



TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
S78 APPEAL AGAINST THE REFUSAL OF PLANNING
PERMISSION

Summary Proof: Economic Matters

Witness: Michael Moore BSc (Hons), MSc, Dip TP, MA, MRTPI, MCILT

References: PINS APP/Y0435/W/20/ 3251121
LPA 19/01818/OUT

Appellant: Appeal by HB (South Caldecotte) Ltd

Site: South Caldecotte Site

Date: 11 August 2020

Summary

- 1.1. My name is Michael Moore. I am employed by Milton Keynes Council (“MKC”) as a Senior Planning Officer in the Development Plans Team. I am MKC’s witness in relation to economic and employment land supply matters in this appeal.
- 1.2. My proof of evidence provides additional information on MKC’s position on employment land and supplements details provided in document K9 Statement of Common Ground on Economic Matters (SOCGEM). My evidence seeks to demonstrate the following:
 - 1.3. Around 207 hectares of land was available for large scale warehousing development over the Local Plan period 2016-2031. This figure is almost twice as much as MKC’s own highest forecast [104 hectares] suggests was necessary over this period providing MKC with a considerable amount of flexibility to accommodate higher development pressures for warehousing.
 - 1.4. Even with the development of Eagle Farm North and the partial development of Magna Park-Glebe land the supply of land to accommodate warehousing floorspace over the Local Plan period at 175 hectares is still substantial and still greater than MKC’s highest forecast of need for warehousing land, 104 hectares.
 - 1.5. The Appellant is overlooking the contribution that other sites within the Borough can make to meeting the needs for additional warehousing floorspace particularly Milton Keynes East (MKE) where most constructed employment floorspace will be for large scale B8 uses rather than for B1 or B2 uses but also from the redevelopment of buildings on existing employment sites which are no longer ‘fit for purpose’ and from the development of other sites which are no longer needed for their original purpose.
 - 1.6. Even if the delivery of warehousing floorspace is less than the Appellant proposes on the South Caldecotte site (“the Site”) this should not harm the objective of building a strong competitive economy, since Milton Keynes is a fast-growing diversified economy

not dependent on one sector of the economy or a more limited range of sectors of the economy, and with other major employment generating schemes under construction or in the development pipeline. Additionally, alternative sites for warehousing development such as MKE are becoming available.

- 1.7. I conclude that MKC can demonstrate a robust supply position of available employment land for B8 warehousing and distribution purposes and that there is consequently no case for the economic benefits of the Proposal outweighing the harm the Proposal would cause.

- 1.8. This proof of evidence should be read in conjunction with that of Senior Planning Officer Mr David Buckley of MKC, who will examine the range of planning benefits and dis-benefits of the Proposal and set out the weight which should be applied to these.