

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

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 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 site 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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

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 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 site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>		<p>The site is already serviced.</p>	
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>Noise from the railway could inhibit the marketability of the site for residential use.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site would not impact any areas of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>Development on the site would not lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>There would be no impact on archaeological and heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site is allocated for commercial uses and is still used for this purpose. However, its location outside the town centre means that availability for residential development could potentially be supported.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>SHLAA records indicate that site is under lease for retail until 2017 after which the owner is happy to explore further uses.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>Site preparation would require clearance and demolition. There may also be remediation required.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is unlikely to be large enough to generate significant levels of infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Knowles Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Sir Herbert Leon Academy
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Bletchley/Fenny Stratford
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Tesco Watling Street
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Denbigh East

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Distance to play area GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	1	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	1	
Quality of agricultural land GIS	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	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)</p>	<p>The site could have some regenerative benefit.</p>
<p>Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Other supporting factors</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Conclusion: There is limited added value to allocating the site.</p>	

<p>Overall conclusions and recommendations</p>
<p>The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options.</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

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 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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		The site can be accessed along most of its perimeter.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>		<p>The site is surrounded by plots that are already fully serviced.</p>	
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site has a sloping topography although this would not unduly constrain development.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>There is a grid road within reasonable proximity suggesting noise could be an issue although there is equivalent development either side.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any area of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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).</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

		<p>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.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any designated heritage or archaeological assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site is owned and promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>The levels of the site may necessitate more earthworks than usual although this is not expected to limit viability.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is capacity to accommodate expected pupil yield from the development.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is probably too small to contribute significantly to local infrastructure needs.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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
<p>Nature of site</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	2	
<p>Relationship with settlement boundary</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	10	
<p>Distance to bus stop or train station –</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1</p>	4	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>CMK Medical Centre</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Summerfield School</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Stantonbury campus</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Central Milton Keynes</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Aldi Bradwell Common
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Rooksley
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	2	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	

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 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	Land is already identified as a reserve site for housing/specialist housing.
Conclusion: There is little added value to allocating this site.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations

The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

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

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 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.*

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 site 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			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		<p>There are access points readily available into the site.</p>	
<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>Anecdotally there are surface-water flooding issues on the site, it is expected that development would represent an opportunity to relieve these through appropriate drainage improvements.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>Part of the site forms an informal buffer zone for the Bedford-Milton Keynes waterway, which could limit development.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is bordered on 2 sides by grid roads, which could present noise issues on the periphery without appropriate mitigation.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known area of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is currently open space and partially accessible to the public however amenity value appears to be minimal.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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 (97th out of 118). Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site is owned by MKDP who have confirmed its availability and have commissioned a development brief to guide the principles of any potential development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is potentially large enough to accommodate a degree of local infrastructure on-site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site would lead to the loss of designated employment land.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Broughton Fields School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Oakgrove School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Kingston
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Kingston
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Northfield

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1 (5)</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>43 (47)</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)</p>	<p>The site is of sufficient size that it could support the delivery of its own play areas or other necessary infrastructure.</p>
<p>Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Other supporting factors</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Conclusion: The site's size should mean there is a degree of added value in allocating it for development.</p>	

<p>Overall conclusions and recommendations</p>
<p>The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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 site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should be achievable from Gurnards avenue or, depending on layout, individually by plot.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is flat and free of constraint.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to existing residential development, which is considered to be a compatible use.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any areas of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is currently publically accessible open space but it appears to have limited amenity value.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted as part of a previous SHLAA exercise.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a health centre with capacity within 1km</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate significant levels of on-site infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Jubilee Wood/The Willows
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Milton Keynes Academy
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Central Milton Keynes
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Oldbrook Lidl
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Central Milton Keynes

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	4	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	
	<p>Total score</p>	55	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)</p>	<p>Potentially some regeneration value</p>
<p>Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Other supporting factors</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Conclusion: There is limited added value to allocating the site.</p>	

<p>Overall conclusions and recommendations</p>
<p>The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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 site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		The site is readily accessed along most of its perimeter	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site appears developable without any specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is next to a grid road and some retail services, however there is an abundance of equivalent development that does not seem to suffer from noise.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any designated area of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space that is accessible to the public, however it appears to be of limited amenity value and lies at the edge of the grid square.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site currently has no existing use. It is allocated as a reserve site with a range of possible uses listed.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted as part of a previous SHLAA exercise.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure on-site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	5	Christ the Sower Ecumenical primary school
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Hazeley Academy
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Grange Farm local centre
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Grange Farm Budgens
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Crownhill

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	
	<p>Total score</p>	58	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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	None
Conclusion: No added value in allocating.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should be achievable from Breckland.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site itself is developable without any specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is set amongst an existing business park. This is not necessarily an incompatible use but given the lack of any other residential development the suitability of the site is questionable.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban with the exception of Linford Wood to the south.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to Linford Wood, which is an important habitat with several notable species that are recorded close to the site.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space that is technically publically accessible; the loss of this would be likely to be of negligible harm though given the more significant Linford Wood to the south.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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 (35th out of 118). Therefore a change of use to residential is likely to be unacceptable.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was made available as part of a previous SHLAA exercise.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is unlikely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure on-site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would impede the delivery of any further employment development that the site is allocated for.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	1	Stanton School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Stantonbury campus
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Stantonbury local centre
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Neath Hill Co-Op
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Linford Wood

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Distance to play area GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	1	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	5	
Quality of agricultural land GIS	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	45	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
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 (35th out of 118). Therefore a change of use to residential is likely to be unacceptable.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		The site should be easily accessible.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>The site is slightly sloping although this should not constrain drainage provision.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site appears developable without any specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to existing residential development, which is considered a compatible use.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not within but is close to a wildlife corridor.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was made available as part of the last SHLAA exercise.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, there is no health centre with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure on site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would mean the current commercial allocation is lost, although this does not currently appear to be harmful it would be a permanent impediment if required in the future.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	5	Christ the Sower Ecumenical primary school
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Hazeley Academy
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Grange Farm local centre
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Grange Farm Budgens
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Crownhill

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>3</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>56</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 to allocating	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should be achievable from Ladbroke Grove.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>The site adjoins a watercourse although it is expected that any flood-risk could be easily mitigated through appropriate drainage measures.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site has no site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site adjoins linear park and existing residential uses, both of which are considered compatible.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Part of the site is in a wildlife corridor</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>Site is currently open space although is not designated as such and seems to have only limited amenity value.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact on any known archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site is currently allocated for commercial purposes although there is an alternative centre towards the north and it is expected that the loss of land for this purpose would not be harmful.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted as part of a previous SHLAA exercise.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to deliver any additional infrastructure on-site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would mean the current commercial uses it is allocated for cannot be delivered in future.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	2	Monkston Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Oakgrove School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Kingston
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Tesco Kingston
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Kents Hill

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>41</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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	No
Conclusion: No added value to allocating.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
<p>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. The site is subject to a fresh planning application (Ref 16/01100/FUL) for residential purposes.</p>

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 site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should be readily available from Lilleshall Avenue.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>Consultation feedback suggests that surface water drainage could be an issue, although this should be easily rectified with appropriate mitigation measures.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site has no site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The neighbouring uses are residential and therefore compatible.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any area designated for biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use. It is allocated as a reserve site with housing and open space listed as potential uses.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site is owned and promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it is available for development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS data the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate significant amounts of new infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Monkston Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Oakgrove School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Kingston
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Kingston
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Kents Hill

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	4	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	
	<p>Total score</p>	51	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 to allocating	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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 site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>Development would need to respect the canal-side location.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>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 too.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>There is a pub towards the southern end of the site may present noise issues.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site represents an illogical long and thin extension into open countryside, however it is brownfield and redevelopment would not necessarily result in any additional harm.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the area is urban/rural fringe, which development would not necessarily harm. The site is also already developed, redevelopment could represent an opportunity to implement more appropriate design.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is in a wildlife corridor.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is not public open space.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site overlaps partially with a heritage site although redevelopment may represent an opportunity to enhance the historic canal.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site is currently in use for employment purposes. Due to its small size the value of this use was not assessed as part of the recent Employment Land Study but the requirement to relocate any businesses currently using the site would be likely to limit development.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site has been promoted as part of a previous SHLAA exercise.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>Site preparation would be likely to be costly although the value of canal-side dwellings would be likely to offset this.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate additional infrastructure on site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would impede its currently allocation as a rail/canal freight site.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	1	Queen Eleanor Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	The Radcliffe School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Wolverton
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Wolverton Tesco
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Wolverton Mill

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Distance to play area GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	2	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	3	Ouse Valley Park
Quality of agricultural land GIS	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	45	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 to allocating.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has at least one major constraint, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinders its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
<p>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.</p>

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 site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site does not appear to have any site-specific issues.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to a proposed community centre, a school and existing residential development, all of which are considered to be compatible uses although the design of the edge with the community centre may need careful consideration.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not harm any known area of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site would have no impact on any designated archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed the site is available for development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate significant amounts of new infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would need to respect the proposed community centre to the north although is not likely to directly impede this.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Longmeadow school
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Shenley Brook End school
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Westcroft
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Westcroft
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Shenley Wood

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Distance to play area GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	4	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	3	Howe Park Wood
Quality of agricultural land GIS	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	46	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 to allocating.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
The site is allocated for educational purposes on the proposals map. Part of the site was granted planning permission for an independent school (Ref 16/00542/FUL). The remainder of the site could still be available for housing

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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should be achievable from Daubeney gate.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site appears developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is set amongst existing residential development, which is considered a compatible use.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known area of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is currently open space and is accessible to the public however it is not formally designated for this purpose and its amenity value appears to be limited.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site overlaps partially with an archaeological notification area.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use. It has an existing allocation for education purposes. Although this has not been required to date, changing the allocation to residential would make it unavailable for future requirements.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site is owned by MKDP who have confirmed they support its availability for development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is capacity to accommodate expected pupil yield from the development.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a health centre with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site would likely be large enough to accommodate a degree of additional infrastructure on-site.</p>	

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would preclude the delivery of the site for education purposes as currently designated.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Christ the Sower Ecumenical Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Denbigh School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Shenley Church End local centre
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Grange Farm Budgens
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Crownhill

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>3</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>53</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 to allocating.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access would be available through the existing development to the south.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is relatively unconstrained although is heavily planted.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is set amongst existing residential development, which is considered a compatible use.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any areas designated for biological or geological importance, although consultation feedback has indicated the site has a degree of value to wildlife.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The owner has indicated the site may not be available for development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is unlikely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure on site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Queen Eleanor Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	The Radcliffe School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Stony Stratford
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Stony Stratford Budgens
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Wolverton Mill

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>43</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 to allocating	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has at least one major constraint, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinders its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>Site is partially in Flood Risk Zone 2. This could potentially be mitigated through appropriate drainage measures or developing on only part the site.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>Site is adjacent to a linear park and wildlife corridor. It is also overlooked extensively by neighbouring properties.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is bordered by existing residential development, which is considered a compatible use.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site would represent a logical 'rounding off' of the settlement with the river representing a natural boundary to development..</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>Depending on the screening and landscaping any potential scheme incorporates, development could harm the landscape to the west and south, particularly as immediately adjoining the site is an attractive linear park setting.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>There are notable species recorded on the site and an adjacent wildlife corridor.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site itself is not publically accessible, however, development would enclose the path that runs along its boundary and make the immediate area less open. The amenity value of the site in terms of its appearance would therefore potentially be harmed by development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact any known archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site owner has confirmed it is available now.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not large enough to accommodate significant levels of new infrastructure on site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	2	Queen Eleanor Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Radcliffe School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Stony Stratford
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Stony Stratford Budgens
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Wolverton Mill

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	4	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	
	<p>Total score</p>	41	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 to allocating.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has two major constraints, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinders its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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	

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is relatively unconstrained.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is neighbored by employment uses, open countryside and existing residential development, which should generally be compatible uses.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>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 although this conclusion will be strengthened when the SLA parcel to the east has been completed.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the area is defined by the rural/urban fringe, which should not be harmed in principle by development on the site. However, as a relatively large and open area, impact should be minimised with appropriate design.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is currently open although is not publically accessible outside of any rights of way.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site is owned by the HCA who have confirmed it is available now.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>The site is over 1km away from a surgery that has capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is potentially large enough to accommodate a degree of additional infrastructure on-site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Wavendon Gate school
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Walton High
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Kingston
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Tesco Kingston
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Brinklow/Wavendon Tower

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 (5)	Wavendon Gate
Quality of agricultural land GIS	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	46 (48)	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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	Early allocation could allow build-out alongside or shortly after SLA, minimising construction disruption.
Conclusion: Limited added value to allocating.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should be achievable from either Wimborne Crescent or Barnsdale Drive (but not both).	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>Supermarket service road could lead to noise and traffic issues (depending on where access is taken).</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Planning history suggests appropriate mitigation measures would need to be incorporated for great crested newts and other birds and mammals.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is undeveloped but does not appear to serve any open space or amenity purpose.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not harm any known heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site is allocated for commercial purposes on the proposals map as part of the wider District Centre. However it has not come forward for this purpose and was recently characterised as 'backland' by a planning inspector, indicating that commercial use may no longer be appropriate or viable.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was unsuccessfully brought forward for an alternative scheme, indicating that the owner is open to the principle of development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>The design of the site may need to incorporate extra measures to mitigate against noise from the supermarket service yard, this may limit the amount of developable land and therefore viability.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate significant amounts of new infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Developing the site for residential purposes would preclude the provision of commercial uses on the site, although this has not come forward for that purpose and is unlikely to do so in future.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Oxley Park Academy
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Shenley Brook End School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Westcroft
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Westcroft Morrisons
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Shenley Wood

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	4	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	
	<p>Total score</p>	53	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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	No
Conclusion: No added value to allocating.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access is readily available from Cranborne Avenue.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>The site's sloping topography may influence the most appropriate sustainable urban drainage system for the site.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>There is a grid road reserve adjacent to the site that may limit development; there is also a slope towards the southern corner of the site.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The neighbouring uses are predominantly residential, which is considered compatible.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known area of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is not allocated as public open space but is accessible and potentially has a degree of amenity value.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any designated archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site does not have an existing use although is allocated as a reserve site with housing listed as one potential use.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed its availability and commissioned a development brief to guide the principles of any potential development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is unlikely to be large enough to provide significant on-site infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Oxley Park Academy
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Shenley Brook End School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Westcroft
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Westcroft
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Shenley Wood

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Distance to play area GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	3	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	5	Westcroft
Quality of agricultural land GIS	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	46	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		The site covers a large area in a historic town centre that would be likely to increase congestion without appropriate design and mitigation.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>		<p>Site is already serviced</p>	
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>Site is brownfield land with opportunity to improve current drainage.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>Potentially contamination.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is located between the existing town centre, commercial and retail uses and the canal to the north. These are expected to be compatible uses, particularly as the site appears large enough to be able to accommodate buffers where necessary.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>There is a notable bird species recorded on the site.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>Redevelopment would not lead to the loss of public open space and may increase provision.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is within a conservation area and itself is an historic use with heritage value. This should be incorporated into any redevelopment scheme.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site is subject to a live planning application and is therefore definitely available.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>As a brownfield site the land is more likely to require remediation or other site preparation expenditure.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is likely to be large enough to accommodate additional infrastructure on site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability Deliverability constraints could potentially be overcome in longer term.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Wyvern/Bushfield School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	The Radcliffe School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Wolverton Town Centre
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Wolverton Tesco/Asda
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Old Wolverton

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Distance to play area GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	2 (5)	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	1 (5)	Wolverton sports ground
Quality of agricultural land GIS	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	58 (65)	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)</p>	<p>Regeneration of Wolverton town centre</p>
<p>Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Other supporting factors</p>	<p>There is strong local support for sensitive redevelopment as indicated by the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<p>Conclusion: There is added value to allocating the site.</p>	

<p>Overall conclusions and recommendations</p>
<p>The site has one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. The site possibly suitable in longer term.</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should be achievable from Stratford road.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>There is a watercourse on the site, which should be easily incorporated into appropriate drainage measures.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site has no site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site adjoins employment development to the east, which should not be an incompatible use. However, to the west is the A5, which may present noise issues on certain parts of the site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known areas of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space although not publically accessible.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted during a previous SHLAA exercise.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is potentially large enough to accommodate a degree of additional infrastructure on-site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site for residential purposes would preclude any opportunity to deliver the site for its current employment allocation.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability constraints could potentially be overcome in longer term.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	2	Queen Eleanor school
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Radcliffe school
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Stony Stratford
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Wolverton Tesco
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Wolverton Mill

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>47</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 to allocating	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. The site possibly suitable in longer term.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access is achievable from various points although development is likely to have a strategic impact on the level crossing at the northeast tip of the site and the major trunk road (A5) junction to the south.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is flat and relatively unconstrained.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is bordered by roads and the railway, both of which could present noise and pollution issues along the edge of the site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>Whilst the boundaries of the site may represent a logical 'triangle' of land between existing roads (particularly when considered alongside adjoining parcels), there is very little enclosure character in relation to the existing settlement. The site would therefore represent a harmful intrusion into open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the area is rural/urban fringe, which would not necessarily be harmed in principle by development although there is an area of attractive landscape directly to the south of the site, which may be impacted.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact on any areas designated for biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space although not publically accessible other than via rights of way.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is partially covered by an archaeological notification area.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use other than agriculture.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site has been promoted through the SHLAA process.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>There are no health facilities within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is large enough to accommodate a significant amount of infrastructure on-site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	2 (5)	Bow Brickhill C of E School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Walton High
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Bletchley/Fenny Stratford
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Bletchley Tesco
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4 (5)	Caldecotte/Tilbrook

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Distance to play area GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	2 (5)	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	5	The site adjoins open countryside.
Quality of agricultural land GIS	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	3	
	Total score	30 (42)	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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: There is no added value in allocating the site.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has a major constraint, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinders its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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.

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 site 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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No (Yes, but only in the medium term)	The site is physically separate from the urban area although once the SLA has been built out it will adjoin the revised 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.

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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access would be achievable from Lower End Road although this is rural in nature and may not be appropriate.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is relatively unconstrained and developable.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site adjoins open countryside and a small amount of existing residential development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not a logical extension to the settlement in terms of enclosure character. Even once the SLA has been built out, development of the site would represent a noticeable intrusion into open countryside beyond the accepted boundary of Lower End Road.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The site is not in an area of attractive landscape and there is other (limited) development along Lower End Road. However, the landscape character of the area is predominantly rural, which development of the site would harm.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known areas of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is currently open space although is not publically accessible.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact any known archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted to the last Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	1	St Mary's, Wavendon (schools in the SLA are likely to be closer)
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Walton High (schools in the SLA are likely to be closer)
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Woburn Sands
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>*Defined by the Institute of Grocery Distribution as an outlet larger than 3000 sq. feet.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Tesco Kingston
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Magna Park

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Distance to play area GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	1	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	1	
Quality of agricultural land GIS	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	3	Unknown, assumed to be 3b as 'average'
	Total score	16	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has a major constraint, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinders its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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 site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No (Yes, but only in the medium	The site is physically separate from the urban area although once the SLA has been built out it will

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

	term)	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.

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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access would be achievable from Lower End Road although this is rural in nature and may not be appropriate.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to a sewage works, which could present odour issues.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site adjoins open countryside and a small amount of existing residential development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not a logical extension to the settlement in terms of enclosure character. Even once the SLA has been built out, development of the site would represent a noticeable intrusion into open countryside beyond the accepted boundary of Lower End Road.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The site is not in an area of attractive landscape and there is other (limited) development along Lower End Road. However, the landscape character of the area is predominantly rural, which development of the site would harm.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known areas of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is currently open space although is not publically accessible.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>There are two listed buildings adjoining the site, the setting of which may be harmed by development.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted to the last Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	1	St Mary's, Wavendon (schools in the SLA are likely to be closer)
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Walton High (schools in the SLA are likely to be closer)
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Woburn Sands
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>*Defined by the Institute of Grocery Distribution as an outlet larger than 3000 sq. feet.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Tesco Kingston
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Magna Park

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Distance to play area GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	1	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	1	
Quality of agricultural land GIS	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	3	Unknown, assumed to be 3b as 'average'
	Total score	18	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has a major constraint, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinders its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site for fewer than 10 dwellings	No	
Is the site 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	

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is relatively unconstrained.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The railway line to the north may constrain development by virtue of noise or pollution.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>Development would represent a noticeable intrusion into open countryside and present coalescence issues between Bow Brickhill and the urban area of Milton Keynes.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the area is rural/urban fringe. However, there is a large area of attractive landscape to the south of the site that would potentially be impacted by development.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known area of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The land is open space although not publically accessible.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not harm any known archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use other than agriculture.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted by its owners.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is potentially large enough to provide some new infrastructure on site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to the East-West Rail project, which may require access or land-take from the site. However, this would probably only affect a limited portion of the site and would occur prior to any potential development anyway.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Bow Brickhill C of E school
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Walton High
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Bletchley/Fenny Stratford
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Tesco Bletchley
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Caldecotte/Tilbrook

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Distance to play area 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	5	Site edges the open countryside
Quality of agricultural land GIS	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	2	
Total score		31 (35)	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has a major constraint, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinders its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access from Little Linford lane is unlikely to be suitable for any significant amount of new development.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>Flooding is an issue on part of the site and would limit development. However, the site is large enough to accommodate appropriate drainage measures.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site runs parallel to the M1 motorway which will severely limit development along its eastern edge and is likely to adversely impact the marketability and suitability of the development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is long and thin in nature and would represent a notable extrusion into open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>Consideration of the site at previous enquiries has found that landscape impacts have been a major issue for the site.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to an important wildlife site and is also covered by a wildlife corridor.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space but not publically accessible with the exception of any rights of way. It is, however, allocated as a future linear park extension.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use other than agriculture.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site has been formally promoted by its owner who confirms it is available for development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is potentially large enough to accommodate additional infrastructure on site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would impede allocated linear park extension and may preclude any potential motorway improvements in the future.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	2	Portfields Combined School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Ousedale School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Newport Pagnell town centre
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Newport Pagnell Co-Op
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Blakelands

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1 (5)</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Site is located on land currently designated as linear park extension.</p>
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Unknown – assumed to be 3b as average</p>
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>28 (34)</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 to allocating.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has numerous major constraints, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinder its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		There is a grid road reserve to the east of the site through which access could be facilitated.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>No site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is neighbored by open countryside, existing residential development and a school, all of which are considered to be compatible in principle.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site would not form a logical extension to the settlement in terms of enclosure character. Whilst part of the site could be 'naturally' developed in 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 conclusion could potentially be revised once the full extent of the western expansion area to the north has been built out.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The site does not lie within an area of attractive landscape but development would breach a natural ridge that exists between the site and the western edge of the city. This would harm the character of the Whaddon valley, as concluded by the Local Plan inspector in 2005.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is bordered extensively by wildlife corridors with several notable species recorded in the vicinity of the site.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space but not publically accessible (with the exception of rights of way).</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets although the grade II listed Shenley Dens Farmhouse lies immediately to the north of the site, the setting of which would need to be respected.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use other than agriculture</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site has been formally promoted by its owner through the SHLAA process and the freehold is understood to be controlled by a housebuilder.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data the site is not within 1km of a surgery with capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is of sufficient size that it could accommodate additional infrastructure on-site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Christ the Sower Ecumenical School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	The Hazeley academy
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Westcroft District Centre
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Budgens Grange Farm
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Crownhill

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1 (5)</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Unknown – assumed to be 3b as average.</p>
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>34 (40)</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 to allocating this site.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has two major constraints, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinder its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should be achievable from Ridgeway.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site has an oil pipeline running beneath it, which could restrict or limit development.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any areas designated for biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space although not publically accessible (except for any rights of way).</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact on any known heritage or archaeological asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site has been formally promoted to the SHLAA process and confirmed to be available for development (potentially in a bespoke low-density form).</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>There is a high-pressure oil pipeline beneath the site, in respect of which easements or other requirements may restrict land budget and deliverability.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability constraints could potentially be overcome in longer term.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Queen Eleanor School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Radcliffe School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Stony Stratford
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Budgens Stony Stratford
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Wolverton Mill

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Unknown – assumed to be 3b as average</p>
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>35</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 to allocating.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. The site possibly suitable in longer term.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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.

<i>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.</i>		
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Owners confirmed that they also own land necessary for footpath link.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>The site is currently hard-surfaced; development may provide an opportunity to improve drainage.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to the railway and also industrial uses, both of which could limit the suitability and/or marketability of residential uses if not designed sensitively.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>Site is not in open countryside</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact on any areas of biological or geological importance. There is a wildlife corridor associated with the railway to the east of the site – development would represent to enhance rather than harm this.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is not publically accessible open space.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact on any archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site is designated as a lorry park although appears underused in this regard. The neighbouring industrial units may use it informally for storage or turning but the extant permission for an office block indicates this is not an essential use.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted by the ward member for the area. Owner has subsequently confirmed that they do wish the site to be considered for residential development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is capacity to accommodate expected pupil yield from the development.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is likely to be too small to contribute significantly to local infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to the railway that will be upgraded as part of the East-West Rail project, access over the site may be required for construction even if no land is taken.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	1	Knowles Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Lord Grey School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Bletchley town centre
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Duncombe Street Sainsburys
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Wellington Place

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	
	<p>Total score</p>	59	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>There are no site-specific constraints to development.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site adjoins existing residential development, Stoke Road and the canal. The canal-side would potentially be a particularly attractive and compatible neighbouring use.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is currently open space and is publically accessible although does not appear to have any amenity value.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known heritage or archaeological asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted by MKDP during the call-for-sites process and confirmed to be available within the next 5 years.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>It is unlikely the site would be able to contribute significantly to infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Water Hall Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Sir Herbert Leon Academy
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Score is based on Serpentine Court, which is of poor quality and likely to be redeveloped. Bletchley/Fenny Stratford town centre would score 2.
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Sainsburys Brunel Centre
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Barton Road

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Total score</p>		<p>51</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)</p>	<p>The site would support the delivery of the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood including aspects of wider regeneration.</p>
<p>Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Other supporting factors</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Conclusion: There is added value in allocating the site.</p>	

<p>Overall conclusions and recommendations</p>
<p> </p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>Drainage will need to respect the canal to the east.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>There could be contamination on the site that requires remediation due to its current use as a builders merchant.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is generally set amongst existing residential development, which would make redevelopment of the site appropriate. The canal side would also provide attractive opportunities whilst the site is also separated from the railway, which should minimise noise and pollution issues..</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to the wildlife corridor associated with the canal but redevelopment probably represents an opportunity to enhance rather than harm this.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is not currently public open space.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Redevelopment of the site may represent an opportunity to enhance the heritage of the canal.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site is currently used by a builders merchant that would potentially require relocation before the site became available.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was not originally promoted by the owner. However, following contact they confirmed that they do wish the site to be considered.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>The site would require clearance and potentially remediation. The canal frontage represents an opportunity to enhance the value of the scheme but may hinder construction and the land budget.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site could potentially incorporate a degree of additional infrastructure on-site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Access to and construction of the site would be affected by the East-West Rail upgrade but development of the site is not likely to impede the actual delivery of East-West Rail.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Knowles Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Sir Herbert Leon Academy
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Fenny Stratford
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Tesco Watling Street
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Denbigh East

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>51</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access is achievable from Harrowden.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site appears to be free of any constraints that could prevent or limit development.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjoined by existing residential properties, which is considered a compatible use.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to and partially covered by a wildlife corridor, which may need to be reflected in any potential scheme.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact any archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it is available immediately.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>There do not appear to be any factors that would limit the viability of development.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to generate significant levels of on-site infrastructure.</p>	

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	5	Pepper Hill School (Infant, Stanton School [Junior] would score 3)
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Stantonbury campus
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Stantonbury local centre
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Wolverton Asda
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Blundells road, Bradville

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	
	<p>Total score</p>	50	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Accessible is readily available from Caldecotte Lake drive (or roundabout).	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site does not appear to have any constraints that would prevent or limit development.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is covered by a wildlife corridor (rail).</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it is available immediately.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is unlikely to be sizeable enough to provide significant levels of additional infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability constraints could potentially be overcome in longer term.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	2	Bow Brickhill CofE School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Walton High School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Walnut Tree
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Asda Denbigh
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Caldecotte/Tilbrook

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	4	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	
	<p>Total score</p>	42	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. The site possibly suitable in longer term.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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 Alliance 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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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	

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>The site is mostly paved; development may represent an opportunity to provide Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

		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.	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		Development would not harm any known archaeological or heritage assets, although the bus station is a listed building in reasonable proximity to the site.	
Deliverability/availability constraints			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site is owned by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who confirm the site is available within the next 5 years.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.</p>	

<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site could incorporate other mixed-uses and infrastructure if deemed appropriate in this strategic location between the station and city centre.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would mean it cannot be used in future for any works associated with the train station or other transport interchange.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability constraints could potentially be overcome in longer term.</p>			

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<i>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.</i>			
Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<p>Nature of site</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	6	Two squares of 'greenfield' exist within the otherwise paved site.
<p>Relationship with settlement boundary</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	10	
<p>Distance to bus stop or train station –</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1</p>	5	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>CMK Medical Centre</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Jubilee Wood Primary School</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Milton Keynes Academy</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Central Milton Keynes</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Aldi Bradwell Common</p>
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Central Milton Keynes</p>
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Teardrop lakes</p>
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	

Total score	47	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?	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

The site has one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. The site possibly suitable in longer term.

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

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 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 Neighbourhood Plan, which designates the site as 'classic infrastructure'.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 site 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
--------------------	------------	---------	----------------------------------------------------

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Physical constraints			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>The site is hard-surfaced, development may represent an opportunity to incorporate sustainable urban drainage systems.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site itself is developable with few site-specific constraints other than those outlined elsewhere in this assessment.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any areas of biological or geological importance.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is publically accessible but is used for parking rather than genuine 'open space'.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development could affect the setting of the listed shopping building to the west.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>It is also designated as 'classic infrastructure' in the CMK Business Neighbourhood Plan and should therefore be protected unless exceptional development is proposed.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site has been promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it will be available within the next 5 years.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, there are no health centres with capacity within 1km of the site.</p>	

<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Assuming a high density, the site is potentially viable enough to retain or add to certain infrastructure requirements.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<i>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.</i>			
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>	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	5	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Fishermead Medical Centre</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Southwood School/Downs Barn School</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Milton Keynes Academy</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Central Milton Keynes</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Marks & Spencers Central Milton Keynes
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Central Milton Keynes
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	3	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	

Total score	58	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	None
Conclusion: No added value in allocating	

Overall conclusions and recommendations

The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options.

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

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 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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 site 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
--------------------	------------	---------	----------------------------------------------------

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is bordered by existing residential development, which is considered to be a compatible use.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is covered by a wildlife (wood) corridor that may need to be reflected in any potential scheme.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is not public open space.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by its owner.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>The site's small size may mean viability is an issue. If demolition is required then this will also increase the site preparation costs.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there is capacity to accommodate expected pupil yield from the development.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.</p>	

<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is probably too small to contribute to any existing infrastructure needs.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<i>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.</i>			
Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<p>Nature of site</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	10	
<p>Relationship with settlement boundary</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	10	
<p>Distance to bus stop or train station –</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1</p>	4	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The Grove Surgery</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>New Chapter Primary School</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Milton Keynes Academy</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Coffee Hall Local Centre</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Lidl Oldbrook</p>
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Bleak Hall</p>
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	

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

Overall conclusions and recommendations

The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options.

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 site 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	

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Physical constraints			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		<p>Access is likely to be achievable although the site would be likely to have a significant effect on the major trunk road junction to the east.</p>	
<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site generally appears developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is set between two busy roads, which could present marketability issues in terms of noise and pollution.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>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.</p>	<p>This assessment could potentially change if adjacent sites are brought forward.</p>
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The site would extend towards (although not within) an area of attractive landscape.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is covered by two distinct wildlife corridors associated with adjoining roads.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is currently open although is not publically accessible (with the exception of rights of way).</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is partially covered by a Scheduled Ancient Monument.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use other than agriculture.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by its owner.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site's nearest health facilities are already operating over capacity.</p>	

<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is likely to be large enough to accommodate a degree of additional infrastructure on-site</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is positioned between major roads and junctions that may require upgrading in the future.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<i>service that residents would reasonably be expected to take.</i>			
<i>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.</i>			
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>	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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>The Red House Surgery</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Knowles Primary School</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Sir Herbert Leon Academy</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Bletchley/Fenny Stratford</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Tesco Watling Street</p>
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Fenny Stratford</p>
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1 (5)</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>3 (5)</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Significant portion is 3b</p>

Total score	25 (31)	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	None
Conclusion: No added value in allocating.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
<p>The site has a major constraint, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinders its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.</p>

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

Planning history/context
<p><i>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.</i></p>
<p>The site has no planning history and is not within any designated Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 site 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.

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
--------------------	------------	---------	----------------------------------------------------

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjoined by the local road network and limited residential development. The road could present noise and pollution issues.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>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.</p>	<p>This assessment could potentially change if adjacent sites are brought forward.</p>
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The site would adjoin an area of attractive landscape, which would potentially be harmed by development.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is partially covered by a wildlife corridor and also two notable species (plant and mammal) are recorded.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space although not publically accessible (except for any rights of way).</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is covered by an archaeological notification area.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use other than agriculture.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>The site does not have a health centre with capacity within 1km.</p>	

<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to generate significant levels of on-site infrastructure.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site adjoins a major road junction that may require upgrading in the future.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<i>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.</i>			
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>	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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Red House Surgery</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Bow Brickhill CE Primary School</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Sir Herbert Leon Academy</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Bletchley/Fenny Stratford</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Tesco Watling Street</p>
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Caldecotte</p>
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1 (5)</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Just under 50% is 3a</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Total score	17 (21)	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	None
Conclusion: No added value in allocating	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
<p>The site has a major constraint, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinders its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.</p>

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

Planning history/context
<p><i>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.</i></p>
<p>The site has no planning history and is not within any designated neighbourhood plan area.</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 site 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.

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
--------------------	------------	---------	----------------------------------------------------

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site adjoins the A5 which may present noise and pollution issues that would limit suitability/marketability.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>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.</p>	<p>This assessment could potentially change if adjacent sites are brought forward.</p>
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>There is a wildlife corridor that runs through the site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space although not publically accessible (other than any rights of way).</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is covered by an archaeological notification area.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site's only existing use is agriculture.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>The site does not have any health facilities within 1km that have capacity.</p>	

<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is potentially large enough to accommodate a degree of infrastructure on-site.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The Red House Surgery</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Bow Brickhill CE Primary School</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Sir Herbert Leon Academy</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Bletchley/Fenny Stratford</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Tesco Watling Street</p>
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Caldecotte</p>
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1 (5)</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>1 (5)</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>2</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Total score	14 (22)	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	None
Conclusion: No added value in allocating	

Overall conclusions and recommendations

The site has a major constraint, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinders its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.

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

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 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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 site 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.*

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
--------------------	------------	---------	----------------------------------------------------

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>There are no neighbouring uses.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The western edge of the WEA follows a natural landscape ridge that development of this site would breach.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site would not impact on any area of biological or geological importance.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space although not publically accessible (with the exception of any rights of way).</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site is not within 1km of a surgery with capacity.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is unlikely to be large enough to accommodate significant levels of infrastructure.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Wolverton Health Centre (health centres in the WEA are likely to be closer)</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Christ the Sower Ecumenical Primary School (schools in the WEA are likely to be closer)</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The Hazeley Academy (schools in the WEA are likely to be closer)</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Stony Stratford town centre</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Morrisons Westcroft</p>
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Kiln Farm</p>
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>No distinction between 3a and 3b – score assumed to be 3 as an ‘average’.</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Total score	14	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	None
Conclusion: There is no added value in allocating the site.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
<p>The site has two major constraints, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinder its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.</p>

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

Planning history/context
<p><i>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.</i></p>
<p>The site has no planning history and is not part of any designated neighbourhood plan area.</p>

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 site 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.

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>There are no neighbouring uses.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The western edge of the WEA follows a natural landscape ridge that development of this site would breach.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site would not impact on any area of biological or geological importance.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space although not publically accessible (with the exception of any rights of way).</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site is not within 1km of a surgery with capacity.</p>	

<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is unlikely to be large enough to accommodate significant levels of infrastructure.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<i>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.</i>			
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>	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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Wolverton Health Centre (health centres in the WEA are likely to be closer)</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Christ the Sower Ecumenical Primary School (schools in the WEA are likely to be closer)</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The Hazeley Academy (schools in the WEA are likely to be closer)</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Stony Stratford town centre</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Morrisons Westcroft</p>
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Kiln Farm</p>
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>No distinction between 3a and 3b – score assumed to be 3 as an ‘average’.</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Total score	14	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	None
Conclusion: There is no added value in allocating the site.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
<p>The site has two major constraints, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinder its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No (Yes, but only in the medium term)	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.

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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access to the site would need to be off Lower End Road which is rural in nature and unlikely to be suitable.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The southern edge of the site adjoins a sewerage works, which may present odour issues that limit the marketability of the site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not a logical extension to the settlement in terms of enclosure character. Even once the SLA has been built out, development of the site would represent a noticeable intrusion into open countryside beyond the accepted boundary of Lower End Road.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The site is not in an area of attractive landscape and there is other (limited) development along Lower End Road. However, the landscape character of the area is predominantly rural, which development of the site would harm.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would not impact upon any areas designated for biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is currently open although is not publically accessible (with the exception of any rights of way).</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>There is a listed building in the north-east corner of the site, the setting of which development would need to respect.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to generate any additional infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	1	St Mary's, Wavendon (schools in the SLA are likely to be closer)
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Walton High (schools in the SLA are likely to be closer)
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Woburn Sands
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Tesco Kingston
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Magna Park

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	1	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	1	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	3	Unknown (assumed to be 3 as an 'average').
	<p>Total score</p>	19	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has a major constraint, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinders its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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 site 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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

		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.

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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>Neighbouring uses include agriculture, existing dwellings and rural roads, all of which are considered to be compatible uses.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not a logical extension to the settlement in terms of enclosure character. Even once the SLA has been built out, development of the site would represent a noticeable intrusion into open countryside beyond the accepted boundary of Lower End Road.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The site is not in an area of attractive landscape and there is other (limited) development along Lower End Road. However, the landscape character of the area is predominantly rural, which development of the site would harm.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would not impact upon any areas designated for biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is currently open although is not publically accessible (with the exception of any rights of way).</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site's existing use is as a private horse stables.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was submitted by its part-owner. Confirmation will be required that the whole site is available.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>The nearest health facilities are over 1km away.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is unlikely to be large enough to accommodate any additional infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	1	St Mary's Wavendon (schools in the SLA are likely to be closer)
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Walton High (schools in the SLA are likely to be closer)
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Woburn Sands
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	1	Tesco Kingston
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Magna Park

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Distance to play area GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	1	
Distance to park/publically accessible open space GIS	Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1	1	
Quality of agricultural land GIS	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	3	Unknown (assumed to be 3 as an 'average').
	Total score	20	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has a major constraint, other than the provision of healthcare, which significantly hinders its suitability and/or deliverability. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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 site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----	--

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		<p>Access is easily achievable from Timbold Drive or Hammerwood Gate. Bus service provision, redways and traffic calming may all need to be enhanced.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>Small parts of the site have a low risk for surface water flooding. This is likely to be easily managed through appropriate mitigation measures.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to a higher education facility and hotel, both of which are considered compatible uses.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would not impact upon any areas of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space and is technically accessible by the general public. However it is allocated as commercial 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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact any known archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use. However it is allocated for commercial purposes. This allocation was partially implemented with the adjacent hotel and it is unlikely the remainder will be required. However, any change to residential may incorporate an element of commercial development as a mixed use scheme.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it is available immediately.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>Plans for new schools to the north of the site are being made in expectation that pupil yield from this site could be accommodated.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is allocated for commercial purposes so consideration needs to be given whether the site is required to deliver this or other infrastructure.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	4 (5)	<p>Kents Hill Primary (Infant only, Heronsgate School [junior] would score 3)</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3 (5)	<p>Walton High</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	<p>Walnut Tree</p>
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	<p>Waitrose Oakgrove</p>
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	<p>Kents Hill</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1 (5)</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>3 (5)</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>47 (56)</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Site Name	Kents Hill site C
Reference Number	U66

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Settlement	Kents Hill
Size (Ha)	5.11

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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 site 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	

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		<p>Access is easily achievable from Timbold Drive although traffic calming may be required. Redway and bus service provision will need to be enhanced.</p>	
<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site adjoins existing residential properties, open space, and a higher education facility, all of which are considered to be compatible uses.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>There are several notable species recorded close to the site.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it is available immediately.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>Plans for new schools to the north of the site are being made in expectation that pupil yield from this site could be accommodated.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is allocated for higher education facilities. Residential development would therefore impede the future delivery of this allocation if required.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<p>Nature of site</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	2	
<p>Relationship with settlement boundary</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	10	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to bus stop or train station –</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Walnut Tree Health Centre</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>3 (5)</p>	<p>Kents Hill School (infant only – Heronsgate School [junior] would score 1)</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3 (5)</p>	<p>Walton High (scores 2 or 3 depending on route)</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Walnut Tree</p>
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Waitrose Oakgrove</p>
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Kents Hill</p>
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1 (5)</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Quality of agricultural land GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Total score</p>		<p>47 (55)</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

<p>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</p>	
<p>Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?</p>	<p>No</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: No added value in allocating	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Site Name	Kents Hill site D1
Reference Number	U67
Settlement	Kents Hill
Size (Ha)	2.05

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 site 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	

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		<p>Access is easily achievable from Timbold Drive. Bus service and redway provision will both need to be addressed along with potential traffic calming.</p>	
<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to existing residential development, hotel, and higher education facility. All of which are considered compatible uses.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would not impact upon any areas of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact any known archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership who have confirmed it is available immediately.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>According to the schools sufficiency and access team, there will be capacity to accommodate expected pupil yield from the development.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, there is no surgery with capacity within 1km of the site.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>When considered with its adjoining parcels, the site will be large enough to sustain new infrastructure. For instance, according to the draft development brief for the site, new schools are already scheduled to be provided.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is allocated for higher education purposes, which would be lost once delivered for residential development.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<p>Nature of site</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	2	
<p>Relationship with settlement boundary</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	10	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to bus stop or train station –</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Walnut Tree Health Centre</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>4 (5)</p>	<p>Kents Hill Primary (Infant only, Heronsgate School [junior] would score 3)</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3 (5)</p>	<p>Walton High</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Walnut Tree
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Waitrose Oakgrove
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Kents Hill
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	1 (4)	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	3 (5)	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Total score</p>		<p>47 (56)</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

<p>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</p>	
<p>Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?</p>	<p>No</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Other supporting factors	None
Conclusion: No added value in allocating.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 site 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	

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable with no site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would not harm any area of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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 (98th out of 118). Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership during the call for sites process.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

		<p>finalised.</p> <p>This is particularly true in the case of this site as it is proposed for a new school itself.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>When considered with adjoining parcels the site would most likely be large enough to accommodate a degree of additional infrastructure.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would impede the delivery of a proposed new secondary school.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<p>Nature of site</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	<p>2</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Relationship with settlement boundary</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	<p>10</p>	
<p>Distance to bus stop or train station –</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Walnut Tree Health Centre</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Monkston Primary School</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Oakgrove</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Kingston</p>
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Tesco Kingston</p>
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Kents Hill</p>
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>4 (5)</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 GIS	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.

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Overall conclusions and recommendations
<p>The site has more than one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. Unsuitable as preferred options.</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should be easily achievable from Timbold Drive.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable with no site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>There is a notable plant species recorded on the site.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site would not impact upon any designated archaeological or heritage assets although there appears to be an old road running through the site, the historical importance of which will need to be considered.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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 (98th out of 118). Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership during the call for sites process.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>This is particularly true in the case of this site as it is proposed for a new school itself.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>When considered with adjoining parcels the site would most likely be large enough to accommodate a degree of additional infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would impede the delivery of a proposed new secondary school.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Monkston Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Oakgrove
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Kingston
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Tesco Kingston
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Kents Hill

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>4 (5)</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>4 (5)</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>48 (50)</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has more than one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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 site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Would development of the site have a significant negative effect on a site designated for biological, geological, archaeological or historical importance?	No	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----	--

<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>			
Stage 2 Assessment	RAG Rating	Comment	Mitigation measures required/Opportunities created
Physical constraints			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should only be taken from Far Holme, with careful design in terms of how the approach to the site is aligned. However, due to the ownership issues this may not be possible	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site adjoins existing residential development and Oakgrove secondary school, neither of which should limit the suitability or marketability of the site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact on any designated heritage or archaeological asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site has no existing use although is allocated for community facility purposes and is subject to a restrictive covenant in that regard. This would require lifting before the site could be considered for alternative uses.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>The details of the covenant referred to above could restrict the viability of the site for the immediate future.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site could potentially contribute some on-site infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Middleton Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Oakgrove Secondary School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Monkston Park
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Waitrose Oakgrove
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Kingston

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	4	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	
	<p>Total score</p>	52	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has more than one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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 site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should be easily achievable from the existing network.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable without site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to the M1 motorway and any potential development would be entirely within the 200m buffer that the 2005 Local Plan considered to be unacceptable in terms of air and noise pollution</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the immediate surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would not impact upon any areas of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space that may be accessible to the public (although privately owned). However, it is allocated as employment land and is not considered to be covered by Policy L2 of the Local Plan in terms of serving a recreation, appearance, landscaping or wildlife purpose.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site is used for private equestrian purposes but is allocated for employment. 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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is likely to be large enough to accommodate a degree of additional infrastructure on site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would impede the delivery of its current allocation for employment purposes.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Giffard Park Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	2	Ousebank School (Newport Pagnell campus)
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Newport Pagnell town centre
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Newport Pagnell Co-Op
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Blakelands

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>3 (5)</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>48 (50)</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has more than one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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 site physically separate from the urban area, a Key Settlements or Selected Village set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1?	No	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should be taken from Merlewood Drive.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to the wildlife (wood) corridor, with several notable species recorded nearby.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is partially covered by an archaeological notification area.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>There is also the potential for the site to be required for primary school provision.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership during the call for sites process.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>This is particularly true with regards to this site as a new primary school has also been proposed for the area.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 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 development for residential purposes.	
Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability constraints could potentially be overcome in longer term.			

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<i>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.</i>			
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	3	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Westcroft Health Centre</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>3 (5)</p>	<p>Longmeadow School</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Shenley Brook End School</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Westcroft</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Morrisons Westcroft</p>
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Shenley Wood</p>
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1 (5)</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Total score	46 (52)	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	None
Conclusion: No added value in allocating	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
<p>The site has one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. The site possibly suitable in longer term.</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access is easily achievable from Foxcovert Road/Merlewood Drive.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to the wildlife (wood) corridor, with several notable insect and mammal species recorded on the site itself.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site would not impact upon any designated archaeological or heritage assets, although there is a notification area directly adjacent.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>The site is also proposed for new school development, which residential development would prejudice.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership during the call for sites process.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would impede the delivery of a proposed new school.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Longmeadow School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Shenley Brook End School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Westcroft
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Morrisons Westcroft
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Shenley Wood

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1 (5)</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>47 (51)</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has more than one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. Unsuitable as preferred options.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should easily be achievable off Bergamot Gardens.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to existing residential properties and school playing fields, both of which are considered to be compatible uses.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would not impact upon any known areas of biological or geological importance although the 'natural' state of the site should be investigated for potential habitats.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is formally allocated as open space on the proposals map and is registered for use as allotments. Under the criteria of Policy L2, this use should not be altered unless the site is not serving a useful purpose in terms of recreation, landscape, wildlife or appearance. The site is flat and generally appears overgrown, therefore it is unlikely to fulfil a purpose in terms of recreation, landscape or appearance. In terms of wildlife</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

		purpose there is minimal planting on the site although some grass habitats may exist.	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		Development of the site would not impact upon any known archaeological or heritage assets.	
Deliverability/availability constraints			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		The site has no existing use other than open space.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was promoted by the local community council who are the owners. However, the site's (unused) purpose as allotments can only be altered with permission from the Secretary of State. The site is also subject to a covenant for claw-back payment that could frustrate the timely (and viable) delivery of the site in the immediate future.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>The site is subject to a covenant for claw-back payment until 2043, which unless lifted would limit the viability of any redevelopment.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	

<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate significant amounts of new infrastructure.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<i>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.</i>			
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Walnut Tree Health Centre</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Heronshaw/Heronsgate School</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Walton High</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Walnut Tree</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	<p>Tesco Express Walnut Tree (Tesco Kingston for larger store would score 1)</p>
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	<p>Tilbrook</p>
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	2	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	4	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	

Total score	53	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?	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.
Conclusion: There is some added value in allocating the site.	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to existing residential development, open space and allocated employment land. None of these are considered to be incompatible uses in principle or are likely to limit the suitability or marketability of the site or vice versa.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not harm any areas of biological or geological importance although there is a wildlife corridor adjacent to the site that would need to be respected.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is open space that is technically open to the public. However, it is allocated for employment purposes and it is not considered to be serving a useful purpose in terms of appearance, recreation, landscaping or wildlife as per Policy L2 of the Local Plan.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would harm any known heritage or archaeological assets.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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 (89th out of 118). Therefore a change of use to residential may be acceptable.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by Milton Keynes Development Partnership during the call for sites process.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a surgery with capacity within 1km.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is potentially large enough to accommodate a degree of additional infrastructure on-site.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is not considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m - 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	2	Heronshaw/Hersongate School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Walton High
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Walnut Tree
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Walnut Tree Tesco (for a larger store, Waitrose Oakgrove would score 1)
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m - 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Walton Manor

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>1</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>46</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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: There is no added value in allocating	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site is not considered to have any major constraints. Suitable as preferred options

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access should be achievable from Ortensia Drive.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to Wavendon business park to the south, open countryside to the north (which has also been promoted) and a 'green buffer' for the Strategic Land Allocation to the east. The Stables venue lies 250m to the east across the buffer, which could present noise issues. In general the neighbouring uses are therefore unorthodox but not necessarily incompatible with residential development, particularly if designed well.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the area is urban/rural fringe, which would not be harmed in principle by additional residential development.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>There is a notable species recorded on the site.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is not publically accessible open space.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not impact upon any known heritage or archaeological asset.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>The site is currently allocated as employment land although is not built up and is notionally used as a car park. However, Wavendon Business park as a location is a high-value employment site and ranked 17th 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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is potentially large enough to accommodate a degree of on-site infrastructure and contribute to off-site provision.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Wavendon Gate Primary School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Walton High
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Walnut Tree
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Walnut Tree Tesco (for larger stores, Kingston Tesco would score 1)
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Wavendon Business Park

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Distance to play area GIS	Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1	2	
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 GIS	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	52	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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Other supporting factors</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Conclusion: No added value in allocating</p>	

<p>Overall conclusions and recommendations</p>
<p></p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Site Name	Hewlett Packard (East site)
Reference Number	U83
Settlement	Wavendon/Wavendon Gate
Size (Ha)	0.94

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access is potentially a constraint with poor visibility on the site's logical junction with Walton Road.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>			
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>The site is developable without any site-specific constraints.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>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, particularly if designed well.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the area is urban/rural fringe, which would not be harmed in principle by additional residential development.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would not harm any area of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is not publically accessible open space.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development of the site would need to be sensitive to the archaeological notification site that it partially overlaps with.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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 17th 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.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by its owner during the call for sites process.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>			
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>Although within reasonable proximity, according to NHS England data, the nearest healthcare facilities are approaching capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to generate significant levels of on-site infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability constraints could potentially be overcome in longer term.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	4	St Mary's Wavendon CofE School
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Walton High
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Walnut Tree
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Walnut Tree Tesco (for larger stores, Kingston Tesco would score 1)
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Wavendon Business Park

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>5</p>	
	<p>Total score</p>	<p>49</p>	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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	

Overall conclusions and recommendations
The site has one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. The site possibly suitable in longer term.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Site Name	1 Glyn Square
Reference Number	U84
Settlement	Wolverton
Size (Ha)	0.1

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

		suggests that the site could yield around 30 dwellings in the form of apartments.
Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		Access is likely to be a major constraint to residential development as daily movements would be significantly increased in an area without appropriate highways provision. Parking is also likely to be an issue.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>		<p>The site is already serviced.</p>	
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>The site is already developed.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>Development of the site would be limited by the need to provide basement parking.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>The site would not impact on any areas of biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>The site is not public open space.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		<p>Development could represent an opportunity to enhance the area, which has a wider historical context.</p>	
<p>Deliverability/availability constraints</p>			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		<p>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 to residential may not be acceptable.</p>	
<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>The site was formally promoted by its owners during the call for sites process.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England, the nearest health centre has capacity.</p>	
<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to accommodate any additional on-site infrastructure.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

<p>STAGE 3- <i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>			
<p>Stage 3 Assessment</p>	<p>Draft Scoring</p>	<p>Weighted outcome</p>	<p>Comment/conclusion</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	3	Wyvern School (Infant; Bushfield Junior School would score 4)
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	3	Radcliffe School
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Wolverton
<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Tesco/Asda Wolverton
<p>Distance to employment area (as defined on the proposals map)</p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Wolverton/Old Wolverton

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	4	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	
	<p>Total score</p>	62	<p>Bracketed score reflects potential score for larger sites that could deliver on-site facilities closer than existing ones.</p>

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

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Would the site support delivery of other plan, policies or strategies (i.e. community facilities, play area provision, International Sporting City...)</p>	<p>Redevelopment of the site could have some regenerative benefit in Wolverton town centre.</p>
<p>Has the site been identified locally as in need of improvement?</p>	<p>Anecdotally, yes.</p>
<p>Other supporting factors</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Conclusion: There is potentially some added value in allocating the site.</p>	

<p>Overall conclusions and recommendations</p>
<p>The site has more than one major constraint other than the provision of healthcare. Unsuitable as preferred options.</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Site Name	Garages West of Rowle Close
Reference Number	U86
Settlement	Stantonbury
Size (Ha)	0.57

Planning history/context
<i>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.</i>
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	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Is the site 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			
<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>The site is mostly hard-surfaced; development may represent an opportunity to incorporate more sustainable urban drainage systems.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>Redevelopment would improve the existing run-down nature of the garages on the site.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to existing residential properties, which are considered a compatible use.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>Development would not harm any areas designated for biological or geological importance.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

		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.	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		Development of the site would not impact upon any known heritage or archaeological assets.	
Deliverability/availability constraints			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a health centre with capacity within 1km.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to provide additional on-site infrastructure.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint (Concerns from a number of leaseholders)</p>			

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<i>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.</i>			
Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<p>Nature of site</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	4	
<p>Relationship with settlement boundary</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	10	
<p>Distance to bus stop or train station –</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1</p>	5	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Purbeck Health Centre</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Wood End First School (Infant; Stanton School [junior] would score 2)</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Stantonbury campus</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Stantonbury local centre</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Great Linford Co-Op
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Linford Wood
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	5	Linford Wood
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	

Total score	57
--------------------	-----------

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...)	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

The site has ownership constraints/concerns from a number of leaseholders. Unsuitable as preferred options.

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

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 site 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			

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Access - can it be achieved? Are there any local or strategic highway constraints?</p> <p>In consultation with the Highways Team and Highways Agency.</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Utilities - is there capacity to provide all required utilities?</p> <p>Water, sewage, gas, electric, broadband companies' service/asset/management plans</p>			
<p>Drainage - can suitable drainage of the site be provided? Will development of the site increase risk of flooding either on site or elsewhere?</p> <p>IDB</p>		<p>The site is mostly hard-surfaced; development may represent an opportunity to incorporate more sustainable urban drainage systems.</p>	
<p>Site specifics (e.g. topography, pylons, contamination etc...) - are there any issues that would prevent/limit development? Could development improve an existing issue?</p> <p>Site Visits</p>		<p>Redevelopment would improve the existing run-down nature of the garages on the site.</p>	
<p>Impact of neighbouring uses (e.g. noise, smell) - would any limit suitability or marketability of the site? Would the site adversely impact neighbouring uses?</p> <p>Site Visits/mapped information</p>		<p>The site is adjacent to existing residential properties, which are considered a compatible use.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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?</p> <p>Site visits</p>		<p>The site is not in open countryside.</p>	
<p>Environmental constraints</p>			
<p>Landscape character- would development harm the landscape character of the area it lies in, including areas outside the borough boundary (if applicable)?</p> <p>Site visit/Landscape Character Assessment</p>		<p>The landscape character of the surrounding area is predominantly urban.</p>	
<p>Impact on areas of biological or geological importance - would development cause harm?</p> <p>GIS/Internal consultation</p>		<p>There is a notable species recorded on the site.</p>	
<p>Impact on public open space - would development of the site lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space or physical education facilities.</p> <p>Local Plan Proposals Map</p>		<p>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</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

		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.	
<p>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?</p> <p>GIS/internal consultation</p>		Development of the site would not impact upon any known heritage or archaeological assets.	
Deliverability/availability constraints			
<p>Existing uses (e.g. ongoing employment) - is there any activity that would limit current development potential?</p> <p>Site visit/developer feedback</p>		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.	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Ownership arrangements - is there confirmation that the site is available for development, with a willing landowner?</p> <p>Site proforma/consultation</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>Is development of the site economically viable- are there any particular factors that would limit the viability of development?</p> <p>Site visit/desktop work</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do the local schools have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of education?</p> <p>School Organisation Framework/education team</p>		<p>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.</p>	
<p>Do local healthcare facilities have capacity? Would development of the site cause particular issues with the provision of healthcare?</p> <p>CCG Health Partnerships team</p>		<p>According to NHS England data, the site does not have a health centre with capacity within 1km.</p>	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>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)</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>		<p>The site is not likely to be large enough to provide additional on-site infrastructure.</p>	
<p>What level of recent housing development has there been in the local area? Is there still capacity in the local market?</p>			
<p>Would the development of the site for residential use impede the delivery of any known infrastructure projects?</p> <p>Desktop study/internal consultation</p>			
<p>Overall conclusions on deliverability: Deliverability is currently considered to be a major constraint.</p>			

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.

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<i>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.</i>			
Stage 3 Assessment	Draft Scoring	Weighted outcome	Comment/conclusion
<p>Nature of site</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>100% brownfield- 5 75-99% brownfield-4 50-74% brownfield- 3 25-49%brownfield- 2 0-24% brownfield- 1</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	4	
<p>Relationship with settlement boundary</p> <p>Site visit/mapped information</p>	<p>Within settlement- 5 Edged on three sides- 4 Edged on 2 sides- 3 Edged on 1 side- 2 No relationship- 0</p> <p><u>Weighting x 2</u></p>	10	
<p>Distance to bus stop or train station –</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>under 200m – 5 200m - 400m -4 400m - 800m – 3 800m - 1000m - 2 over 1000m - 1</p>	5	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to health centre/doctors (inc proposed facilities)</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Purbeck Health Centre</p>
<p>Distance to primary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 250m - 5 250 - 500m- 4 500 - 1000m - 3 1000m - 1500 - 2 over 1500m -1</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Wood End First School (Infant; Stanton School [junior] would score 2)</p>
<p>Distance to secondary school</p> <p>*capacity issues are dealt with in stage 2 – the outcomes of <u>both</u> stages will be used to determine preferred options.</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Stantonbury campus</p>
<p>Distance to town/local centre</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Stantonbury local centre</p>

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

<p>Distance to a supermarket</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	4	Great Linford Co-Op
<p>Distance to employment area <i>(as defined on the proposals map)</i></p> <p>Desktop study/GIS</p>	<p>Under 500m - 5 501 - 1000m- 4 1001 - 1500m - 3 1501m - 2000 - 2 over 2000m -1</p>	5	Linford Wood
<p>Distance to play area</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 200m - 5 200m-300m - 4 300m-400m- 3 400m-500m - 2 Over 500m - 1</p>	5	
<p>Distance to park/publically accessible open space</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>Under 400m - 5 400m-500m - 4 500-600m - 3 600m-700m- 2 Over 700m - 1</p>	5	Linford Wood
<p>Quality of agricultural land</p> <p>GIS</p>	<p>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</p>	5	

Appendix 3 – Site Assessments

Total score	57	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 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
<p>The site has ownership constraints/concerns from a number of leaseholders. Unsuitable as preferred options.</p>