbackOwnership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?Site proforma/consultationIs development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?Site visit/desktop workDo the local schools have		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?		
activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation		

Do local healthcare facilities		
have capacity? Would		
development of the site cause		
particular issues with the provision		
of healthcare?		
CCG		
Health Partnerships team		
Are there any other local		
infrastructure needs that could		
be accommodated on the site as		
part of a mixed use		
development? (e.g. local play area		
deficiency, a community facility,		
International Sporting City enabling		
development)		
. ,		
Desktop study/internal consultation		
What level of recent housing		
development has there been in		
the local area? Is there still		
capacity in the local market?		
Would the development of the		
site for residential use impede		
the delivery of any known		
infrastructure projects?		
Desktop study/internal consultation		
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty	

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options. GIS	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Distance to primary school         *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of both stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		

	1		1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS			
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
010	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	Over 500m - 1		
	Under 400m - 5		
Distance to park/publically	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
	or grade 2- 1		
GIS			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	X (Y)	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.
		1	

 STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

 Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)

Gity)	
Has the site been identified locally	
as in need of improvement?	
Other supporting factors	
Conclusion:	

	Land South of Lower
Site Name	End Road (a)
Reference Number	U25
Settlement	Wavendon (expansion)
Size (Ha)	1

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is a small parcel of land directly to the south of the Strategic Land Allocation. It has no planning history. It is within the designated area of Wavendon Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	Yes	The site is physically separate from the urban area although once the SLA has been built out it will adjoin the settlement boundary.
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
<b>Access -</b> can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?		Access would be achievable from Lower End	
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Road although this is rural in nature and may not be appropriate.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
IDB			
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?			
Site Visits		The site is relatively unconstrained and developable.	

Impact of neighbouring uses	
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit	
suitability or marketability of the	
site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?	
impact heighbouring uses:	The site adjoins open countryside and a small
Site Visits/mapped information	amount of existing residential development.
Is the site a logical extension to a	
settlement - where a site is in the	
open countryside, would it form a	The site is not a logical extension to the
logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?	settlement in terms of enclosure character. Even
	once the SLA has been built out, development of
Site visits	the site would represent a noticeable intrusion into
	open countryside beyond the accepted boundary of Lower End Road.
Environmental constraints	
Landscape character- would	
development harm the landscape	The site is not in an area of attractive landscape
character of the area it lies in,	and there is other (limited) development along
including areas outside the borough	Lower End Road. However, the landscape
boundary (if applicable)?	character of the area is predominantly rural, which
Site visit/Landscape Character	development of the site would harm.
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment	
Impact on areas of biological or	
geological importance - would development cause harm?	
GIS/Internal consultation	Development of the site would not impact upon
	any known areas of biological or geological
Impact on public open space -	importance.
would development of the site lead	
to the loss of publicly accessible	
open space or physical education	
facilities.	
	The site is currently open space although is not
Local Plan Proposals Map	publically accessible.
Impact on archaeological and	
heritage assets - would there be	
potential harm through development of the site or would it	
provide an opportunity to enhance	
an area?	
GIS/internal consultation	Development of the site would not import only
	Development of the site would not impact any known archaeological or heritage assets.
Deliverability/availability constrain	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any	
activity that would limit current	
development potential?	
	The site has no existing use.
Site visit/developer feedback	
Ownership arrangements - is	
there confirmation that the site is	
available for development, with a	The site was assessed at the last Other to the
willing landowner?	The site was promoted to the last Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Site proforma/consultation	Housing Land Availability Assessment.
lo dovolorment of the site	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there	
any particular factors that would	
limit the viability of development?	
Site visit/desktop work	
Do the local schools have	
capacity? Would development of	
the site cause particular issues with	According to the schools sufficiency and access
the provision of education?	team, there is potential to mitigate the potential
	pupil yield from site although this will need to be
School Organisation	confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are
Framework/advantion toom	
Framework/education team	finalised.

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would levelopment of the site cause hardicular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as hard of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area leficiency, a community facility, international Sporting City enabling levelopment) Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing hee local area? Is there still
development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?       Image: CCG The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.         CCG Health Partnerships team       The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.         Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as bart of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, international Sporting City enabling development)       The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure.         Desktop study/internal consultation       The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure.
barticular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team Are there any other local Infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as bart of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area leficiency, a community facility, international Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in
of healthcare?       The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.         CCG       The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.         Are there any other local       Image: Commodated on the site as bart of a mixed use         development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, international Sporting City enabling development)       The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure.         Desktop study/internal consultation       The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure.
Health Partnerships team       The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.         Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, international Sporting City enabling development)       The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure.
Health Partnerships team       The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.         Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, international Sporting City enabling development)       The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure.
Are there any other local nfrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, nternational Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in
nfrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as bart of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, nternational Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation Nhat level of recent housing development has there been in
be accommodated on the site as bart of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, international Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in
bart of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, international Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in
development? (e.g. local play area       deficiency, a community facility,         nternational Sporting City enabling       The site is not likely to be large enough to         development)       accommodate any additional infrastructure.         Nhat level of recent housing       development has there been in
deficiency, a community facility, nternational Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in
International Sporting City enabling       The site is not likely to be large enough to         Desktop study/internal consultation       The site is not likely to be large enough to         Nhat level of recent housing       The site is not likely to be large enough to         development has there been in       The site is not likely to be large enough to
development) The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure. What level of recent housing development has there been in
Desktop study/internal consultation       The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure.         What level of recent housing levelopment has there been in       Image: Commodate and additional infrastructure.
Desktop study/internal consultation         accommodate any additional infrastructure.           What level of recent housing         accommodate any additional infrastructure.           development has there been in         accommodate any additional infrastructure.
What level of recent housing development has there been in
development has there been in
he local area? Is there still
capacity in the local market?
Nould the development of the
site for residential use impede
he delivery of any known
nfrastructure projects?
Desktop study/internal consultation
Overall conclusions on deliverability

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		0	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0	2	
	Weighting x 2	0	Would rise to 4 once SLA has been built out.
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		3	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.		1	Asplands Medical Centre (health centres in the SLA are likely to be closer)
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	1	St Mary's, Wavendon (schools in the SLA are likely to be closer)

	Total score	16	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
GIS	or grade 2- 1	3	Unknown, assumed to be 3b as 'average'
Quality of agricultural land	3b - 3 50% or more is grade 3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1		
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	1	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
GIS	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	1	
Distance to play area	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		Magna Park
Desktop study/GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	1	Magna Park
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS		1	Tesco Kingston
*Defined by the Institute of Grocery Distribution as an outlet larger than 3000 sq. feet.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5	1	Woburn Sands
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		1	Walton High (schools in the SLA are likely to be closer)
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
GIS			

**STAGE 4 -** Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting

City)	No	
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	Νο	
as in need of improvement:		
Other supporting factors	None	
Conclusion: No added value in allocating		

Site Name	Land South of Lower
Site Name	End Road (b)
Reference Number	U26
Settlement	Wavendon (expansion)
Size (Ha)	2.63

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is a small parcel of land directly to the south of the Strategic Land Allocation. It has no planning history. It is within the designated area of Wavendon Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	Yes	The site is physically separate from the urban area although once the SLA has been built out it will adjoin the settlement boundary.
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?		Access would be achievable from Lower End	
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Road although this is rural in nature and may not be appropriate.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
IDB			
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing			
issue? Site Visits		The site is adjacent to a sewage works, which could present odour issues.	

Impact of neighbouring uses	
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit	
suitability or marketability of the	
site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?	
	The site adjoins open countryside and a small
Site Visits/mapped information	amount of existing residential development.
Is the site a logical extension to a	
settlement - where a site is in the	
open countryside, would it form a	The site is not a logical extension to the
logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?	settlement in terms of enclosure character. Even
	once the SLA has been built out, development of
Site visits	the site would represent a noticeable intrusion into open countryside beyond the accepted boundary
	of Lower End Road.
Environmental constraints	
Landscape character- would	
development harm the landscape	The site is not in an area of attractive landscape
character of the area it lies in,	and there is other (limited) development along
including areas outside the borough	Lower End Road. However, the landscape
boundary (if applicable)?	character of the area is predominantly rural, which
Site visit/Landscape Character	development of the site would harm.
Assessment	
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would	
development cause harm?	
GIS/Internal consultation	Development of the site would not impact upon
	any known areas of biological or geological importance.
Impact on public open space -	
would development of the site lead	
to the loss of publicly accessible	
open space or physical education	
facilities.	The site is surrently open opens of the use is not
Local Plan Proposals Map	The site is currently open space although is not publically accessible.
Impact on archaeological and	
heritage assets - would there be	
potential harm through	
development of the site or would it	
provide an opportunity to enhance	
an area?	
GIS/internal consultation	There are two listed buildings adjoining the site,
GIS/Internal consultation	the setting of which may be harmed by
	development.
Deliverability/availability constrain	S
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing	
employment) - is there any	
activity that would limit current	
development potential?	The site has no existing use.
Site visit/developer feedback	
Ownership arrangements - is	
there confirmation that the site is	
available for development, with a	
willing landowner?	The site was promoted to the last Strategic
	Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Site proforma/consultation	
Is development of the site	
economically viable- are there any particular factors that would	
limit the viability of development?	
Site visit/desktop work	
Do the local schools have	
capacity? Would development of	
the site cause particular issues with	According to the schools sufficiency and access
the provision of education?	team, there is potential to mitigate the potential
School Organisation	pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the
Framework/education team	exact number and location of all allocations are
	finalised.

<b>Do local healthcare facilities</b> <b>have capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?			
CCG			
Health Partnerships team		The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		The site is not likely to be large enough to	
Desktop study/internal consultation		accommodate any additional infrastructure.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		0	Would rise to 4 once SLA has been built out.
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.		1	Asplands Medical Centre (health centres in the SLA are likely to be closer)
Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		St Mary's, Wavendon (schools in
preferred options.		1	the SLA are likely to be closer)

			1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		1	Walton High (schools in the SLA are likely to be closer)
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5	1	Woburn Sands
-	501 - 1000m- 4		
*Defined by the Institute of Grocery Distribution as an outlet larger than	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
3000 sq. feet.	over 2000m -1		
GIS		1	Tesco Kingston
Distance to employment area (as	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
Desktop study/GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
		1	Magna Park
Distance to play area	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	Over 500m - 1	1	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5		
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
	50% or more in non-	1	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
Quality of parioultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1		
Quality of agricultural land	or grade 2- 1		Unknown, assumed to be 3b as
GIS		3	'average'
	Total score	18	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could
	i otal score	10	deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

**STAGE 4 -** Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting

City)	No	
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	Νο	
as in need of improvement:		
Other supporting factors	None	
Conclusion: No added value in allocating		

Site Name	Land West of Bow Brickhill
Reference Number	U27
Settlement	Bow Brickhill/Caldecotte (expansion)
Size (Ha)	7

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history. It is within the designated area of the emerging Bow Brickhill Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are			
there any local or strategic highway			
constraints?		Access is achievable although development is	
		likely to have a strategic impact on the level	
In consultation with the Highways		crossing at its north-western tip and also on the	
Team and Highways Agency.		village of Bow Brickhill.	
Utilities - is there capacity to			
provide all required utilities?			

Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		
Site Visits	The site is relatively unconstrained.	

Impact of neighbouring uses		
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the		
site? Would the site adversely		
impact neighbouring uses?		
	The railway line to the north may constrain	
Site Visits/mapped information Is the site a logical extension to a	development by virtue of noise or pollution.	
settlement - where a site is in the		
open countryside, would it form a		
logical extension to a settlement in		
terms of enclosure character?	Development would represent a noticeable	
Site visits	intrusion into open countryside and present coalescence issues between Bow Brickhill and	
	the urban area of Milton Keynes.	
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would	The landscape character of the area is rural/urban	
development harm the landscape	fringe. However, there is a large area of attractive	
character of the area it lies in,	landscape to the south of the site that would	
including areas outside the borough	potentially be impacted by development.	
boundary (if applicable)?		
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment		
Impact on areas of biological or		
geological importance - would		
development cause harm?		
GIS/Internal consultation	Development of the site would not impact upon	
	any known area of biological or geological	
Impact on public open space -	importance.	
would development of the site lead		
to the loss of publicly accessible		
open space or physical education		
facilities.	The land is open space although not publically accessible.	
Local Plan Proposals Map		
Impact on archaeological and		
heritage assets - would there be		
potential harm through		
development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance		
an area?		
GIS/internal consultation	Development of the site would not how only	
	Development of the site would not harm any known archaeological or heritage asset.	
Deliverability/availability constraint		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any		
activity that would limit current		
development potential?	The site has no existing use other than	
	agriculture.	
Site visit/developer feedback		
<b>Ownership arrangements -</b> is there confirmation that the site is		
available for development, with a		
willing landowner?	The site was promoted by its owners.	
Site proforma/consultation		
Is development of the site		
economically viable- are there		
any particular factors that would		
limit the viability of development?		
Site visit/desktop work		
Do the local schools have		
capacity? Would development of	According to the schools sufficiency and access	
the site cause particular issues with	team, there is potential to mitigate the potential	
the provision of education?	pupil yield from site although this will need to be	
School Organisation	confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are	
Framework/education team	finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities		
have capacity? Would		
development of the site cause		
particular issues with the provision of healthcare?	According to NHS England data, the site does not	
of nealthcare?	have a surgery with capacity within 1km.	
CCG	have a surgery with capacity within TKM.	
Health Partnerships team		
Are there any other local		
infrastructure needs that could		
be accommodated on the site as		
part of a mixed use		
development? (e.g. local play area		
deficiency, a community facility,		
International Sporting City enabling		
development)	The site is potentially large enough to provide	
Desktop study/internal consultation	some new infrastructure on site.	
What level of recent housing		
development has there been in		
the local area? Is there still		
capacity in the local market?		
Would the development of the		
site for residential use impede	The site is adjacent to the East-West Rail project,	
the delivery of any known	which may require access or land-take from the	
infrastructure projects?	site. However, this would probably only affect a	
	limited portion of the site and would occur prior to	
Desktop study/internal consultation	any potential development anyway.	
Overall conclusions on deliverability		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
		4	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		1	Walnut Tree health centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	3	Row Brickhill C of E school
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 1500m -1	3	Bow Brickhill C of E school

GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		1	Walton High
	Under 500m - 5		traiter right
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
		1	Bletchley/Fenny Stratford
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		<b>T D</b> ( ) )
	Under 500m - 5	1	Tesco Bletchley
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1	_	
	Under 200m - 5	5	Caldecotte/Tilbrook
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	1 (5)	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5		
accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	5	Site edges the open countryside
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1		
Quality of agricultural land	or grade 2-1		
GIS		2	
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	31 (35)	score for larger sites that could
			deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value in alle	None

	Land at Little Linford
Site Name	Lane
Reference Number	U28
	Redhouse park
Settlement	(expansion)
Size (Ha)	19.68

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area. Its planning history consists of an approved use as a stud farm and other agricultural prior approvals. It is allocated for linear park extension on the proposals map.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	Partially (<50%) within floodplain.
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access from Little Linford lane is unlikely to be suitable for any significant amount of new development.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		Flooding is an issue on part of the site and would limit development. However, the site is large enough to accommodate appropriate drainage measures.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The size and shape of the site and the fact it is bordered by both the motorway (and associated banking) and flood zones would limit develop.	

Impact of neighbouring uses		
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the	The site runs parallel to the M1 motorway which	
site? Would the site adversely	will severely limit development along its eastern	
impact neighbouring uses?	edge and is likely to adversely impact the	
	marketability and suitability of the development.	
Site Visits/mapped information		
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the		
open countryside, would it form a		
logical extension to a settlement in		
terms of enclosure character?		
Site visits	The site is long and thin in nature and would	
	represent a notable extrusion into open	
	countryside.	
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape	Consideration of the site at previous enquiries has	
character of the area it lies in,	found that landscape impacts have been a major	
including areas outside the borough	issue for the site.	
boundary (if applicable)?		
Site visit/Landson a Character		
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment		
Impact on areas of biological or		
geological importance - would		
development cause harm?		
GIS/Internal consultation		
	The site is adjacent to an important wildlife site	
Impact on public open opene	and is also covered by a wildlife corridor.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead		
to the loss of publicly accessible	The site is open space but not publically	
open space or physical education	accessible with the exception of any rights of way.	
facilities.	It is, however, allocated as a future linear park	
Local Plan Proposals Man	extension.	
Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and		
heritage assets - would there be		
potential harm through		
development of the site or would it		
provide an opportunity to enhance		
an area?		
GIS/internal consultation		
	Development of the site would not impact upon	
	any known archaeological or heritage assets.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	5	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing		
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current		
development potential?		
	The site has no existing use other than	
Site visit/developer feedback	agriculture.	
Ownership arrangements - is		
there confirmation that the site is		
available for development, with a	The site has been formally promoted by its owner	
willing landowner?	who confirms it is available for development.	
Site proforma/consultation		
Is development of the site		
economically viable- are there		
any particular factors that would		
limit the viability of development?		
Site visit/desktop work		
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of	According to the schools sufficiency and access	
the site cause particular issues with	team, there is potential to mitigate the potential	
the provision of education?	pupil yield from site although this will need to be	
	confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	
School Organisation	exact number and location of all allocations are	
Framework/education team	finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?		According to NHS England data, the site does not	
		have a surgery with capacity within 1km.	
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)			
dovolopinionty		The site is potentially large enough to	
Desktop study/internal consultation		accommodate additional infrastructure on site.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
		Development would impede allocated linear park	
Desktop study/internal consultation		extension and may preclude any potential	
		motorway improvements in the future.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>	2	Due to the site's long thin shape, the 'edge' it does have with the existing settlement is very short relative to its overall size.
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	3 (5)	
GIS		1	Newport Pagnell medical centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	2	Portfields Combined School

	1		
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		2	Ousedale School
	Under 500m - 5	-	
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	2	Newport Pagnell town centre
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Linder 500m 5	1	Newport Pagnell Co-Op
Distance to employment area (as	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 200m - 5	4	Blakelands
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	1 (5)	
Distance to perk/publically	Under 400m - 5		
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		Site is located on land currently
GIS	Over 700m - 1	5	designated as linear park extension.
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade 3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1	3	Unknown – assumed to be 3b as average
		Ŭ	Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	28 (34)	score for larger sites that could
		20 (37)	deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value to allo	None ocating.

Site Name	Shenley Dens Farm
Reference Number	U29
Settlement	Expansion
Size (Ha)	22.4

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is part of a wider area that was submitted as an application for 2055 dwellings in 2004 that was subsequently withdrawn. This area was previously considered as part of the Western Expansion Area although the Local Plan eventually allocated areas to the north. It is not part of any neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
<b>Access -</b> can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?			
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		There is a grid road reserve to the east of the site through which access could be facilitated.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		The site already has a ditch running through it, which combined with its topography may present drainage issues. However, it is of sufficient size for suitable measures to be accommodated on site without unduly limiting development potential.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?			
Site Visits		No site-specific constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses			
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit			
suitability or marketability of the		The site is neighboursed by snop soundhyside	
site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?		The site is neighboured by open countryside, existing residential development and a school, all	
impact heighbouring uses?		of which are considered to be compatible in	
Site Visits/mapped information		principle.	
Is the site a logical extension to a		The site would not form a logical extension to the	
settlement - where a site is in the		settlement in terms of enclosure character. Whilst	
open countryside, would it form a		part of the site could be 'naturally' developed in	
logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?		the gap between Oakhill wood and the western edge of the city, the rest of the site represents an	
		illogical intrusion into open countryside. This	
Site visits		conclusion could potentially be revised once the	
		full extent of the western expansion area to the	
		north has been built out.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would			
development harm the landscape		The site does not lie within an area of attractive	
character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough		landscape but development would breach a natural ridge that exists between the site and the	
boundary (if applicable)?		western edge of the city. This would harm the	
		character of the Whaddon valley, as concluded by	
Site visit/Landscape Character		the Local Plan inspector in 2005.	
Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would			
development cause harm?			
GIS/Internal consultation		The site is bordered extensively by wildlife corridors with several notable species recorded in	
		the vicinity of the site.	
Impact on public open space -		-	
would development of the site lead			
to the loss of publicly accessible			
open space or physical education facilities.			
		The site is open space but not publically	
Local Plan Proposals Map		accessible (with the exception of rights of way).	
Impact on archaeological and			
heritage assets - would there be			
potential harm through development of the site or would it			
provide an opportunity to enhance		Development of the site would not impact upon	
an area?		any known archaeological or heritage assets	
		although the grade II listed Shenley Dens	
GIS/internal consultation		Farmhouse lies immediately to the north of the site, the setting of which would need to be	
		respected.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing			
employment) - is there any			
activity that would limit current			
development potential?		The site has no existing use other than agriculture	
Site visit/developer feedback			
Ownership arrangements - is			
there confirmation that the site is			
available for development, with a		The site has been formally promoted by its owner	
willing landowner?		through the SHLAA process and the freehold is	
		understood to be controlled by a housebuilder.	
Site proforma/consultation			
Is development of the site			
economically viable- are there any particular factors that would			
any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?			
Site visit/desktop work			
De the legal asks als have			
Do the local schools have		According to the schools sufficiency and access	
capacity? Would development of		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential	
		team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be	
<b>capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?		team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	
<b>capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation		team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are	
<b>capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?		team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?			
of ficaliticare :			
CCG		According to NHS England data the site is not	
Health Partnerships team		within 1km of a surgery with capacity.	
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area			
deficiency, a community facility,			
International Sporting City enabling			
development)			
		The site is of sufficient size that it could	
Desktop study/internal consultation		accommodate additional infrastructure on-site.	
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	Weighting x 2		
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2	2	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	4	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	3 (5)	
GIS		1	Watling Vale/Westcroft Health Centre
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	3	Christ the Sower Ecumenical School

GIS			
Distance to cooperative school	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to secondary school	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m - 1		
GIS	Under 500m - 5	5	The Hazeley academy
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	1	Westcroft District Centre
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		Dudana Orana Farra
	Under 500m - 5	4	Budgens Grange Farm
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
Desktop study/GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Deskiep study/010		2	Crownhill
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	1 (5)	
<b></b>	Under 400m - 5	1 (0)	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	5	
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1		
	or grade 2- 1		Unknown – assumed to be 3b as
GIS		3	average.
	Total score	34 (40)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
		54 (40)	deliver on-site facilities closer to existing ones.

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whethe	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value to allo	None

Site Name	Land off Ridgeway
Reference Number	U30
	Stony Stratford
Settlement	(expansion)
Size (Ha)	7.9

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site's planning history is restricted to a screening opinion for a water main. It is not covered by any designated neighbourhood plan area. The owners have indicated it could be brought forward for a very low-density low impact development, which would reduce its indicative capacity.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are			
there any local or strategic highway			
constraints?		Access should be achievable from Ridgeway.	
In consultation with the Highways			
Team and Highways Agency.			
Utilities - is there capacity to			
provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?	Anecdotally the site suffers from a degree of surface-water flooding although this is not recognised at a strategic level and could potentially be mitigated through development via appropriate drainage systems.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits	The site has an oil pipeline running beneath it, which could restrict or limit development.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site is adjacent to existing residential development (plus planned development to the east in the WEA) and open countryside. Both are considered to be compatible uses.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits		The site is an unorthodox shape and is difficult to categorise as either a logical extension or noticeable extrusion. Once the WEA is built out, the site may represent better enclosure character but currently it would potentially appear as 'bolt- on' development. However, the owner has indicated their proposals would be limited in scope, which would be likely to restrict the harm in this respect.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment		The landscape character of the surrounding area is rural/urban fringe. Development of the site would not necessarily harm this character, particularly if the existing landscape ridge is respected. Design restrictions may be required to ensure this.	
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact upon any areas designated for biological or geological importance.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.		The site is open space although not publically accessible (except for any rights of way).	
Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact on any known heritage or archaeological asset.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site has no existing use.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site has been formally promoted to the SHLAA process and confirmed to be available for development (potentially in a bespoke low-density form).	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		There is a high-pressure oil pipeline beneath the site, in respect of which easements or other requirements may restrict land budget and deliverability.	
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is potentially large enough to accommodate additional infrastructure on-site, although this will largely depend on the quantity of development that is proposed as the owner has indicated it will be very-low density.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		There are pipelines crossing the site that will serve the large Western Expansion Area. Easements are likely to be required for these that could limit the development potential of the site.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2	4	Site has very short second edge due to its shape but relative to its overall size, this is negligible.
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	3	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	5	
GIS		3	Stony Medical Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	2	
preferred options.		3	Queen Eleanor School

			1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
-	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
GIS		1	Radcliffe School
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
		3	Stony Stratford
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Budgens Stony Stratford
Distance to employment area (as	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
Desktop study/GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Deskip siduy/010		3	Wolverton Mill
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	2	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3 50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1	3	Unknown – assumed to be 3b as average
	Total score	35	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	l		

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers whethe	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value to allo	None

Site Name	Wellington Place car park
Reference Number	U31
Settlement	Bletchley
Size (Ha)	0.27

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has permission for a single office block that has not yet been implemented. The area is also covered by the emerging West Bletchley Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created			
Physical constraints	Physical constraints					
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access would appear to be through a third-party car park, which would not be acceptable for residential use. Connections for pedestrians are also currently inadequate.				
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans						
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		The site is currently hard-surfaced; development may provide an opportunity to improve drainage.				
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		It is possible the site could have contamination issues if vehicles have been parked and/or serviced on the land for long periods. Generally though the site is unkempt and development would help tidy it up.				

Impact of neighbouring uses			
(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit		The site is adjacent to the railway and also	
suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely		industrial uses, both of which could limit the	
impact neighbouring uses?		suitability and/or marketability of residential uses if	
impact heighbouring uses:		not designed sensitively.	
Site Visits/mapped information			
Is the site a logical extension to a			
settlement - where a site is in the			
open countryside, would it form a			
logical extension to a settlement in		Site is not in open countryside	
terms of enclosure character?			
Site visits			
Environmental constraints			
			[
Landscape character- would			
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in,			
including areas outside the borough		The landscape character of the surrounding area	
boundary (if applicable)?		is predominantly urban.	
Site visit/Landscape Character			
Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or		Development of the site would not impact on any	
geological importance - would development cause harm?		areas of biological or geological importance.	
		There is a wildlife corridor associated with the	
GIS/Internal consultation		railway to the east of the site – development	
		would represent to enhance rather than harm this.	
Import on nublic open encos			
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead			
to the loss of publicly accessible			
open space or physical education		The site is not publically accessible open space.	
facilities.			
Local Plan Proposals Map			
Impact on archaeological and			
heritage assets - would there be			
potential harm through development of the site or would it			
provide an opportunity to enhance		Development of the site would not impact on any	
an area?		archaeological or heritage assets.	
GIS/internal consultation			
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing			
employment) - is there any		The site is designated as a lorry park although	
activity that would limit current		appears underused in this regard. The	
development potential?		neighbouring industrial units may use it informally	
Site visit/developer feedback		for storage or turning but the extant permission for	
		an office block indicates this is not an essential	
		use.	
Ownership arrangements - is			
there confirmation that the site is		<b></b>	
available for development, with a		The site was promoted by the ward member for	
willing landowner?		the area. Owner has subsequently confirmed that	
Site proforma/consultation		they do wish the site to be considered for residential development.	
Site proforma/consultation			
Is development of the site			
economically viable- are there			
any particular factors that would			
limit the viability of development?			
Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have			
<b>capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with		According to the schools sufficiency and access	
the provision of education?		team, there is capacity to accommodate expected	
		pupil yield from the development.	
School Organisation		papa you nom no development.	
Framework/education team			

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is likely to be too small to contribute significantly to local infrastructure.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is adjacent to the railway that will upgraded as part of the East-West Rail project, access over the site may be required for construction even if no land is taken.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Distance to health centre/doctors	Under 500m - 5	4	
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Westfield Road surgery
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		1	Knowles Primary School

GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		3	Lord Grey School
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
		4	Bletchley town centre
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	4	Duncombe Street Sainsburys
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 200m - 5	5	Wellington Place
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	5	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5		
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	5	
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	59	score for larger sites that could
			deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	Yes
Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: Limited added value	in allocating.

Site Name	Land off Phelps Road		
Reference Number	U38		
Settlement	Bletchley		
Size (Ha)	0.32		

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is currently open space but was designated by planning agreement as the location of community facilities (a health centre) as part of the adjacent development. This planning obligation may have expired or may no longer be needed, although confirmation of this will be required. The site is also allocated as part of the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan, which may make allocation in the Site Allocations Plan unnecessary.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is easily achievable and there is already a spur in place. The Neighbourhood Plan contains proposals to divert Stoke Road, which may change the access requirements into the site.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		The site is currently undeveloped with canal frontage to the east. Whilst there is equivalent development to the north, drainage would need to be carefully incorporated into any potential scheme.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		There are no site-specific constraints to development.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site adjoins existing residential development, Stoke Road and the canal. The canal-side would potentially be a particularly attractive and compatible neighbouring use.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits		The site is not in open countryside	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would			
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		The site is not designated for biological or geological importance although it has been left vacant for a number of years, during which time habitats may have developed.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.		The site is currently open space and is publically accessible although does not appear to have any amenity value.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact upon any known heritage or archaeological asset.	
Deliverability/availability constraint	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site does not have any existing use. It was designated by planning agreement for community uses to support the adjacent development. As this has not been delivered, the condition may have lapsed with potential allocation in the neighbourhood plan having superseded this anyway.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site was promoted by MKDP during the call- for-sites process and confirmed to be available within the next 5 years.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?			
Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		It is unlikely the site would be able to contribute significantly to infrastructure.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		The site was earmarked for supporting community infrastructure (health centre) for the adjacent development, however this has come forward and the obligation may have lapsed.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	Weighting x 2		
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>	2	
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Water Eaton Health Centre
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	2	Water Hell Drimery School
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 1500m -1	3	Water Hall Primary School

			1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to secondary school	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		4	Sir Herbert Leon Academy
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		Score is based on Serpentine
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		Court, which is of poor quality and
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		likely to be redeveloped.
	over 2000m -1	4	Bletchley/Fenny Stratford town centre would score 2.
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
		2	Sainsburys Brunel Centre
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
		3	Barton Road
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
615	Over 500m - 1	4	
	Under 400m - 5		
Distance to park/publically	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade 3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	51	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

 STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

 Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)

 The site would support the delivery of the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood including aspects of wider regeneration.

City)	
Has the site been identified locally	
as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors	None

Site Name	Builders merchants, Fenny Stratford	
Reference Number	U39	
Settlement	Fenny Stratford	
Size (Ha)	1.98	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site consists of two builders merchants, the western-most of which is already an allocated housing site that has not been delivered. Otherwise the planning history for both parcels consists of relatively minor applications relating to the current use. They are not within any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		The site already has access although the capacity of the immediate network is likely to change in the near future when East-West Rail is developed. A potential option is to close the level crossing immediately to the south of the site.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		Drainage will need to respect the canal to the east.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		There could be contamination on the site that requires remediation due to its current use as a builders merchant.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information	The site is generally set amongst existing residential development, which would make redevelopment of the site appropriate. The c side would also provide attractive opportunit whilst the site is also separated from the rails which should minimise noise and pollution issues	es
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits	The site is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?	The landscape character of the surrounding is predominantly urban.	area
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation	The site is adjacent to the wildlife corridor associated with the canal but redevelopment probably represents an opportunity to enhan rather than harm this.	
	rather than harm this.	
<b>Impact on public open space</b> - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.	The site is not currently public open space.	
Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation	Redevelopment of the site may represent an opportunity to enhance the heritage of the ca	
Deliverability/availability constrain	S	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback	The site is currently used by a builders merc that would potentially require relocation befo site became available.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation	The site was not originally promoted by the owner. However, following contact they conf that they do wish the site to be considered.	irmed
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work	The site would require clearance and potent remediation. The canal frontage represents a opportunity to enhance the value of the sche but may hinder construction and the land but	an me
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team	According to the schools sufficiency and acc team, there is potential to mitigate the potent pupil yield from site although this will need to confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations a finalised.	ial be

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision		According to NHS England data the site does not	
of healthcare?		have a surgery with capacity within 1km.	
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area		The site could potentially incorporate a degree of	
deficiency, a community facility,		The site could potentially incorporate a degree of additional infrastructure on-site.	
International Sporting City enabling			
development)			
developmenty			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede		Access to and construction of the site would be	
the delivery of any known		affected by the East-West Rail upgrade but	
infrastructure projects?		development of the site is not likely to impede the	
		actual delivery of East-West Rail.	
Desktop study/internal consultation			
	4		
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	τγ		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		10	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2	10	
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	5	
GIS		3	The Red House Surgery
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		3	Knowles Primary School

GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		1	Sir Herbert Leon Academy
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	3	Fenny Stratford
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to a supermarket	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
615		4	Tesco Watling Street
	Under 500m - 5		 
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
denned on the proposals map)	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1	_	
	Under 200m - 5	5	Denbigh East
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	Over 500m - 1	1	
	Under 400m - 5		
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	1	
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade 3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1		
Quality of agricultural land	or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
	<b>-</b>	54	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could
	Total score	51	deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets				
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No			
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	Yes – it was submitted by a member of the general public			
Other supporting factors	None			
Conclusion: Limited added value in allocating.				

Overall conclusions and recommendations
---

Site Name	Land off Harrowden	
Reference Number	U40	
Settlement	Bradville	
Size (Ha)	0.77	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is covered by an existing allocation on the proposals map that has been carried forward through successive plans in the 1990s through to the 2005 Local Plan. The allocation was partially delivered on its eastern side, this site refers to a remaining parcel on the western edge (with a gap inbetween). The parcel itself has no planning history but is within the proposed area of the Stantonbury Neighbourhood Plan. Bradville is also a regeneration estate with the expectation that the site will form part of this program irrespective of its potential allocation in the Site Allocations Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is achievable from Harrowden.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
IDB Site specifies (e.g. tenegraphy			
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		The site appears to be free of any constraints that could prevent or limit development.	
Site Visits			

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site is adjoined by existing residential properties, which is considered a compatible use.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits		The site is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character		The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		The site is adjacent to and partially covered by a wildlife corridor, which may need to be reflected in any potential scheme.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map		The site is currently open and publically accessible although it is not formally designated for recreational purposes and does not appear to be used in this manner. The land immediately to the east seems to fulfil this purpose instead, with a play facility located there. Therefore it is not considered that the loss of this site would be in conflict with the principles Policy L2 of the Local Plan.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact any archaeological or heritage asset.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site has no existing use.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site was promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it is available immediately.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		There do not appear to be any factors that would limit the viability of development.	
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is not likely to be large enough to generate significant levels of on-site infrastructure.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		Development of the site ahead of the rest of the regeneration program could impede the holistic nature of this exercise, although establishing the principle of development beforehand may be beneficial in planning terms.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ity		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Distance to health centre/doctors	Linden 500m - 5	3	
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Purbeck Health Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		Pepper Hill School (Infant, Stanton
preferred options.		5	School [Junior] would score 3)

	1	1	
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to secondary school	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		3	Stantonbury campus
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	4	Stantonbury local centre
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5		
	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	1	Wolverton Asda
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
Deckton study/CIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Desktop study/GIS		3	Blundells road, Bradville
	Under 200m - 5	-	
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	5	
	Under 400m - 5	-	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	5	
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS	01 graue 2- 1	5	
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	50	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.
	L	1	

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets			
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No		
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No		
Other supporting factors None Conclusion: No added value in allocating			

Site Name	Caldecotte site C	
Reference Number	U42	
Settlement	Caldecotte	
Size (Ha)	2.16	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is allocated for employment on the proposals map but has not been delivered for these purposes to date. It has no planning history but is within the designated area of the emerging Walton Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Accessible is readily available from Caldecotte Lake drive (or roundabout).	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
IDB Site specifies (e.g. tenegraphy			
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		The site does not appear to have any constraints that would prevent or limit development.	
Site Visits			

The site adjoins an existing employment area and a railway line. The employment is considered to be compatible use (with existing residential development nearby too) although the railway line could present noise or pollution issues.	
The site is not in open countryside.	
Open countryside and an area of attractive landscape lie shortly to the south of the site. However, development is unlikely to harm the character of the area as there is already equivalent development adjacent to the site.	
The site is covered by a wildlife corridor (rail).	
The site is currently open and publically accessible but does not seem to serve a purpose as an informal recreation/amenity area. It is allocated for employment purposes and therefore it is not considered that development would be contradictory to policy L2 of the Local Plan.	
Development would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.	
S	
The site is allocated for employment purposes. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the bottom 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.	
However, more significantly, the site is potentially required to facilitate access through/over the forthcoming East-West Rail upgrade. This would significantly limit or prevent development.	
The site was promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it is available immediately.	
According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	
	a raiway line. The employment is considered to evolupment nearby too) atthough the raiway line could present noise or pollution issues.         Image: the set of t

<b>Do local healthcare facilities</b> <b>have capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?	Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
CCG Health Partnerships team		
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)	The site is unlikely to be sizeable enough to provide significant levels of additional infrastructure.	
Desktop study/internal consultation		
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?		
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation	The railway that adjoins the site is scheduled to be upgraded as part of the East-West Rail project. The site may be required to facilitate access through/over the line. This is currently not clear although the rail upgrade is due to be complete ahead of any likely residential development	
	anyway.	
Overall conclusions on deliverability	/	

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2	10	Site is edged by the railway line, which is itself on the settlement boundary.
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		1	Walnut Tree Health Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	2	Bow Brickhill CofE School

preferred options.			
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
GIS	Under 500m - 5	1	Walton High School
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	1	Walnut Tree
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		1	Asda Denbigh
	Under 500m - 5		
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
defined on the proposals map)	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 200m - 5	5	Caldecotte/Tilbrook
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
	Under 400m - 5	4	
Distance to park/publically	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	F	
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1	5	
00		5	Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	42	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value in alle	None

Site Name	Station Square	
Reference Number	U45	
Settlement	Central Milton Keynes	
Size (Ha)	0.97	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site was formally allocated in the Local Plan as part of the 'Station Square Quarter' that proposes commercial and residential development; however this policy has been superseded by the CMK Aliance Business Neighbourhood Plan. The parcel as promoted is currently shown as formal open space on the proposals map and as 'classic infrastructure' in the Business Neighbourhood Plan. It has no planning history.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is readily available although depending on the scale of development it may require another redesign of the existing arrangements around the station square area, an important transport interchange.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		The site is mostly paved; development may represent an opportunity to provide Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site uniquely forms the 'entrance' to Central Milton Keynes upon exiting the train station. It is generally free of physical constraints but its location and prominence as the main thoroughfare between the station and CMK would require design of the utmost quality.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site would be expected to be delivered as part of a mixed-use scheme appropriate to a city- centre location. The impact this would have on the neighbouring office and transport uses would need careful assessment once details were known.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?		The site is not in open countryside.	
Site visits			
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would			
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		The landscape character of the area is predominantly urban.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		Development is not likely to impact on any areas of biological or geological importance. There are notable insect species recorded near the site but considering the existing use, a residential/mixed use development is likely to pose an opportunity rather than a threat.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.		The site is publically accessible open space and was allocated as such on the Proposals Map. In the CMK Neighbourhood Plan it is washed over by a 'classic infrastructure' notation indicating its extent, layout and quality should be retained unless proposed development is exceptional. It does not serve any direct leisure or recreation	
		purpose but is instead a unique 'civic' or 'gateway' area. The principle of development would not necessarily undermine this but a significant negative impact would only be avoided if the scale and form of development was appropriate and of exceptional quality.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be			
potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?		Development would not harm any known archaeological or heritage assets, although the bus station is a listed building in reasonable proximity to the site.	
GIS/internal consultation			
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing			
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site is used for cycle parking as well as pedestrian access to Milton Keynes Central train station and a 'gateway' to the rest of the city centre.	
<b>Ownership arrangements -</b> is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who confirm the site is available within the next 5 years.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		As outlined above, any scheme would have to be exceptional in quality and appropriate in scale. Development meeting these criteria is, however, likely to be high-value.	
<b>Do the local schools have</b> <b>capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are	

		finalised.				
Do local healthcare facilities						
have capacity? Would						
development of the site cause						
particular issues with the provision of healthcare?		According to NHS England, the nearest health				
		centre has capacity.				
CCG						
Health Partnerships team						
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could						
be accommodated on the site as						
part of a mixed use		The site could incorporate other mixed-uses and				
<b>development?</b> (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility,		infrastructure if deemed appropriate in this strategic location between the station and city				
International Sporting City enabling		centre.				
development)						
Desktop study/internal consultation						
What level of recent housing						
development has there been in						
the local area? Is there still						
capacity in the local market?						
Would the development of the						
site for residential use impede		Development of the site would mean it connet be				
the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?		Development of the site would mean it cannot be used in future for any works associated with the				
		train station or other transport interchange.				
Desktop study/internal consultation						
			1			
Overall conclusions on deliverability						

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4		
	50-74% brownfield- 3		
Nature of site	25-49%brownfield- 2		
	0-24% brownfield- 1		
Site visit/mapped information			
	Weighting x 2		
		<u> </u>	Two squares of 'greenfield' exist
	Within settlement- 5	6	within the otherwise paved site.
	Edged on three sides- 4		
Deletionekin with estilement	Edged on 2 sides- 3		
Relationship with settlement boundary	Edged on 1 side- 2		
boundary	No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		10	
	under 200m – 5		
Distance to bus stop or train	200m - 400m -4		
station –	400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2		
GIS	over 1000m - 1		
GIS		_	
Distance to health centre/doctors	Under 500m - 5	5	
(inc proposed facilities)	501 - 1000m- 4		
(ine proposed identities)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stage 2 – the outcomes of both	over 2000m -1		
stages will be used to determine			
preferred options.		2	CMK Madical Captro
		3	CMK Medical Centre

GIS		1	1
Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5		
*consoity issues are dealt with in	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1000m - 1500 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 1500m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		1	Jubilee Wood Primary School
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		1	Milton Keynes Academy
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	5	Central Milton Keynes
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5		
•	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	3	Aldi Bradwell Common
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
Desktop study/GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
		5	Central Milton Keynes
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	1	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5		
accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	2	Teardrop lakes
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1	5	
~		-	Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	47	score for larger sites that could
			deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

 STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

 Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)

 No

 Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?
 Anecdotally yes, although the need to preserve its current form has also been highlighted.

 Other supporting factors
 None

 Conclusion: Limited added value in allocating.

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Site Name	Land East of John Lewis Car Park	
Reference Number	U46	
Settlement	Central Milton Keynes	
Size (Ha)	0.76	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is adjacent to a recent permission for a multistorey car-park and has been included previously in various applications relating to the shopping centre, including an unimplemented mixed-use scheme permitted in 2002. It is covered by the CMK Business Neigbourhood Plan, which designates the site as 'classic infrastructure'.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is generally a constraint to the site's development particularly as it will need to reflect the impact of the consented multi-storey car park. Cycle links and coach parking will both need to be reprovided.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		The site is hard-surfaced, development may represent an opportunity to incorporate sustainable urban drainage systems.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site itself is developable with few site-specific constraints other than those outlined elsewhere in this assessment.	

The site will adjoin a car park and a grid road, both of which may present noise and pollution issues affecting the marketability of any dwellings delivered on site.	
The site is not in open countryside.	
The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
Development of the site would not impact upon any areas of biological or geological importance.	
The site is publically accessible but is used for parking rather than genuine 'open space'.	
Development could affect the setting of the listed shopping building to the west.	
The site is currently used as car/coach parking, the loss of which need to be considered in the context of the proposed multi-storey car park adjacent to the site.	
It is also designated as 'classic infrastructure' in the CMK Business Neighbourhood Plan and should therefore be protected unless exceptional development is proposed.	
The site has been promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it will be available within the next 5 years.	
According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	
	both of which may present noise and pollution issues affecting the marketability of any dwellings delivered on site.         The site is not in open countryside.         The site is not in open countryside.         Development of the site would not impact upon any areas of biological or geological importance.         Development of the site would not impact upon any areas of biological or geological importance.         Development of the site would not impact upon any areas of biological or geological importance.         Development could affect the setting of the listed shopping building to the west.         S         The site is currently used as car/coach parking, the loss of which need to be considered in the contex of the proposed multi-storey cap park edjacent to the site.         It is also designated as calascie infrastructure in the CMK Business Neighbourhood Plen and should therefore be protocted unless exceptional development Partnership who have confirmed t will be available within the next 5 years.         According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupilyield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and inclusions are end to be exact number and inclusion of al allocations are

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England data, there are no health centres with capacity within 1km of the site.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		Assuming a high density, the site is potentially viable enough to retain or add to certain infrastructure requirements.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		Development of the site would constrain any future improvements to Marlborough Gate as well as any other infrastructure required at the eastern end of CMK.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		10	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	_	
Distance to health centre/doctors	Under 500m - 5	5	
<ul> <li>(inc proposed facilities)</li> <li>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</li> </ul>	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Fishermead Medical Centre
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		Southwood School/Downs Barn
preferred options.		3	School

	1		1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to secondary school	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		1	Milton Keynes Academy
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	5	Central Milton Keynes
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5		
Sistanos to a Supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		Marks & Spencers Central Milton
615		4	Keynes
Distance to employment area (as	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 200m - 5	4	Central Milton Keynes
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
		3	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2		
	Over 700m - 1	5	
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS	UI GIQUE 2- I	5	
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	58	score for larger sites that could
			deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	L		

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value in alle	None

Site Name	Our Lady of Lourdes Church	
Reference Number	U48	
Settlement	Coffee Hall	
Size (Ha)	0.3	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site is allocated a community facility on the proposals map and until recently was used for this purpose. It is currently subject to a planning application concerning redevelopment for residential use, the outcomes of which may preclude the Site Allocations Plan. It is also within the designated area for the emerging Woughton Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created		
Physical constraints	Physical constraints				
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		The site is already served by an access with its relatively small size meaning intensification should not be an issue.			
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		The site is already serviced.			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?					
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site is developable and redevelopment could improve the unkempt nature of the existing buildings.			

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site is bordered by existing residential development, which is considered to be a compatible use.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits		The site is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		The site is covered by a wildlife (wood) corridor that may need to be reflected in any potential scheme.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.		The site is not public open space.	
Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		The site is designated a 'low-level' heritage asset and therefore has a degree of architectural value. Establishing the principle of residential development would not necessarily require demolition although this is likely. Therefore there is potentially harm to a heritage asset.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site was until recently used as a community facility, which the promoters claim is no longer viable. A marketing exercise should be undertaken to confirm this.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site was formally promoted by its owner.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		The site's small size may mean viability is an issue. If demolition is required then this will also increase the site preparation costs.	
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is capacity to accommodate expected pupil yield from the development.	
<b>capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation		team, there is capacity to accommodate expected	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is probably too small to contribute to any existing infrastructure needs.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		A wider regeneration program across Coffee Hall may be influenced by the site but this is not expected to be an impediment to its goals.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		10	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	4	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	4	
GIS		3	The Grove Surgery
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		3	New Chapter Primary School

	1		1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
GIS		5	Milton Keynes Academy
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
615	over 2000m -1	5	Coffee Hall Local Centre
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
015	Under 500m - 5	3	Lidl Oldbrook
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1	4	Bleak Hall
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	4	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	5	
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade 3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	Brookotod cooro roflacto potential
	Total score	61	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

 STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

 Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)

 The site is likely to have a regenerative benefit.

City)			
Has the site been identified locally			
as in need of improvement?	Anecdotally, yes.		
L			
Other supporting factors	None.		
Conclusion: There is added value in allocating the site.			
	······································		

Site Name	Land at Dropshort Farm	
Reference Number	U54	
Settlement	Fenny Stratford (expansion)	
Size (Ha)	8.13	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history and is not covered by any Neighbourhood Plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	Yes	The site is effectively joined to the settlement boundary through existing development in the open countryside and is also bordered by other sites that have been promoted. Therefore it is considered logical to also assess the site as an option.
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?		Access is likely to be achievable although the site would be likely to have a significant effect on the	
In consultation with the Highways		major trunk road junction to the east.	

Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site generally appears developable without any site-specific constraints.	
Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?		The site is set between two busy roads, which could present marketability issues in terms of noise and pollution.	
Site Visits/mapped information			
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the			
open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?		The site does not represent a logical extension into countryside on its own merits. It is long and thin and would represent a notable intrusion in terms of enclosure character.	This assessment could potentially change if adjacent sites are brought forward.
Site visits			
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would			
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		The site would extend towards (although not within) an area of attractive landscape.	
Site visit/Landscape Character			
Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?		The site is covered by two distinct wildlife corridors associated with adjoining roads.	
GIS/Internal consultation		condors associated with aujoining roads.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map		The site is currently open although is not publically accessible (with the exception of rights of way).	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be			
potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?		The site is partially covered by a Scheduled Ancient Monument.	
GIS/internal consultation			
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site has no existing use other than agriculture.	
<b>Ownership arrangements -</b> is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a			
willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site was formally promoted by its owner.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?			
Site visit/desktop work			

Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	
Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England data, the site's nearest health facilities are already operating over capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		The site is likely to be large enough to accommodate a degree of additional infrastructure on-site	
Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is positioned between major roads and junctions that may require upgrading in the future.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
	Weighting x 2		
		0	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		3	

Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	The Red House Surgery
Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
GIS		1	Knowles Primary School
<b>Distance to secondary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of both	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
GIS		1	Sir Herbert Leon Academy
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
		2	Bletchley/Fenny Stratford
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	3	Tesco Watling Street
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m - 1		
<b>Distance to play area</b> GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	4	Fenny Stratford
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	3 (5)	
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade 3b - 3 50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		2	Significant portion is 3b
	Total score	25 (31)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No

Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: No added value in allo	ocating.

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Site Name Crossroads Farm	
Reference Number	U55
Settlement	Fenny Stratford (expansion)
Size (Ha)	7.52

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history and is not within any designated Neighbourhood Plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	Yes	The site is considered as it completes a logical parcel of land with sites U56 and U22.
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access should be achievable from the adjoining network although development is likely to have an impact on the strategic junction to the south of the site.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
IDB Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site is adjoined by the local road network and limited residential development. The road could present noise and pollution issues.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits		The site does not represent a logical extension into countryside on its own merits. It is long and thin and would represent a notable intrusion in terms of enclosure character.	This assessment could potentially change if adjacent sites are brought forward.
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character		The site would adjoin an area of attractive landscape, which would potentially be harmed by development.	
Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		The site is partially covered by a wildlife corridor and also two notable species (plant and mammal) are recorded.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map		The site is open space although not publically accessible (except for any rights of way).	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		The site is covered by an archaeological notification area.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site has no existing use other than agriculture.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		The site does not have a health centre with capacity within 1km.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is not likely to be large enough to generate significant levels of on-site infrastructure.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		The site adjoins a major road junction that may require upgrading in the future.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		0	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	1	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		1	Red House Surgery
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	1	Bow Brickhill CE Primary School

Under 500m - 5		
1501m - 2000 - 2		
over 2000m -1		
Under 500m - 5	1	Sir Herbert Leon Academy
501 - 1000m- 4		
over 2000m -1	2	Bletchley/Fenny Stratford
Under 500m - 5		
1501m - 2000 - 2		
over 2000m -1	1	Tesco Watling Street
Under 500m - 5		
1501m - 2000 - 2		
over 2000m -1	2	Coldocotto
Under 200m - 5	3	Caldecotte
200m-300m - 4		
400m-500m - 2		
Over 500m - 1	1 (5)	
Under 400m - 5		
500-600m - 3		
	1	
agricultural - 5		
50% or more is grade		
3a - 2		
	3	Just under 50% is 3a
Total score	17 (21)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	501 - 1000m - 4 $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 500m - 5 $501 - 1000m - 4$ $1001 - 1500m - 3$ $1501m - 2000 - 2$ over 2000m -1         Under 200m - 5 $200m - 300m - 4$ $300m - 400m - 3$ $400m - 500m - 3$ $600m - 700m - 2$ Over 500m - 1         Under 400m - 5 $400m - 500m - 3$ $600m - 700m - 2$ Over 700m - 1 $50%$ or more in non- $agricultural - 5$ $50%$ or more is grade 4 $or 5 - 4$ $50%$ or more is grade 3a - 2 $50%$	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets	
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No	
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No	
Other supporting factors	None	
Conclusion: No added value in allocating		

Site Name	Land East of A5	
Reference Number	U56	
Settlement	Fenny Stratford (expansion)	
Size (Ha)	10.6	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history and is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	Yes	The site is considered as it completes a logical parcel of land with sites U55 and U22.
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created	
Physical constraints	Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access would most likely need to be taken through adjoining sites as a new junction on the A5 trunk-road is not likely to be feasible or viable.		
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans				
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?				
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.		

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site adjoins the A5 which may present noise and pollution issues that would limit suitability/marketability.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits		The site does not represent a logical extension into countryside on its own merits. It would represent a notable intrusion in terms of enclosure character.	This assessment could potentially change if adjacent sites are brought forward.
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character		The site is in open countryside. There is an area of attractive landscape to the east, which could be harmed by the development if design is not sensitive to this.	
Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		There is a wildlife corridor that runs through the site.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.		The site is open space although not publically accessible (other than any rights of way).	
Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		The site is covered by an archaeological notification area.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site's only existing use is agriculture.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		The site does not have any health facilities within 1km that have capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		The site is potentially large enough to accommodate a degree of infrastructure on-site.	
Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
	2	
Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
	0	
under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
	1	The Red House Surgery
Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	1	Bow Brickhill CE Primary School
	Scoring           100% brownfield- 5           75-99% brownfield-4           50-74% brownfield-2           0-24% brownfield-1           Weighting x 2           Within settlement-5           Edged on three sides-4           Edged on 2 sides-3           Edged on 1 side-2           No relationship-0           Weighting x 2           under 200m - 5           200m - 400m -4           400m - 800m - 3           800m - 1000m - 2           over 1000m - 1           Under 500m - 5           501 - 1000m - 4           1001 - 1500m - 3           1501m - 2000 - 2           over 2000m -1	Scoring         outcome           100% brownfield-5         75-99% brownfield-4         3           50-74% brownfield-3         2           Veighting x 2         2           Weighting x 2         2           Within settlement-5         Edged on three sides-4           Edged on 2 sides-3         Edged on 1 side-2           No relationship-0         0           Weighting x 2         0           under 200m - 5         0           200m - 400m - 4         0           400m - 800m - 3         1           Under 500m - 5         501 - 1000m - 4           1001 - 1500m - 3         1501m - 2000 - 2           over 2000m -1         1           10under 250m - 5         1           00 - 1000m - 4         1001 - 1500m - 3           1501m - 2000 - 2         1

GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		1	Sir Herbert Leon Academy
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	2	Bletchley/Fenny Stratford
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	1	Tagao Watling Street
	Under 500m - 5	1	Tesco Watling Street
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1	1	Caldecotte
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	1 (5)	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	1 (5)	
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade 3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		2	
	Total score	14 (22)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
No
No
None

Site Name	Land at Middle Weald		
Reference Number	U57		
Settlement	Middle Weald (Expansion)		
Size (Ha)	8.29		

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history and is not part of any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	Yes	The site is physically separate from the urban area although once the WEA has been built out it will adjoin the settlement boundary.
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created			
Physical constraints	Physical constraints					
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access would currently need to be from Calverton Road, which is rural in nature and likely to be unsuitable.				
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans						
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?						
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.				

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information	There are no neighbouring uses.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits	The site is not a logical extension in terms of enclosure character; even if adequate integration with the WEA to the north is designed, the site will still represent a noticeable intrusion into open countryside.	
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?	The western edge of the WEA follows a natural landscape ridge that development of this site would breach.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment		
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation	The site would not impact on any area of biological or geological importance.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.	The site is open space although not publically accessible (with the exception of any rights of way).	
Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation	Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.	
Deliverability/availability constraint	S	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback	The site has no existing use.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation	The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team	According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England data, the site is not within 1km of a surgery with capacity.		
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		The site is unlikely to be large enough to accommodate significant levels of infrastructure.		
Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?				
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation				
Overall conclusions on deliverability				

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
	under 200m – 5	0	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	200m - 400m - 4 400m - 800m - 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		1	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			Wolverton Health Centre (health centres in the WEA are likely to be
GIS Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5	1	closer)
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	0nder 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	1	Christ the Sower Ecumenical Primary School (schools in the WEA are likely to be closer)

	I		I
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			The Hazeley Academy (schools in
GIS		1	the WEA are likely to be closer)
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	1	Stony Stratford town centre
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
•	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	1	Morrisons Westcroft
	Under 500m - 5	1	
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
		1	Kiln Farm
	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
		1	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
		1	
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1		No distinction between 3a and 3b
	or grade 2- 1		<ul> <li>score assumed to be 3 as an</li> </ul>
GIS		3	'average'.
	Total score	14	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than eviciting ones
			existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets				
Νο				
No				
None				

Site Name	Kestrel View Stables, Middle Weald	
Reference Number	U58	
Settlement	Middle Weald (Expansion)	
Size (Ha)	3.41	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history and is not part of any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	Yes	The site is physically separate from the urban area although once the WEA has been built out it will adjoin the settlement boundary.
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access would currently need to be from Calverton Road, which is rural in nature and likely to be unsuitable.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information	There are no neighbouring uses.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits	The site is not a logical extension in terms of enclosure character; even if adequate integration with the WEA to the north is designed, the site will still represent a noticeable intrusion into open countryside.	
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?	The western edge of the WEA follows a natural landscape ridge that development of this site would breach.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment		
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation	The site would not impact on any area of biological or geological importance.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.	The site is open space although not publically accessible (with the exception of any rights of way).	
Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation	Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.	
Deliverability/availability constraint	S	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback	The site has no existing use.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation	The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team	According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England data, the site is not within 1km of a surgery with capacity.		
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		The site is unlikely to be large enough to accommodate significant levels of infrastructure.		
Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?				
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation				
Overall conclusions on deliverability				

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
	under 200m – 5	0	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	200m - 400m - 4 400m - 800m - 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		1	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			Wolverton Health Centre (health centres in the WEA are likely to be
GIS Distance to primary school	Lindor 250m 5	1	closer)
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	1	Christ the Sower Ecumenical Primary School (schools in the WEA are likely to be closer)

	I	1	T
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		1	The Hazeley Academy (schools in the WEA are likely to be closer)
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	1	Stony Stratford town control
	Under 500m - 5	1	Stony Stratford town centre
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1		
GIS		1	Morrisons Westcroft
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
defined on the proposals map)	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
		1	Kiln Farm
<b></b>	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	1	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5		
accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	1	
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
	30% of more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		No distinction between 3a and 3b
CIS	or grade 2- 1	2	- score assumed to be 3 as an
GIS		3	'average'. Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	14	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.
	L	•	<b>_</b>

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets			
Νο			
No			
None			

Site Name	Land South of Lower End Road (c)	
Reference Number	U59	
Settlement	Wavendon (expansion)	
Size (Ha)	3.93	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history. It is within the designated area of the emerging Wavendon Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	Yes	The site currently physically separate from the urban area but will adjoin the urban area once the Strategic Land Allocation has been built out.
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?		Access to the site would need to be off Lower End Road which is rural in nature and unlikely to be	
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		suitable.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			

Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	

Site Visits			
Impact of paighbouring uses			
Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit			
suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely		The southern edge of the site adjoins a sewerage works, which may present odour issues that limit	
impact neighbouring uses?		the marketability of the site.	
Site Visits/mapped information			
Is the site a logical extension to a			
<b>settlement</b> - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a		The site is not a logical extension to the settlement in terms of enclosure character. Even	
logical extension to a settlement in		once the SLA has been built out, development of	
terms of enclosure character?		the site would represent a noticeable intrusion into open countryside beyond the accepted boundary	
Site visits		of Lower End Road.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape			
character of the area it lies in,		The site is not in an area of attractive landscape and there is other (limited) development along	
including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		Lower End Road. However, the landscape	
		character of the area is predominantly rural, which development of the site would harm.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment		development of the site would light.	
Impact on areas of biological or			
<b>geological importance -</b> would development cause harm?			
		Development would not impact upon any areas designated for biological or geological importance.	
GIS/Internal consultation			
Impact on public open space -			
would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible		The site is currently open although is not	
open space or physical education		publically accessible (with the exception of any	
facilities.		rights of way).	
Local Plan Proposals Map			
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be			
potential harm through			
development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance		There is a listed building in the north-east corner	
an area?		of the site, the setting of which development would need to respect.	
GIS/internal consultation			
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any			
activity that would limit current			
development potential?		The site has no existing use.	
Site visit/developer feedback			
<b>Ownership arrangements -</b> is			
there confirmation that the site is			
available for development, with a willing landowner?		The site was formally promoted by its owner	
		during the call for sites process.	
Site proforma/consultation			
Is development of the site			
economically viable- are there			
any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?			
Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have		According to the schools sufficiency and access	
<b>capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with		team, there is potential to mitigate the potential	
the provision of education?		pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	
School Organisation		confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are	

Framework/education team		finalized	
Framework/education team		finalised.	
Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision			
of healthcare?		The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.	
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area		The site is not likely to be large enough to	
deficiency, a community facility,		generate any additional infrastructure.	
International Sporting City enabling			
development)			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
. ,			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2		
Site visit/mapped information	0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		0	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		4	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	1	Asplands Medical Centre (health centres in the SLA are likely to be closer)

GIS	1	ĺ	I
Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5		
*consoity issues are dealt with in	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1000m - 1500 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 1500m -1		
preferred options.			St Mary's, Wavendon (schools in
GIS		1	the SLA are likely to be closer)
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
			Walton High (schools in the SLA
GIS		1	are likely to be closer)
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	1	Woburn Sands
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	1	Tesco Kingston
	Under 500m - 5	1	
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
		3	Magna Park
	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	1	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2		
	Over 700m - 1	1	
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade 3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		Unknown (assumed to be 3 as an
GIS		3	'average').
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	19	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.
	L	<u>I</u>	l _

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: No added value in allo	ocating.

Site Name	Land at corner of Lower End Road and Cranfield Road	
Reference Number	U60	
Settlement	Wavendon (expansion)	
Size (Ha)	1.48	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history. It is within the designated area of the the emerging Wavendon Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	Yes	The site is currently physically separate from the urban area although will adjoin the urban area once the Strategic Land Allocation has been built out.
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is achievable from either Cranfield Road or Lower End Road. There are already existing properties in the vicinity of the site but it is unlikely these rural roads will be suitable to accommodate additional dwellings.	
Utilities - is there capacity to			

provide all required utilities?		
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	

See Vans impact of neighbouring uses if values is a subscription of any lower				
(e.g., noise, and)- would any link significant in a signific	Site Visits			
(e.g., noise, and), would apply inits and apply apply inits apply				
(e.g., noise, and), would apply inits apply app				
Is the site a logical extension to a settiment - which extension to the part countryside, would it form a testing of enclosure character. Even a testing of enclosure characte	(e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely		dwellings and rural roads, all of which are	
settement				
Site visits     of Lower End Road.       Environmental constraints       Environment constraints       Environmenta co	<b>settlement</b> - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in		settlement in terms of enclosure character. Even once the SLA has been built out, development of the site would represent a noticeable intrusion into	
Landscape character - would development ham the landscape character of the area if les in, including areas cuased be boough boolding of geoptication?       The site is not in an area of attractive landscape and there is not in an area of attractive landscape character of the area is predominantly rural, which development cause ham?         Site visitLandscape Character Assessment       Development vould not impact upon any areas designated or areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause ham?       Development vould not impact upon any areas designated for biological or geological importance - the isst is caused with the exception of any rights of way).         Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and potential wave in the loss of physical and potential ham through development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Development of the site would is not publically accessible (with the exception of any rights of way).       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Development of the site is development potential?       The site is existing use is as a private horse stables.         Site wishtdeveloper feedback       The site is existing use is as a private horse stables.         Development of the site economically vabbe are then any particular factors that would limit the vability of development?       The site was submitted by its part-towner. Confimation with be required that the whole site is available.	Site visits		of Lower End Road.	
development harm the landscape character of the area it les in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if application)?       The site is not (initian) development area of character of the area is predominantly rual, which development of the site would harm.         Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment       Development of the site would nation of the site would nation of the site would harm.         Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment       Development of the site would nation of development of the site set outside development cause harm?         GIS/Internal consultation       Development would not impact on public open space - would development of the site set open space or physical education rungities of would have be development of the site set owould development of the site set open space or physical education rungities of would.         Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and horizing assessment of the site set owould fuel open space or physical education area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Obverability/availability constraints       Existing uses (e.g. ongoing amployment) is there any encode set of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         Overeship arrangements - is there confirmation with be required ask stables.       The site is existing use is as a private horse stables.         Site visit/developer feedback       Confirmation with be required that the whole allo is available.         Overeship arrangements - is there confirmation with be required that the whole allo is available.       Existing use site is a private horse stables.	Environmental constraints			
Impact on arcses of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation Impact on public gene space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would a potential harm through development of the site or would a provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/Internal consultation Development of the site or would a provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/Internal consultation Development of the site or would in potential harm through development of the site or would in potential consultation Development of the site or would in potential and the site satisfies as a private horse stables. The site is as a private horse stables. The site was submitted by its part-owner. Confirmation that the site is available or development. Whith willing indowner? Site visit/development of the site is available in development? Site visit/development? Site visit/development of the site is available in development of the site is available in development? Site visit/development of the site i	development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character		and there is other (limited) development along Lower End Road. However, the landscape character of the area is predominantly rural, which	
would development of the site lead to the loss of publical accessible open space or physical education facilities. Lacal Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would here be potential harm through development of the site would not impact upon an area? GIS/internal consultation Development of the site would not impact upon an area? GIS/internal consultation Development of the site would not impact upon an area? GIS/internal consultation Development of the site would not impact upon an area? GIS/internal consultation Development of the site would not impact upon an area? GIS/internal consultation Development of the site would not impact upon an area? The site's existing use is as a private horse stables. The site's existing use is as a private horse stables. The site's existing use is as a private horse stables. The site was submitted by its part-owner. Confirmation will be required that the whole site is available. Development of the site economically viable, are three any particular factors that would imit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site case particular issues with the provision of education?	Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?			
Impact on archaeological and heritage asset - would here be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?       Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.         GIS/internal consultation       Deliverability/availability constraints         Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site's existing use is as a private horse stables.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation the the is is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was submitted by its part-owner. Confirmation will be required that the whole site is available.         Site visit/development of the site econfirmation will be required that the whole site is available.       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although the site outs and the site is arong the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although the provision of education?	would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education		publically accessible (with the exception of any	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site's existing use is as a private horse stables.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site's existing use is as a private horse stables.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was submitted by its part-owner. Confirmation will be required that the whole site is available.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?			
employment) - is it here any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site's existing use is as a private horse stables.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site's existing use is as a private horse stables.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was submitted by its part-owner. Confirmation will be required that the whole site is available.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential to mitigate allowing and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
employment) - is it here any activity that would limit current development potential?       The site's existing use is as a private horse stables.         Site visit/developer feedback       The site's existing use is as a private horse stables.         Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was submitted by its part-owner. Confirmation will be required that the whole site is available.         Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential to mitigate allowing and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the				
there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?       The site was submitted by its part-owner. Confirmation will be required that the whole site is available.         Site proforma/consultation       Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?         Site visit/desktop work       According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?			
economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?Site visit/desktop workSite visit/desktop workDo the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?		Confirmation will be required that the whole site is	
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	<b>economically viable</b> - are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?			
capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	Site visit/desktop work			
	capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with		team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be	
	School Organisation			

Framework/education team		finalised.	1
Framework/education team		Inalised.	
Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision		<b>—</b>	
of healthcare?		The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.	
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area		The site is unlikely to be large enough to	
deficiency, a community facility,		accommodate any additional infrastructure.	
International Sporting City enabling			
development)			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
			1
Overall conclusions on deliverability			

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2		
Site visit/mapped information	0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		0	
<b>Distance to bus stop or train station –</b>	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	1	Asplands Medical Centre (Health centres in the SLA are likely to be closer)

GIS		1	
Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	500 - 1000m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		1	St Mary's Wavendon (schools in
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5	1	the SLA are likely to be closer)
	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			Walton High (schools in the SLA
GIS		1	are likely to be closer)
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	1	Woburn Sands
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	1	Tesco Kingston
	Under 500m - 5	1	
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
		3	Magna Park
Distance to play area	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
		1	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
	50% or more in non-	1	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
	or grade 2- 1		Unknown (assumed to be 3 as an
GIS		3	'average').
		20	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could
	Total score	20	deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers whethe	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: No added value in allo	ocating

Site Name	Kents Hill site A	
Reference Number	U65	
Settlement	Kents Hill	
Size (Ha)	1.14	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history although is adjacent to a hotel development and has been covered by various permissions relating to signage. It is not within any designated Neighbourhood Plan area. It is allocated for commercial purposes. A recent development brief indicated it should be brought forward for commercial and residential uses.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is easily achievable from Timbold Drive or Hammerwood Gate. Bus service provision, redways and traffic calming may all need to be enhanced.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		Small parts of the site have a low risk for surface water flooding. This is likely to be easily managed through appropriate mitigation measures.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information	The site is adjacent to a higher educ and hotel, both of which are conside compatible uses.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits	The site is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would		
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?	The landscape character of the surr is predominantly urban.	ounding area
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment		
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation	Development would not impact upor biological or geological importance.	n any areas of
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map	The site is open space and is techni accessible by the general public. Ho allocated as commercial land and do to serve a useful purpose in terms o recreation, landscaping or wildlife as of the Local Plan.	owever it is oes not seem of appearance,
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation	Development of the site would not ir known archaeological or heritage as	
Deliverability/availability constraint	S	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback	The site has no existing use. However, allocated for commercial purposes. was partially implemented with the arrow it is unlikely the remainder will be However, any change to residential incorporate an element of commercial development as a mixed use schemet of the statement of the schemet	This allocation adjacent hotel be required. may ial
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation	The site was promoted by Milton Ke Development Partnership who have is available immediately.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?		
Site visit/desktop work		
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team	Plans for new schools to the north o being made in expectation that pupi this site could be accommodated.	

Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause			
particular issues with the provision		According to NHS England data, the site does not	
of healthcare?		have a surgery with capacity within 1km.	
of ficaliticate :		have a surgery with capacity within TKIN.	
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use		When considered with its adjoining parcels, the	
development? (e.g. local play area		site is probably large enough to sustain new	
deficiency, a community facility,		infrastructure. New schools are potentially being	
International Sporting City enabling		delivered to the north already.	
development)		,	
, ,			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known		The site is allocated for commercial purposes so	
infrastructure projects?		consideration needs to be given whether the site	
		is required to deliver this or other infrastructure.	
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		
	-		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>	2	
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	5	
GIS		4	Walnut Tree Health Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	4 (5)	Kents Hill Primary (Infant only, Heronsgate School [junior] would score 3)

			1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
-	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		3 (5)	Walton High
	Under 500m - 5	0 (0)	Waterrigh
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
010	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	4	Walnut Tree
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		2	Waitrose Oakgrove
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
		4	Kents Hill
	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	1 (5)	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5		
accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	3 (5)	
	50% or more in non-		
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
010	or grade 2- 1	-	
GIS		5	Prockatod acoro roflacto actostici
	Total score	47 (56)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
			existing ones.

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers wheth	ner there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value in all	None

Site Name	Kents Hill site C	
Reference Number	U66	
Settlement	Kents Hill	
Size (Ha)	5.11	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history and is not covered by any designated Neighbourhood Plan area. It is allocated for educational purposes on the proposals map.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is easily achievable from Timbold Drive although traffic calming may be required. Redway and bus service provision will need to be enhanced.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		There is a low risk of surface water flooding on a small part of the site. This is likely to be easily mitigated through appropriate SUDS.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site adjoins existing residential properties, open space, and a higher education facility, all of which are considered to be compatible uses.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits		The site is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would			
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		There are several notable species recorded close to the site.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map		The site is open space that is publically accessible although is allocated for higher educational purposes and does not seem to serve a useful purpose in terms of appearance, landscaping, recreation as per Policy L2 of the Local Plan.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site has no existing use but is allocated for higher education facilities. Therefore consideration needs to be given as to whether this allocation is still required.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site was promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it is available immediately.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?			
Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		Plans for new schools to the north of the site are being made in expectation that pupil yield from this site could be accommodated.	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		When considered with its adjoining parcels, the site is probably large enough to sustain new infrastructure. New schools are potentially being delivered to the north already.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is allocated for higher education facilities. Residential development would therefore impede the future delivery of this allocation if required.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visionapped information	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Distance to health centre/doctors	Under 500m - 5	5	
(inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Walnut Tree Health Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	3 (5)	Kents Hill School (infant only – Heronsgate School [junior] would score 1)

[	1		1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
······································	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			Walton High (scores 2 or 3
GIS		3 (5)	depending on route)
	Under 500m - 5	0 (0)	
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	3	Walnut Tree
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	2	Waitrose Oakgrove
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
		5	Kents Hill
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
		1 (5)	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5		
accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	_	
		5	
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	<b>T</b> ( 1	47 (55)	score for larger sites that could
	Total score	47 (55)	deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.
			-

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whethe	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Νο
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value in allo	None

Site Name	Kents Hill site D1	
Reference Number	U65	
Settlement	Kents Hill	
Size (Ha)	2.05	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history. It is not within any designated Neighbourhood Plan area. It is allocated for educational purposes on the proposals map.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is easily achievable from Timbold Drive. Bus service and redway provision will both need to be addressed along with potential traffic calming.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		A small part of the site has a medium to high risk of surface water flooding. This is likely to be easily mitigated through appropriate SUDS measures though.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site is adjacent to existing residential development, hotel, and higher education facility. All of which are considered compatible uses.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits		The site is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would			
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		Development would not impact upon any areas of biological or geological importance.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map		The site is open space and is technically accessible by the general public. However it is allocated as educational land and does not seem to serve a useful purpose in terms of appearance, recreation, landscaping or wildlife as per Policy L2 of the Local Plan.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact any known archaeological or heritage assets.	
Deliverability/availability constraint	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site has no existing use. However it is allocated for educational purposes. This has not been brought forward to date and there is no indication that it will actually be required in the future. Therefore a change in allocation to residential may be acceptable.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site was promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it is available immediately.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?			
Site visit/desktop work			
<b>Do the local schools have</b> <b>capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there will be capacity to accommodate expected pupil yield from the development.	
Framework/education team			

Do local healthcare facilities				
have capacity? Would				
development of the site cause				
particular issues with the provision		According to NHS England data, there is no		
of healthcare?		surgery with capacity within 1km of the site.		
222				
CCG				
Health Partnerships team				
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could				
be accommodated on the site as				
part of a mixed use		When considered with its adjoining parcels, the		
development? (e.g. local play area		site will be large enough to sustain new		
deficiency, a community facility,		infrastructure. For instance, according to the draft		
International Sporting City enabling		development brief for the site, new schools are		
development)		already scheduled to be provided.		
Desktop study/internal consultation				
What level of recent housing				
development has there been in				
the local area? Is there still				
capacity in the local market?				
Would the development of the				
site for residential use impede				
the delivery of any known		The site is allocated for higher education		
infrastructure projects?		purposes, which would be lost once delivered for		
		residential development.		
Desktop study/internal consultation				
Overall conclusions on deliverability				

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	Weighting x 2		
		2	
<b>Relationship with settlement boundary</b> Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	_	
Distance to health centre/doctors	Under 500m - 5	5	
(inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Walnut Tree Health Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	4 (5)	Kents Hill Primary (Infant only, Heronsgate School [junior] would score 3)

[	1		1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		3 (5)	Walton High
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	4	Walnut Tree
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
		2	Waitrose Oakgrove
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
defined on the proposals map)	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
		4	Kents Hill
	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	1 (4)	
	Under 400m - 5		
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4		
	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	3 (5)	
	50% or more in non-	3 (5)	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1		
Quality of agricultural land	or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
	Total score	47 (56)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers wheth	ner there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value in all	None

Site Name	Kents Hill site B	
Reference Number	U68	
Settlement	Kents Hill	
Size (Ha)	1.39	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history and is not part of any designated Neighbourhood Plan area. It is allocated for employment purposes although a recent development brief indicated it will be delivered for educational purposes.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access should be easily achievable from Timbold Drive.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site is developable with no site-specific constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information	The site is bordered by employment uses (conference centre), which is considered to be compatible and would not limit the suitability or marketability of the site.
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits	The site is not in open countryside.
Environmental constraints	
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character	The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.
Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation	Development would not harm any area of biological or geological importance.
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map	The site is open space and is technically accessible by the general public. However it is allocated as employment land and does not seem to serve a useful purpose in terms of appearance, recreation, landscaping or wildlife as per Policy L2 of the Local Plan.
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation	The site would not impact upon any designated archaeological or heritage assets although there is an historic road running through the site, the significance of which would need to be considered.
Deliverability/availability constrain	
Denverability/availability constrain	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback	The site is allocated for employment purposes.         According to the Council's Employment Land         Study, its relative value for this use is in the         bottom 50% of employment sites across the         Borough (98 <sup>th</sup> out of 118). Therefore a change of         use to residential may be acceptable.         However, the recent development brief process         has indicated that site will be delivered for school
	purposes instead, the need for which would obviously be prejudiced if the site came forward for residential development.
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation	The site was formally promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership during the call for sites process.
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?	
Site visit/desktop work	
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team	According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.
	This is particularly true in the case of this site as it

		is proposed for a new school itself.	
Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?		According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.	
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		When considered with adjoining parcels the site would most likely be large enough to accommodate a degree of additional infrastructure.	
Desktop study/internal consultation			
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?		Development of the site would impede the delivery of a proposed new secondary school.	
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ity		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		4	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
		1	Walnut Tree Health Centre

GIS			
Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
GIS		3	Monkston Primary School
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5	-	
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Oakgrove
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	3	Kingston
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Tesco Kingston
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map) Desktop study/GIS	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
		5	Kents Hill
Distance to play area GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	4 (5)	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	4	
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade 3b - 3 50% or more is grade 3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1	5	
	Total score	48 (49)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers whethe	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: No added value in allo	ocating

Site Name	Kents Hill site E	
Reference Number	U68	
Settlement	Kents Hill	
Size (Ha)	4.2	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history and is not part of any designated Neighbourhood Plan area. It is allocated for employment purposes although a recent development brief process indicated the site will be delivered for educational purposes.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created			
Physical constraints	Physical constraints					
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access should be easily achievable from Timbold Drive.				
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans						
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?						
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site is developable with no site-specific constraints.				

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information	(confere compat	e is bordered by employment uses ence centre), which is considered to be ible and would not limit the suitability or ability of the site.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits	The site	e is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		dscape character of the surrounding area ominantly urban.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment			
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation	There is site.	s a notable plant species recorded on the	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map	accessi allocate to serve recreati	e is open space and is technically ble by the general public. However it is ad as employment land and does not seem a useful purpose in terms of appearance, ion, landscaping or wildlife as per Policy L2 local Plan.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation	archaeo appears	e would not impact upon any designated blogical or heritage assets although there s to be an old road running through the e historical importance of which will need to sidered.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	S		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback	Accordi Study, i bottom Boroug	e is allocated for employment purposes. Ing to the Council's Employment Land Its relative value for this use is in the 50% of employment sites across the h (98 <sup>th</sup> out of 118). Therefore a change of residential may be acceptable.	
	has ind purpose obvious	er, the recent development brief process icated that site will be delivered for school es instead, the need for which would sly be prejudiced if the site came forward dential development.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		e was formally promoted by Milton Keynes oment Partnership during the call for sites S.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?			
Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team	team, th pupil yie confirm	ing to the schools sufficiency and access here is potential to mitigate the potential eld from site although this will need to be ed on a case-by-case basis when the umber and location of all allocations are d.	
	This is	particularly true in the case of this site as it	

		is proposed for a new school itself.	]
		is proposed for a new school liseli.	
Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would		According to NUC England data the site data not	
development of the site cause particular issues with the provision		According to NHS England data, the site does not	
of healthcare?		have a surgery with capacity within 1km.	
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use		When considered with adjoining parcels the site	
development? (e.g. local play area		would most likely be large enough to	
deficiency, a community facility,		accommodate a degree of additional	
International Sporting City enabling		infrastructure.	
development)			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known		Development of the site would impede the	
infrastructure projects?		delivery of a proposed new secondary school.	
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ity		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
Site visit/mapped information	<u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		4	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
		1	Walnut Tree Health Centre

GIS			
Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
GIS		3	Monkston Primary School
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5	-	
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Oakgrove
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
615	over 2000m -1	3	Kingston
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	2	Tagaa Kingatan
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map) Desktop study/GIS	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	3	Tesco Kingston
		5	Kents Hill
Distance to play area	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	4 (5)	
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade 3b - 3 50% or more is grade 3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1	4 (5)	
GIS		5	Procketed score reflects actential
	Total score	48 (50)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers whethe	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: No added value in allo	ocating

Site Name	Land at Oakgrove School	
Reference Number	U70	
Settlement	Middleton	
Size (Ha)	1.76	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has been included in planning applications related to the secondary school to the west and the residential development to the east. However, it has no individual planning history and is not part of any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access should only be taken from Far Holme, with careful design in terms of how the approach to the site is aligned.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site adjoins existing residential development and Oakgrove secondary school, neither of which should limit the suitability or marketability of the site.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits		The site is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character		The landscape of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		There are two notable amphibian/reptile recorded on the site (within the last 5 years). Confirmation and appropriate mitigation will therefore be required before development can be considered acceptable.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map		The site is open space and may be accessible by the general public. However it is allocated as community facilities and does not seem to serve a useful purpose in terms of appearance, recreation, landscaping or wildlife as per Policy L2 of the Local Plan. It is onerous to maintain according to the academy that owns and promotes the land.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact on any designated heritage or archaeological asset.	
Deliverability/availability constraints			
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site has no existing use although is allocated for community facility purposes and is subject to a restrictive covenant in that regard. The owner has confirmed that it is unlikely to be required for additional educational uses and its maintenance is onerous, therefore it seems there is little need for the existing allocation although this will need to be confirmed via consultation.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process. However, there is a restrictive covenant on the land that would require lifting before it could definitely be considered available.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		The details of the covenant referred to above could restrict the viability of the site for the immediate future.	
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		The site could potentially contribute some on-site infrastructure.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is allocated for community facilities (associated with the adjacent secondary school), confirmation will be required that this allocation is no longer needed as development would otherwise impede this.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	3	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Milton Keynes Village Practice
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		3	Middleton Primary School

		1	
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		5	Oakgrove Secondary School
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	4	Monkston Park
	Under 500m - 5	r	
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
		4	Waitrose Oakgrove
Distance to employment area (as	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Linder 000m 5	3	Kingston
Distance to play area	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
GIS	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	4	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	5	
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
	Total score	52	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value in allo	None

Site Name	Land at the Walnuts	
Reference Number	U71	
Settlement	Redhouse Park	
Size (Ha)	1.91	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site's planning history consists of an application for a Certificate of Lawful Use (granted) relating to the horse grazing and stables on the site. It is also within the Great Linford (north) Neighbourhood Plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access should be easily achievable from the existing network.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric,			
broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
IDB			
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		The site is developable without site-specific constraints.	
Site Visits			

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information	The site is adjacent to the M1 potential development would be 200m buffer that the 2005 Loo to be unacceptable in terms of pollution	be entirely within the cal Plan considered
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits	The site is not in open country	/side.
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?	The landscape character of th surrounding area is predomina	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment		
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation	Development would not impac biological or geological import	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.	The site is open space that me the public (although privately of is allocated as employment la considered to be covered by F Local Plan in terms of serving appearance, landscaping or w	owned). However, it nd and is not Policy L2 of the a recreation,
Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation	Development of the site would any known archaeological or h	
Deliverability/availability constrain	s	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback	The site is used for private eq but is allocated for employmen Council's Employment Land S value for this use is in the top sites across the Borough. The use to residential is likely to be	nt. According to the Study, its relative 50% of employment erefore a change of
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation	The site was formally promote during the call for sites proces	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?		
Site visit/desktop work		
<b>Do the local schools have</b> <b>capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?	According to the schools suffic team, there is potential to miti pupil yield from site although t confirmed on a case-by-case exact number and location of	gate the potential this will need to be

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?		According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.	
Health Partnerships team Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		The site is likely to be large enough to accommodate a degree of additional infrastructure on site.	
Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		Development of the site would impede the delivery of its current allocation for employment purposes.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>	-	
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	5	
GIS		2	Newport Pagnell medical centre.
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		3	Giffard Park Primary School

GIS			
Distance to cocondary asked	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to secondary school	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m - 1		
			Ousebank School (Newport
GIS	Under 500m - 5	2	Pagnell campus)
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	3	Newport Pagnell town centre
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	2	
	Under 500m - 5	3	Newport Pagnell Co-Op
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
Desktop study/GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
		5	Blakelands
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	3 (5)	
	Under 400m - 5		
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4		
	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	5	
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
	or grade 2-1		
GIS		5	
	Total score	48 (50)	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

 STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets

 Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)

 No

Gity)	
Has the site been identified locally	
as in need of improvement?	No
•	
Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: No added value in all	ocating
Conclusion. No audeu value in all	ocauny.

Site Name	Shenley Wood site E	
Reference Number	U72	
Settlement	Shenley Wood	
Size (Ha)	1.18	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no individual planning history although adjacent parcels were permitted to a change of use to open space network (incorporated SUDs, wildlife and leisure paths) in order to facilitate the allocated employment development on the site. It is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access should be taken from Merlewood Drive.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
IDB Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	
Site Visits			

The site is next to a range of uses including employment (both unimplemented allocations and recently constructed), a proposed school, and open space. In principle none of these is necessarily incompatible although the unorthodox and uncertain land assembly in the immediate area means the cumulative impact of neighbouring uses will need careful consideration.         The site is not in open countryside.
The site is not in open countryside.
The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.
The site is adjacent to the wildlife (wood) corridor, with several notable species recorded nearby.
The site is currently open space and technically publically accessible. However it is allocated for employment purposes and it is not considered that it is serving a useful amenity purpose in terms of recreation, wildlife, appearance or landscape under Policy L2 of the Local Plan. This is
supported by the fact there are few existing residences within the vicinity of the site.
The site is partially covered by an archaeological notification area.
The site is allocated for employment purposes.
According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the top 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential may not
be acceptable.
There is also the potential for the site to be required for primary school provision.
The site was formally promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership during the call for sites process.
According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be

		finalised.	
		This is particularly true with regards to this site as a new primary school has also been proposed for the area.	
Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		If taken in combination with adjoining sites, it is possible the site could provide additional infrastructure required in the area. This is particularly true in respect of primary school proposals.	
Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?		The site is currently allocated for employment purposes whilst primary school provision has been suggested. Both these uses would not be possible to deliver in future if the site is	
Desktop study/internal consultation		development for residential purposes.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ity		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2		
	0-24% brownfield- 1		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		3	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
		3	Westcroft Health Centre

GIS			
Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
GIS		3 (5)	Longmeadow School
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		Ĭ
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Shenley Brook End School
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1	3	Westcroft
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	3	Morrisons Westcroft
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map) Desktop study/GIS	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Desktop study/GIG		5	Shenley Wood
<b>Distance to play area</b> GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	1 (5)	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5	5	
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade 3b - 3 50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1	5	
		5	Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	46 (52)	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers whethe	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: No added value in allo	ocating

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Site Name	Shenley Wood site D	
Reference Number	U73	
Settlement	Shenley Wood	
Size (Ha)	2.77	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no individual planning history although adjacent parcels were permitted to a change of use to open space network (incorporated SUDs, wildlife and leisure paths) in order to facilitate the allocated employment development on the site. It is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is easily achievable from Foxcovert Road/Merlewood Drive.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
IDB Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	
Site Visits			

	The site is adjacent to open space and allocated employment sites (along with residential farm buildings). In principle these uses are not necessarily incompatible although the unorthodox and uncertain land assembly in the rest of the area (e.g. proposed school, retirement village and implemented employment allocations) means the cumulative impact of neighbouring uses will need careful consideration.	
	The site is not in open countryside.	
	The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
	The site is adjacent to the wildlife (wood) corridor, with several notable insect and mammal species recorded on the site itself.	
	The site is currently open space and technically publically accessible. However it is allocated for employment purposes and it is not considered that it is serving a useful amenity purpose in terms of recreation, wildlife, appearance or landscape under Policy L2 of the Local Plan as there are few existing residences within the vicinity of the site.	
	The site would not impact upon any designated archaeological or heritage assets, although there is a notification area directly adjacent.	
ts		
	The site has no existing use but is allocated for employment development. According to the Council's Employment Land Study, its relative value for this use is in the top 50% of employment sites across the Borough. Therefore a change of use to residential is likely to be unacceptable.	
	The site is also proposed for new school development, which residential development would prejudice.	
	The site was formally promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership during the call for sites process.	
	According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	
		employment sites (along with residential fam buildings), in principle these uses are not necreasanily incompatible although the unortholox and uncertain land assembly in the rest of the area (e.g. proposed school, retirement village and uncertain land sesembly in the rest of the area (e.g. proposed school, retirement village and uncertain land)         Image: the image of th

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?		Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		When considered with adjoining parcels the site is likely to be able to accommodate additional infrastructure on-site, such as the new school that is proposed.	
Desktop study/internal consultation			
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		Development of the site would impede the delivery of a proposed new school.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	3	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Westcroft Health Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	3	
preferred options.		3	Longmeadow School

[		1	1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		3	Shenley Brook End School
	Under 500m - 5	<u> </u>	
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	3	Westcroft
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 5		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	3	Morrisons Westcroft
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
		5	Shenley Wood
	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	1 (5)	
	Under 400m - 5		
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	_	
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade 3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1	5	
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	47 (51)	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	L		

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers wheth	ner there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets		
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No		
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No		
Other supporting factors	None		
Conclusion: No added value in allocating			

Site Name	Land at Bergamot Gardens	
Reference Number	U80	
Settlement	Walnut Tree	
Size (Ha)	0.53	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history but is designated for allotment purposes. It is also within the designated area of the Walton Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are			
there any local or strategic highway			
constraints?		Access should easily be achievable off Bergamot	
		Gardens.	
In consultation with the Highways			
Team and Highways Agency.			
Utilities - is there capacity to			
provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			
,			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	
Site Visits		

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information	properti	is adjacent to existing residential es and school playing fields, both of which sidered to be compatible uses.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits	The site	is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		dscape character of the surrounding area minantly urban.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation	areas of although	ment would not impact upon any known biological or geological importance in the 'natural' state of the site should be ated for potential habitats.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map	the prop allotmer should r a useful landsca and ger unlikely landsca purpose	is formally allocated as open space on posals map and is registered for use as nts. Under the criteria of Policy L2, this use not be altered unless the site is not serving purpose in terms of recreation, pe, wildlife or appearance. The site is flat erally appears overgrown, therefore it is to fulfil a purpose in terms of recreation, pe or appearance. In terms of wildlife there is minimal planting on the site n some grass habitats may exist.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation	Develop	oment of the site would not impact upon wn archaeological or heritage assets.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	s		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback	The site space.	has no existing use other than open	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation	council (unused altered State. T claw-ba	was promoted by the local community who are the owners. However, the site's ) purpose as allotments can only be with permission from the Secretary of he site is also subject to a covenant for ck payment that could frustrate the timely ble) delivery of the site in the immediate	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work	The site paymen	is subject to a covenant for claw-back t until 2043, which unless lifted would limit ility of any redevelopment.	
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team	team, th pupil yie confirme	ng to the schools sufficiency and access here is potential to mitigate the potential and from site although this will need to be ad on a case-by-case basis when the umber and location of all allocations are l.	
the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation	pupil yie confirme exact nu	eld from site although this will need to be ed on a case-by-case basis when the umber and location of all allocations are	

<b>Do local healthcare facilities</b> <b>have capacity?</b> Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?		Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
CCG Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate significant amounts of new infrastructure.	
Desktop study/internal consultation			
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is registered for allotment purposes with the local community council. However, there parish is well-served by 4 other allotments, all of which appear to have vacant plots.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		5	Walnut Tree Health Centre
<b>Distance to primary school</b> *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1	3	Heronshaw/Heronsgate School

	1	1	1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS		5	Walton High
	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
Distance to town/local centre	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	4	Walnut Tree
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		T
010	over 2000m -1		Tesco Express Walnut Tree (Tesco Kingston for larger store
GIS		4	would score 1)
Distance to employment area (as	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Desktop study/GIS		4	Tilbrook
	Under 200m - 5		
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	2	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
		4	
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1	5	
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	53	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	μ	1	

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No.
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	Anecdotally yes.
Other supporting factors	The site would be brought forward by the Local Community Council who would aim to deliver a scheme that benefits residents of the local area. The 'grassroots' support for the site can therefore be considered a supporting factor.

Site Name	Land at Walton Manor	
Reference Number	U81	
Settlement	Walton	
Size (Ha)	5.14	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history. It is allocated for employment purposes on the proposals map. It is within the designated area of the Walton neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access from Hulwell Gate would be preferable with pedestrian and cycling access also achievable from Simpson Road. Pedestrian routes to schools will need careful consideration as there are already issues with crossing Brickhill St.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		There are potentially drainage issues to the west of the site although the land as promoted is unlikely to be constrained by this and could help to alleviate any problems.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		The site is developable and does not appear to have site-specific constraints. However, the promoters have indicated that contamination issues will need to be investigated from historical land uses.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information	The site is adjacent to existing development, open space and employment land. None of thes to be incompatible uses in princ limit the suitability or marketabil vice versa.	allocated se are considered ciple or are likely to
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits	The site is not in open countrys	ide.
Environmental constraints		
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character	The landscape character of the is predominantly urban.	surrounding area
Assessment		
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation	Development of the site would areas of biological or geologica although there is a wildlife corrisi site that would need to be responded	l importance dor adjacent to the
<b>Impact on public open space</b> - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.	The site is open space that is the public. However, it is allocated employment purposes and it is be serving a useful purpose in the appearance, recreation, landscoper Policy L2 of the Local Plan.	ted for not considered to terms of aping or wildlife as
Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation	Development of the site would heritage or archaeological asse	
Deliverability/availability constraint	;	
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback	The site is allocated for employ According to the Council's Emp Study, its relative value for this bottom 50% of employment site Borough (89 <sup>th</sup> out of 118). Then use to residential may be accept	bloyment Land use is in the es across the efore a change of
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation	The site was formally promoted Development Partnership durin process.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		
ORE VISIVUESKIUP WUIK		
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team	According to the schools suffici team, there is potential to mitiga pupil yield from site although th confirmed on a case-by-case ba exact number and location of al finalised.	ate the potential is will need to be asis when the

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development) Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is potentially large enough to accommodate a degree of additional infrastructure on-site.	
What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation		The site is allocated for employment purposes, a change of use to residential would mean the site is unavailable for this purpose in the future.	
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		2	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 Weighting x 2		
		10	
<b>Distance to bus stop or train station –</b> GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
Distance to health centre/doctors	Under 500m - 5	4	
(inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Walnut Tree Health Centre
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		2	Heronshaw/Hersongate School

GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to secondary school	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.	0ver 2000m - 1		
GIS	Under 500m - 5	3	Walton High
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	3	Walnut Tree
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
-	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		Walnut Tree Tesco (for a larger
GIS	over 2000m -1		store, Waitrose Oakgrove would
	Under 500m - 5	3	score 1)
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
Desktop study/GIS	0ver 2000m - 1	5	Walton Manor
	Under 200m - 5	5	
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	Over 500m - 1		
	Under 400m - 5	1	
Distance to park/publically	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
		5	
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade 3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
	Total score	46	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

ner there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
No
No
None

Site Name	Hewlett Packard (West site)	
Reference Number	U82	
Settlement	Wavendon Gate	
Size (Ha)	2.87	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site's planning history is associated with the adjacent business park. It is also subject to a live planning application covering a larger area, the determination of which may preclude its inclusion in the Site Allocations Plan. It is within the designated area of the Wavendon Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?		Access should be achievable from Ortensia Drive.	
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.			
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric,			

broadband companies' service/asset/management plans		
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		
IDB		
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?	The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	
Site Visits		

n business park o the north (which green buffer' for the east. The east across the e issues. In re therefore ncompatible with arly if designed de. de. de. area is urban/rural ed in principle by nt.
area is urban/rural ed in principle by
ed in principle by
ed in principle by
ed in principle by
ded on the site.
ble open space.
ot impact upon ogical asset.
employment land tionally used as a susiness park as a hent site and e Borough hent Land Study. hal part of the opment would see mployment
by its owner

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		The site is potentially large enough to accommodate a degree of on-site infrastructure and contribute to off-site provision.	
Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects? Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverability			

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		6	
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	4	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Walnut Tree Health Centre
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.		3	Wavendon Gate Primary School

			1
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Walton High
Distance to town/local centre	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	3	Walnut Tree
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		Walnut Tree Tesse (for lorger
GIS	over 2000m -1		Walnut Tree Tesco (for larger stores, Kingston Tesco would
	Linder 500m 5	3	score 1)
Distance to employment area (as	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
Desktop study/GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
		5	Wavendon Business Park
	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1		
	Under 400m - 5	2	
Distance to park/publically	400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	4	
	50% or more in non-	- <del>-</del>	
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade 3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
Quality of agricultural land	3a - 2 50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
	Total score	52	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value in all	None

Site Name	Hewlett Packard (East site)	
Reference Number	U82	
Settlement	Wavendon/Wavendon Gate	
Size (Ha)	0.94	

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site's planning history is associated with the adjacent business park. It is also subject to a live planning application, the determination of which may preclude its inclusion in the Site Allocations Plan. It is within the designated area of the Wavendon Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		Access is potentially a constraint with poor visibility on the site's logical junction with Walton Road.	
<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?			
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?			
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?		The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.	
Site Visits			

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site is adjacent to Wavendon business park to the north and a 'green buffer' for the Strategic Land Allocation. To the south and east lies properties in Wavendon Village. The Stables venue a short way to the north may present noise issues. In general the neighbouring uses are therefore unorthodox but not necessarily incompatible with residential development,	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?		particularly if designed well. The site is not in open countryside.	
Site visits			
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character		The landscape character of the area is urban/rural fringe, which would not be harmed in principle by additional residential development.	
Assessment Impact on areas of biological or			
geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		Development of the site would not harm any area of biological or geological importance.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.		The site is not publically accessible open space.	
Local Plan Proposals Map			
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would need to be sensitive to the archaeological notification site that it partially overlaps with.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The site is currently allocated as employment land although is not built up and is 'leftover' land. However, Wavendon Business park as a location is a high-value employment site and ranked 17 <sup>th</sup> out of 118 across the Borough according to the recent Employment Land Study. The site does not form a functional part of the current business park but development would see the loss of part of a high-value employment allocation.	
Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work			
Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	

Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?		Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.	
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use		The site is not likely to be large enough to	
development? (e.g. local play area		generate significant levels of on-site	
deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling		infrastructure.	
development)			
developmenty			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1		
	<u>Weighting x 2</u>		
Relationship with settlement boundary Site visit/mapped information	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0 <u>Weighting x 2</u>	2	
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1	5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities) *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
GIS		3	Walnut Tree Health Centre
Distance to primary school *capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		St Mania Wayandan Coff Sabaal
preferred options.		4	St Mary's Wavendon CofE School

	1		
GIS			
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
	501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u>	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m - 1		
GIS		4	Walton High
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1	2	
	Under 500m - 5	3	Walnut Tree
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		Walnut Tree Tesco (for larger
GIS	over 2000m -1	2	stores, Kingston Tesco would
	Under 500m - 5	3	score 1)
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		Waxaa dag Dugingga Dark
	Under 200m - 5	5	Wavendon Business Park
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	2	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5		
accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
	600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	4	
	50% or more in non-	1	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4 50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade		
Quality of action/tural law d	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	49	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	No
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	No
Other supporting factors Conclusion: No added value in alle	None

Site Name	1 Glyn Square	
Reference Number	U84	
Settlement	Wolverton	
Size (Ha)	0.1	

## Planning history/context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has an extensive planning history, predominantly concerned with changing the use of the existing building from D1 use (non-residential institution; specifically a training centre) to retail use. This was eventually permitted although restricted to the current occupiers so as to avoid intensification of highways issues. More recently this condition was varied to include more recent occupiers that traded in a similar fashion. It is not within any designated Neighbourhood Plan area although the Wolverton Town Centre Neighbourhood Plan covers the area directly to the north.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	Site area indicates low capacity although town centre location and existing building height/massing suggests that the site could yield around 30 dwellings in the form of apartments.
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

In making decisions about the allocation of sites, the conclusions drawn in Stage 2 will need to be considered alongside the sustainability score of each site established at Stage 3. This will ensure that the deliverability of a site is taken into account in the allocations process alongside the relative suitability for development. Where an issue which affects the likelihood of a site being allocated for development, the landowner/developer/agent will be given an opportunity to investigate whether the constraint could be mitigated in a cost effective manner.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?		Access is likely to be a major constraint to residential development as daily movements would be significantly increased in an area without	
In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		appropriate highways provision. Parking is also likely to be an issue.	
Utilities - is there capacity to			

<b>Utilities -</b> is there capacity to provide all required utilities?		
Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans	The site is already serviced.	
<b>Drainage -</b> can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?	The site is already developed.	
IDB		

Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing		Development of the site would be limited by the need to provide basement parking.		
issue?		······································		
Site Visits				
Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site is located in the town centre but is predominantly surrounded by commercial and retail uses. The western outlook from the site for instance would be over active goods-yards, which could limit the site's marketability and suitability in terms of appearance and noise.		
Is the site a logical extension to a				
<b>settlement</b> - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?		The site is not in open countryside.		
Site visits				
Environmental constraints				
Landscape character- would				
development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		The landscape character of the surrounding area is urban.		
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment				
Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?		The site would not impact on any areas of		
GIS/Internal consultation		biological or geological importance.		
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.		The site is not public open space.		
Local Plan Proposals Map Impact on archaeological and				
heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area?		Development could represent an opportunity to enhance the area, which has a wider historical context.		
GIS/internal consultation				
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts			
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing				
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?		The site is currently used for commercial (retail) purpose. This is apparently marginal in terms of viability but in terms of planning a change of use		
Site visit/developer feedback		to residential may not be acceptable.		
<b>Ownership arrangements -</b> is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?		The site was formally promoted by its owners		
Site proforma/consultation		during the call for sites process.		
Is development of the site				
economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?		Development would incur demolition costs whilst the cost of earthworks could also be significant due to differences in ground levels, particularly if the scheme involves basement parking.		
Site visit/desktop work				

Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation Framework/education team		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, the expected pupil yield from the development cannot be adequately accommodated within the existing education system even with the contribution the site itself would be expected to make towards addressing this.	
Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional on-site infrastructure.	
Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ity		

**STAGE 3-** This part of the assessment considers the suitability and sustainability of sites for housing development. It will be used to compare the relative merits of each site.

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Issues relating to the capacity of schools and doctors surgeries will not influence the scoring in Stage 3. Any lack of capacity will be picked up at stage 2 and will be considered as appropriate in determining the most appropriate allocations.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<b>Nature of site</b> Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 Weighting x 2		
		10	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.		2	Wolverton Health Centre

GIS			
Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
preferred options.			Wesser Och est /lafeate Duchfield
GIS		3	Wyvern School (Infant; Bushfield Junior School would score 4)
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	over 2000m -1		
preferred options.			
GIS	Under 500m - 5	3	Radcliffe School
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4		
GIS	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	5	Wolverton
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
•	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	5	Tesco/Asda Wolverton
<b>Distance to employment area</b> (as defined on the proposals map)	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
	1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1	5	Wolverton/Old Wolverton
	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
Distance to play area	300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	4	
	Under 400m - 5	4	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1		
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade 3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1	5	
	Tetal accur		Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could
	Total score	62	deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
	L		

Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Redevelopment of the site could have some regenerative benefit in Wolverton town centre.
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	Anecdotally, yes.
Other supporting factors	None.
Conclusion: There is potentially s	ome added value in allocating the site.

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Site Name	Garages West of Rowle Close	
Reference Number	U86	
Settlement	Stantonbury	
Size (Ha)	0.57	

## Planning history/context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history. It is within the area of the emerging Stantonbury Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

In making decisions about the allocation of sites, the conclusions drawn in Stage 2 will need to be considered alongside the sustainability score of each site established at Stage 3. This will ensure that the deliverability of a site is taken into account in the allocations process alongside the relative suitability for development. Where an issue which affects the likelihood of a site being allocated for development, the landowner/developer/agent will be given an opportunity to investigate whether the constraint could be mitigated in a cost effective manner.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		The site is served by access already. However, consideration needs to be given to the impact on the properties on Ormonde between which the access road passes as residential development would lead to an intensification of traffic movements.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		The site is mostly hard-surfaced; development may represent an opportunity to incorporate more sustainable urban drainage systems.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		Redevelopment would improve the existing run- down nature of the garages on the site.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site is adjacent to existing residential properties, which are considered a compatible use.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character? Site visits		The site is not in open countryside.	
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)? Site visit/Landscape Character		The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
Assessment Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		Development would not harm any areas designated for biological or geological importance.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map		The site is predominantly used for garages although there is some open space surrounding these. This is informal amenity land and, under the terms of Policy L2 of the Local Plan, should not be redeveloped unless it is not serving a useful purpose in terms of appearance or landscaping, recreation or wildlife. The appearance and landscaping value of the open space is likely to be minimal given the poor appearance of the garages at its centre. However a recreation purpose may exist given the provision of play facilities. This value will need to be confirmed in consultation with local residents.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact upon any known heritage or archaeological assets.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The sites are currently used as garages for adjacent properties. Whilst several units appear unused, some residents may wish to retain their garages or need provision elsewhere.	
<b>Ownership arrangements -</b> is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner? Site proforma/consultation		The site was promoted by a third party during the call for sites process. The title-holders were contacted and confirmed the site is available subject to variations to the long lease terms that are attached to most of the properties.	
		A separate issue remains in that the surrounding green space is not registered to any owner although seems to have been transferred from public ownership (the HCA) to a housebuilder in the 1980s. The availability of this particular space will therefore need to be established separately.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		The site would require clearance although this is not expected to be costly. Variations to the leases of the tenants plus the involvement of several freeholders may undermine the viability of the overall scheme though.	

Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education? School Organisation		According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is potential to mitigate the potential pupil yield from site although this will need to be confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the exact number and location of all allocations are finalised.	
Framework/education team		Indised.	
Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare? CCG Health Partnerships team		According to NHS England data, the site does not have a health centre with capacity within 1km.	
Are there any other local infrastructure needs that could be accommodated on the site as part of a mixed use development? (e.g. local play area deficiency, a community facility, International Sporting City enabling development)		The site is not likely to be large enough to provide additional on-site infrastructure.	
Desktop study/internal consultation What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		1

**STAGE 3-** This part of the assessment considers the suitability and sustainability of sites for housing development. It will be used to compare the relative merits of each site.

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Issues relating to the capacity of schools and doctors surgeries will not influence the scoring in Stage 3. Any lack of capacity will be picked up at stage 2 and will be considered as appropriate in determining the most appropriate allocations.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		4	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.		3	Purbeck Health Centre

GIS			
Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 1500m - 1		Wood End First School (Infant;
GIS		3	Stanton School [junior] would score 2)
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
GIS		4	Stantonbury campus
	Under 500m - 5		
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	4	Stantonbury local centre
Distance to a supermarket	501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
GIS	over 2000m -1		
	Under 500m - 5	4	Great Linford Co-Op
Distance to employment area (as	501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1	_	
	Under 200m - 5	5	Linford Wood
Distance to play area	200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3		
GIS	400m-500m - 2		
	Over 500m - 1	5	
Distance to park/publically	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4		
accessible open space	500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2		
GIS	Over 700m - 1	5	Linford Wood
	50% or more in non-	5	
	agricultural - 5 50% or more is grade 4		
	or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade 3b - 3		
	50% or more is grade 3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1		
GIS	or grade 2- 1	5	
			Bracketed score reflects potential
	Total score	57	score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than
			existing ones.

STAGE 4 - Stage 4 considers whether there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets				
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	Development of the site would have some regenerative benefit.			
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	Yes			
Other supporting factors	None			
Conclusion: There is added value in allocating the site.				

Overall conclusions and recommendations

Site Name	Garages East of Rowle Close	
Reference Number	U87	
Settlement	Stantonbury	
Size (Ha)	0.53	

## Planning history/context

This section provides a brief overview of any significant planning history on the site (including relationship to Neighbourhood Plans where applicable) to identify any factors that may require particular focus in the assessment stages below.

The site has no planning history. It is within the area of the emerging Stantonbury Neighbourhood Plan.

**STAGE 1-** Answer yes, no or uncertain. This stage of the assessment rules out sites due to clear conflicts with national and local policy and any insurmountable environmental constraints. If the answer to any question below is 'yes' the site will be ruled out of further assessment and added to the list of ruled out sites. Where there is uncertainty, the site will be carried forward to the next stage of assessment but subject to more detailed assessment, specifically with statutory consultees.

Stage 1 Assessment	Outcome	Comment/conclusion
Is the site greenfield within the floodplain (more than 50%)	No	
Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	
Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	

**STAGE 2-** This stage involves a qualitative assessment of the deliverability each of the sites that pass Stage 1. The assessment records feedback on sites from statutory consultees and expert Council teams on specific issues that cannot be scored in the same way as the sustainability criteria considered at Stage 3. This stage will establish whether there are constraints to the availability of sites and the achievability of development and whether they can realistically be overcome in a timely manner. In considering deliverability, input from site promoters will be considered to ensure sites are genuinely available for development and that development could be implemented in a timely manner. Each category will be given a Red, Amber or Green rating depending on whether delivery issues are raised.

In making decisions about the allocation of sites, the conclusions drawn in Stage 2 will need to be considered alongside the sustainability score of each site established at Stage 3. This will ensure that the deliverability of a site is taken into account in the allocations process alongside the relative suitability for development. Where an issue which affects the likelihood of a site being allocated for development, the landowner/developer/agent will be given an opportunity to investigate whether the constraint could be mitigated in a cost effective manner.

Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints? In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.		The site is served by access already. However, consideration needs to be given to the impact on the properties on Ormonde between which the access road passes as residential development would lead to an intensification of traffic movements.	
Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities? Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans			
Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?		The site is mostly hard-surfaced; development may represent an opportunity to incorporate more sustainable urban drainage systems.	
Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue? Site Visits		Redevelopment would improve the existing run- down nature of the garages on the site.	

Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses? Site Visits/mapped information		The site is adjacent to existing residential properties, which are considered a compatible use.	
Is the site a logical extension to a settlement - where a site is in the open countryside, would it form a logical extension to a settlement in terms of enclosure character?		The site is not in open countryside.	
Site visits			
Environmental constraints			
Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?		The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.	
Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment Impact on areas of biological or			
<b>geological importance -</b> would development cause harm? GIS/Internal consultation		There is a notable species recorded on the site.	
Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities. Local Plan Proposals Map		The site is predominantly used for garages although there is some open space surrounding these. This is informal amenity land and, under the terms of Policy L2 of the Local Plan, should not be redeveloped unless it is not serving a useful purpose in terms of appearance or landscaping, recreation or wildlife. The appearance and landscaping value of the open space is likely to be minimal given the poor appearance of the garages at its centre. However a recreation and wildlife purpose may exist given the provision of play facilities and notable species recorded on the site. This value will need to be confirmed in consultation with local residents.	
Impact on archaeological and heritage assets - would there be potential harm through development of the site or would it provide an opportunity to enhance an area? GIS/internal consultation		Development of the site would not impact upon any known heritage or archaeological assets.	
Deliverability/availability constrain	ts		
Existing uses (e.g. ongoing			
employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential? Site visit/developer feedback		The sites are currently used as garages for adjacent properties. Whilst several units appear unused, some residents may wish to retain their garages or need provision elsewhere.	
<b>Ownership arrangements -</b> is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?		The site was promoted by a third party during the call for sites process. The title-holders were contacted and confirmed the site is available subject to variations to the long lease terms that are attached to most of the properties.	
Site proforma/consultation		A separate issue remains in that the surrounding green space is not registered to any owner although seems to have been transferred from public ownership (the HCA) to a housebuilder in the 1980s. The availability of this particular space will therefore need to be established separately.	
Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development? Site visit/desktop work		The site would require clearance although this is not expected to be costly. Variations to the leases of the tenants plus the involvement of several freeholders may undermine the viability of the	
Site visit/desktop work			

Do the local schools have			
capacity? Would development of		According to the schools sufficiency and access	
the site cause particular issues with		team, there is potential to mitigate the potential	
the provision of education?		pupil yield from site although this will need to be	
		confirmed on a case-by-case basis when the	
School Organisation		exact number and location of all allocations are	
Framework/education team		finalised.	
Do local healthcare facilities			
have capacity? Would			
development of the site cause		Assessing to NUIC England data the site data and	
particular issues with the provision		According to NHS England data, the site does not	
of healthcare?		have a health centre with capacity within 1km.	
CCG			
Health Partnerships team			
Are there any other local			
infrastructure needs that could			
be accommodated on the site as			
part of a mixed use			
development? (e.g. local play area		The site is not likely to be large enough to provide	
deficiency, a community facility,		additional on-site infrastructure.	
International Sporting City enabling			
development)			
developmenty			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
What level of recent housing			
development has there been in			
the local area? Is there still			
capacity in the local market?			
Would the development of the			
site for residential use impede			
the delivery of any known			
infrastructure projects?			
Dealstan atudu/internal concultation			
Desktop study/internal consultation			
Overall conclusions on deliverabili	ty		

**STAGE 3-** This part of the assessment considers the suitability and sustainability of sites for housing development. It will be used to compare the relative merits of each site.

The criteria are mainly based on distances. In each case, the distance will be based on a realistic route to each service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.

Issues relating to the capacity of schools and doctors surgeries will not influence the scoring in Stage 3. Any lack of capacity will be picked up at stage 2 and will be considered as appropriate in determining the most appropriate allocations.

Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
Nature of site Site visit/mapped information	100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1 <u>Weighting x 2</u>		
		4	
Relationship with settlement boundary	Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0		
Site visit/mapped information	Weighting x 2		
		10	
Distance to bus stop or train station – GIS	under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1		
		5	
Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
preferred options.		3	Purbeck Health Centre

GIS			
Distance to primary school	Under 250m - 5		
*capacity issues are dealt with in	250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1000m - 1500 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 1500m -1		Wood End First School (Infant;
GIS		3	Stanton School [junior] would score 2)
Distance to secondary school	Under 500m - 5	5	
*capacity issues are dealt with in	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
stage 2 – the outcomes of both	1501m - 2000 - 2		
stages will be used to determine preferred options.	over 2000m -1		
		4	Stantanhury commun
GIS	Under 500m - 5	4	Stantonbury campus
Distance to town/local centre	501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2		
	over 2000m -1	4	Stantonbury local centre
Distance to a supermarket	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
	1001 - 1500m - 3		
GIS	1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1		
		4	Great Linford Co-Op
Distance to employment area (as	Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4		
defined on the proposals map)	1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2		
Desktop study/GIS	over 2000m -1		
		5	Linford Wood
Distance to play area	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4		
	300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2		
GIS	Over 500m - 1	5	
	Under 400m - 5	5	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space	400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3		
GIS	600m-700m- 2		
	Over 700m - 1	5	Linford Wood
	50% or more in non- agricultural - 5		
	50% or more is grade 4 or 5 - 4		
	50% or more is grade		
	3b - 3 50% or more is grade		
	3a - 2		
Quality of agricultural land	50% or more is grade 1 or grade 2- 1		
GIS		5	
	Total score	57	Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.
			Shound ones.

<b>STAGE 4 -</b> Stage 4 considers wheth	er there is any added value to the allocation of the site over and above supporting the delivery of housing targets
Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City)	The site could have some regenerative benefit.
Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?	Yes
Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: There is added value	in allocating the site.

Overall conclusions and recommendations