

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

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

## SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

### Site Details

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

### Suitability

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

### Availability

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

### Achievability

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

### Conclusions:

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

## SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

### Site Details

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

### Suitability

<b>Policy Constraints (e.g. change of use would be necessary)</b>	Currently allocated in the Local Plan as Open Countryside
<b>Physical limitations/constraints (e.g. flood risk; landscape character; natural assets, site topography, contamination etc.)</b>	Existing hedgerows, ecology, likely protected species
<b>Access (Is there a proposed/existing access to the site?, Are there any access issues?)</b>	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
<b>Does the site contain, or closely relate to listed buildings, conservation areas, areas of archaeological importance, SAMs etc?</b>	Calverton Conservation Area and various Grade II and 1 Grade II* listed building within the Wealds directly to the west of the site
<b>Does the site contain any open space used for leisure and recreation?</b>	No – any rights of way will be incorporated into development
<b>Potential impact of development (e.g. on the landscape or heritage assets)</b>	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)
<b>Conflicting adjacent land uses</b>	None

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

#### Availability

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

#### Achievability

<b>Potential Timeframe for development?</b>	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
<b>Is the development viable?</b>	Yes, but requires all sites to come forward to create an integrated and sustainable development
<b>How quickly can the homes be built?</b>	Within 5 years
<b>Is the site marketable (location, alternative uses...)</b>	Yes – would be seen as urban extension to the WEA
<b>Costs of (re)development. Commitment to fund required infrastructure.</b>	Advanced infrastructure likely to be funded by Gallaghers or tariff

#### Conclusions:

<b>Is the site suitable</b>	Yes subject to policy change
<b>Is it available</b>	Not currently – various leases will need to run out
<b>Constraints to be overcome</b>	Current Policy
<b>When could it be developed?</b>	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

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

### Suitability

<b>Policy Constraints (e.g. change of use would be necessary)</b>	Allocated as open countryside on the proposals map.
<b>Physical limitations/constraints (e.g. flood risk; landscape character; natural assets, site topography, contamination etc.)</b>	Site slopes
<b>Access (Is there a proposed/existing access to the site?, Are there any access issues?)</b>	Access available via existing grid road reserve through Oakhill.
<b>Does the site contain, or closely relate to listed buildings, conservation areas, areas of archaeological importance, SAMs etc?</b>	Adjacent to Shenley Dens Farm which is Grade II listed
<b>Does the site contain any open space used for leisure and recreation?</b>	No
<b>Potential impact of development (e.g. on the landscape or heritage assets)</b>	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.
<b>Conflicting adjacent land uses</b>	None

<b>Condition for residents (i.e. are there factors that would make it a difficult place to live?)</b>	
<b>Would the site be more suitable for an alternative use or mixed use?</b>	
<b>Could the constraints be overcome?</b>	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

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

### Achievability

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

### Conclusions:

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

## SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

### Site Details

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

### Suitability

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



### Availability

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

### Achievability

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

### Conclusions:

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

## SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

### Site Details

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

### Suitability

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

### Availability

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

### Achievability

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

### Conclusions:

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

## SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

### Site Details

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

### Suitability

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

### Availability

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

### Achievability

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

### Conclusions:

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

## SHLAA Site Assessment Form- 2017

### Site Details

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

### Suitability

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

### Availability

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

### Achievability

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

### Conclusions:

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