

SHLAA Pro-Formas for SA Shortlisted Milton Keynes Urban edge sites

1) Wavendon Golf Course	2
2) WEA Expansion	4
3) Shenley Dens Farm	6
4) South East Milton Keynes	8
5) East of the M1 (north)	10
6) East of the M1 (South)	12
7) North of MK	14

SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

Site Details

Name	Golf Course
Location	Wavendon
Urban/rural	Urban (Extension)
Size (ha)	39.22 ha
Estimated capacity (+source)	686 (50% of site @35 dph)
Current Land Use/Local Plan designation	Golf course/open countryside in local plan
PDL/Greenfield	Greenfield
Any existing/previous planning permission?	None
How identified	Call for sites

Suitability

Policy Constraints (e.g. change of use would be necessary)	Site lies in open countryside
Physical limitations/constraints (e.g. flood risk; landscape character; natural assets, site topography, contamination etc.)	Contains significant amount of planting. Additional land would be required to create a sensible development area.
Access (Is there a proposed/existing access to the site?, Are there any access issues?)	Access would need to be provided via extension of the grid roads within the SLA
Does the site contain, or closely relate to listed buildings, conservation areas, areas of archaeological importance, SAMs etc?	There are a number of listed buildings within and adjoining the site.
Does the site contain any open space used for leisure and recreation?	Currently an 18 hole golf course
Potential impact of development (e.g. on the landscape or heritage assets)	Would be a large expansion into open countryside, so impact on landscape would need to be investigated.
Conflicting adjacent land uses	None
Condition for residents (i.e. are there factors that would make it a difficult place to live?)	No
Would the site be more suitable for an alternative use or mixed use?	No
Could the constraints be overcome?	Yes

Availability

Landowner	Wavendon Residential Properties LLP & Merton College Oxford
Legal/ownership issues	None
Has developer expressed intention to develop or owner to sell?	Yes
Could any problems be overcome?	

Achievability

Potential Timeframe for development?	5-15 years
Is the development viable?	Yes
How quickly can the homes be built?	Could be built out within 5 years
Is the site marketable (location, alternative uses...)	Yes
Costs of (re)development. Commitment to fund required infrastructure.	

Conclusions:

Is the site suitable	Yes, but requires policy change
Is it available	Yes
Constraints to be overcome	Current policy
When could it be developed?	5-15 years

SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

Site Details

Name	WEA Expansion
Location	
Urban/rural	Urban (Extension)
Size (ha)	57.3 ha
Estimated capacity (+source)	1015 (50% of site @35dph)
Current Land Use/Local Plan designation	Grade 3b (low quality) Agricultural Land / Open Countryside
PDL/Greenfield	Greenfield
Any existing/previous planning permission?	None
How identified	Call for Sites

Suitability

Policy Constraints (e.g. change of use would be necessary)	Currently allocated in the Local Plan as Open Countryside
Physical limitations/constraints (e.g. flood risk; landscape character; natural assets, site topography, contamination etc.)	Existing hedgerows, ecology, likely protected species
Access (Is there a proposed/existing access to the site?, Are there any access issues?)	Site will connect into the existing MK Grid Road Network via H2 and H3. Access would be taken from within the WEA. Numerous rights of way will need to be incorporated or diverted through the new development
Does the site contain, or closely relate to listed buildings, conservation areas, areas of archaeological importance, SAMs etc?	Calverton Conservation Area and various Grade II and 1 Grade II* listed building within the Wealds directly to the west of the site
Does the site contain any open space used for leisure and recreation?	No – any rights of way will be incorporated into development
Potential impact of development (e.g. on the landscape or heritage assets)	A key issue will be avoiding coalescence and retaining the character of the Wealds and Calverton “The site will clearly be visible from the surrounding area. Viewpoints however located over 500m from the site are unlikely to have a significant visual effect. This is largely as a result of the sensitive nature of the proposed development proposals, the visual containment of the site, and the proposed mitigation works.” (quote from landowners consultant)
Conflicting adjacent land uses	None

Condition for residents (i.e. are there factors that would make it a difficult place to live?)	None
Would the site be more suitable for an alternative use or mixed use?	This will be a residential led mixed use development
Could the constraints be overcome?	Would require to be reallocated in Plan:MK for housing led mixed use development

Availability

Landowner	Gallagher Estates and various others
Legal/ownership issues	None
Has developer expressed intention to develop or owner to sell?	Yes
Could any problems be overcome?	n/a

Achievability

Potential Timeframe for development?	5-15 years. It might be nearer the 10-15 year mark because a significant amount of Area 11 needs to still be built out
Is the development viable?	Yes, but requires all sites to come forward to create an integrated and sustainable development
How quickly can the homes be built?	Within 5 years
Is the site marketable (location, alternative uses...)	Yes – would be seen as urban extension to the WEA
Costs of (re)development. Commitment to fund required infrastructure.	Advanced infrastructure likely to be funded by Gallaghers or tariff

Conclusions:

Is the site suitable	Yes subject to policy change
Is it available	Not currently – various leases will need to run out
Constraints to be overcome	Current Policy
When could it be developed?	5-15 years. It might be nearer the 10-15 year mark because a significant amount of Area 11 needs to still be built out

SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

Site Details

Name	Shenley Dens Farm
Location	Oakhill
Urban/rural	Urban (Extension)
Size (ha)	88 ha
Estimated capacity (+source)	1540 (50% of site @35 dph)
Current Land Use/Local Plan designation	Agricultural land / Open Countryside
PDL/Greenfield	Greenfield
Any existing/previous planning permission?	
How identified	Call for sites

Suitability

Policy Constraints (e.g. change of use would be necessary)	Allocated as open countryside on the proposals map.
Physical limitations/constraints (e.g. flood risk; landscape character; natural assets, site topography, contamination etc.)	Site slopes
Access (Is there a proposed/existing access to the site?, Are there any access issues?)	Access available via existing grid road reserve through Oakhill.
Does the site contain, or closely relate to listed buildings, conservation areas, areas of archaeological importance, SAMs etc?	Adjacent to Shenley Dens Farm which is Grade II listed
Does the site contain any open space used for leisure and recreation?	No
Potential impact of development (e.g. on the landscape or heritage assets)	Over the Shenley Landscape Ridge, so has potential to have an adverse impact on landscape character in the area. This was recognised in the Local Plan Inspectors Report (2005), in relation to the wider 10.4 area, which said that development would be visible from a large part of the Whaddon Valley. The location of this smaller site, tucked behind Oakhill Wood, may partly mitigate this issue. This would need further investigation if the site were to be considered for allocation.
Conflicting adjacent land uses	None

Condition for residents (i.e. are there factors that would make it a difficult place to live?)	
Would the site be more suitable for an alternative use or mixed use?	
Could the constraints be overcome?	Would require to be allocated as housing in Plan:MK Impact on landscape character would need much more detailed consideration prior to any allocation, along with the availability of access via the grid road reserve

Availability

Landowner	Private / Unknown
Legal/ownership issues	None
Has developer expressed intention to develop or owner to sell?	Yes
Could any problems be overcome?	

Achievability

Potential Timeframe for development?	5-15 years
Is the development viable?	Yes
How quickly can the homes be built?	Could be built out within 5 years
Is the site marketable (location, alternative uses...)	Yes
Costs of (re)development. Commitment to fund required infrastructure.	

Conclusions:

Is the site suitable	Yes subject to policy change and better understanding of impact on landscape character
Is it available	Yes
Constraints to be overcome	Current policy and assessment of impact on landscape character
When could it be developed?	5-15 years

SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

Site Details

Name	South East Milton Keynes
Location	
Urban/rural	Urban (Extension)
Size (ha)	192 ha
Estimated capacity (+source)	3360 (50% of site @35 dph)
Current Land Use/Local Plan designation	Agricultural/open countryside
PDL/Greenfield	Greenfield
Any existing/previous planning permission?	None
How identified	Call for sites

Suitability

Policy Constraints (e.g. change of use would be necessary)	Site lies in open countryside
Physical limitations/constraints (e.g. flood risk; landscape character; natural assets, site topography, contamination etc.)	Wildlife corridor along railway; need to protect the existing character of Bow Brickhill; development will need to respect the landscape character of the Brickhills.
Access (Is there a proposed/existing access to the site?, Are there any access issues?)	Access to the site from Milton Keynes is poor and would need to cross the railway line.
Does the site contain, or closely relate to listed buildings, conservation areas, areas of archaeological importance, SAMs etc?	Area of archaeological notification; listed buildings within nearby Bow Brickhill
Does the site contain any open space used for leisure and recreation?	No
Potential impact of development (e.g. on the landscape or heritage assets)	
Conflicting adjacent land uses	None
Condition for residents (i.e. are there factors that would make it a difficult place to live?)	No
Would the site be more suitable for an alternative use or mixed use?	No
Could the constraints be overcome?	Yes

Availability

Landowner	O & H and Gallaghers
Legal/ownership issues	None
Has developer expressed intention to develop or owner to sell?	Yes
Could any problems be overcome?	

Achievability

Potential Timeframe for development?	5-15 years
Is the development viable?	Yes
How quickly can the homes be built?	Could be built out within 5 years
Is the site marketable (location, alternative uses...)	Yes
Costs of (re)development. Commitment to fund required infrastructure.	

Conclusions:

Is the site suitable	Yes, but requires policy change
Is it available	Yes
Constraints to be overcome	Current policy
When could it be developed?	5-15 years

SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

Site Details

Name	East of the M1 - North
Location	
Urban/rural	Urban (Extension)
Size (ha)	446 ha
Estimated capacity (+source)	7800 (50% of site @35 dph)
Current Land Use/Local Plan designation	Agricultural land/open countryside and linear park extension in Local Plan
PDL/Greenfield	Greenfield
Any existing/previous planning permission?	None
How identified	Call for sites

Suitability

Policy Constraints (e.g. change of use would be necessary)	Site lies in open countryside
Physical limitations/constraints (e.g. flood risk; landscape character; natural assets, site topography, contamination etc.)	River Ouzel runs through the site, flood risk zone associated with river, ecology, wildlife corridor.
Access (Is there a proposed/existing access to the site?, Are there any access issues?)	Site will connect into existing road network (A422, M1, A509)
Does the site contain, or closely relate to listed buildings, conservation areas, areas of archaeological importance, SAMs etc?	Listed buildings in Moulsoe (outside but close to the site), archaeological notification sites to the west of A509
Does the site contain any open space used for leisure and recreation?	No
Potential impact of development (e.g. on the landscape or heritage assets)	Development will need to accommodate River Ouzel within linear park.
Conflicting adjacent land uses	None
Condition for residents (i.e. are there factors that would make it a difficult place to live?)	No
Would the site be more suitable for an alternative use or mixed use?	No
Could the constraints be overcome?	Yes

Availability

Landowner	Berkeley Strategic
Legal/ownership issues	None
Has developer expressed intention to develop or owner to sell?	Yes
Could any problems be overcome?	

Achievability

Potential Timeframe for development?	5-15 years
Is the development viable?	Yes
How quickly can the homes be built?	Could be built out within 5 years
Is the site marketable (location, alternative uses...)	Yes
Costs of (re)development. Commitment to fund required infrastructure.	

Conclusions:

Is the site suitable	Yes, but requires policy change
Is it available	Yes
Constraints to be overcome	Current policy
When could it be developed?	5-15 years

SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

Site Details

Name	East of the M1 - South
Location	
Urban/rural	Urban (Extension)
Size (ha)	709 ha
Estimated capacity (+source)	12,425 (50% of site @35 dph)
Current Land Use/Local Plan designation	Agricultural/open countryside
PDL/Greenfield	Greenfield
Any existing/previous planning permission?	None
How identified	Call for sites

Suitability

Policy Constraints (e.g. change of use would be necessary)	Site lies in open countryside
Physical limitations/constraints (e.g. flood risk; landscape character; natural assets, site topography, contamination etc.)	Landfill site, flood zones around existing watercourses
Access (Is there a proposed/existing access to the site?, Are there any access issues?)	Site is not well connected to existing highway network.
Does the site contain, or closely relate to listed buildings, conservation areas, areas of archaeological importance, SAMs etc?	
Does the site contain any open space used for leisure and recreation?	
Potential impact of development (e.g. on the landscape or heritage assets)	
Conflicting adjacent land uses	None
Condition for residents (i.e. are there factors that would make it a difficult place to live?)	No
Would the site be more suitable for an alternative use or mixed use?	No
Could the constraints be overcome?	Yes

Availability

Landowner	Landowner consortium
Legal/ownership issues	None
Has developer expressed intention to develop or owner to sell?	Yes
Could any problems be overcome?	

Achievability

Potential Timeframe for development?	5-15 years
Is the development viable?	Yes
How quickly can the homes be built?	Could be built out within 5 years
Is the site marketable (location, alternative uses...)	Yes
Costs of (re)development. Commitment to fund required infrastructure.	

Conclusions:

Is the site suitable	Yes, but requires policy change
Is it available	Yes
Constraints to be overcome	Current policy
When could it be developed?	5-15 years

SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

Site Details

Name	MK North
Location	
Urban/rural	Urban (Extension)
Size (ha)	1770
Estimated capacity (+source)	12,000 (Gallaghers submission)
Current Land Use/Local Plan designation	Agricultural, leisure and recreation (lakes and country park)/open countryside
PDL/Greenfield	Greenfield
Any existing/previous planning permission?	None
How identified	Call for sites

Suitability

Policy Constraints (e.g. change of use would be necessary)	Site lies in open countryside
Physical limitations/constraints (e.g. flood risk; landscape character; natural assets, site topography, contamination etc.)	Scale and location of development is limited by landscape quality, and flood risk areas.
Access (Is there a proposed/existing access to the site?, Are there any access issues?)	Development would require significant investment in transport infrastructure.
Does the site contain, or closely relate to listed buildings, conservation areas, areas of archaeological importance, SAMs etc?	There are listed buildings, ancient monuments, potential for archaeology and conservation area in Castlethorpe.
Does the site contain any open space used for leisure and recreation?	The site contains Linford Lakes and Stantonbury Country Park.
Potential impact of development (e.g. on the landscape or heritage assets)	
Conflicting adjacent land uses	
Condition for residents (i.e. are there factors that would make it a difficult place to live?)	No
Would the site be more suitable for an alternative use or mixed use?	Proposal is for a mixed use expansion area
Could the constraints be overcome?	Yes

Availability

Landowner	Gallaghers
Legal/ownership issues	None
Has developer expressed intention to develop or owner to sell?	Yes
Could any problems be overcome?	

Achievability

Potential Timeframe for development?	5-15 years
Is the development viable?	Yes
How quickly can the homes be built?	Could be built out within 5 years
Is the site marketable (location, alternative uses...)	Yes
Costs of (re)development. Commitment to fund required infrastructure.	

Conclusions:

Is the site suitable	Yes, but requires policy change
Is it available	Yes
Constraints to be overcome	Current policy
When could it be developed?	5-15 years