



# Emberton Neighbourhood Plan

2019 to 2031

## Assessment of Potential Housing Sites

May 2022

## Call for sites

During the initial consultation process in 2018, local landowners surrounding the village were contacted to invite them to put forward sites for consideration as part of this Neighbourhood Plan. A total of sixteen sites were suggested for consideration, which between them could deliver more than 160 houses.

It should be noted that some of the sites, such as those at Manor Farm, have been submitted as potential alternatives and would not all be brought forward if one or more of them were chosen for an allocation.

Further sites were invited to be submitted as part of the revised consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan in March 2020 and late 2020.

This reflected the change in strategy for the Neighbourhood Plan to make more limited changes to the development boundary to focus this around Emberton Village.

Due to the passage of time and delays caused by the pandemic, a further call for sites was carried out in November 2021, prior to the plan being resubmitted for public consultation. Additional sites were received, and these were assessed on the same basis as all the other submissions.

## Site selection methodology

When considering locations for new development, an assessment of potential options around the village has been undertaken. The sites were assessed on a comparative basis against the following consistent criteria:

- Applying a clear preference in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the wishes of the community, for new housing to be located on previously developed land (brownfield sites), over and above greenfield development.
- Compatibility with relevant sections of Plan:MK that apply to Neighbourhood Plans.
- Potential sites within the defined development boundary would be prioritised over sites separated from it.
- Development in open countryside would be discouraged.
- Highway considerations, such as capacity and safety would be taken into account.
- Potential sites should not have significant adverse impacts upon the historic setting of the village, including designated and non-designated heritage assets.
- Potential sites should avoid locations that are at risk of flooding if lower risk opportunities are suitable, in accordance with the NPPF and applying the sequential test and exceptions test.
- Sites that provide a benefit to the community would be scored more highly.

- Other factors such as access, utilities, feasibility, land availability, and whether housing could be realistically delivered within the timeframe of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Proposals that generate significant amounts of traffic and could lead to an increase in rat running will be discouraged.

## Consideration of potential housing sites

On that basis it has been necessary to compare the suggested sites against the site selection methodology to assess their suitability for inclusion within the Neighbourhood Plan. The suggested sites are indicated on the map at Figure 19 as shown overleaf and have been assessed using a standard methodology.

The following tables detail the planning merits of each site put forward on a consistent basis and have allowed a direct comparison to be made for each opportunity.

The assessment has also had regard to the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan and the feedback of the community through the consultation and parish questionnaire.






Figure 1: Potential Housing Allocations put forward for consideration

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>001/2018</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Charity Fields, Petsoe End, Emberton</b>	
Area / No. of units?	0.8 ha / Several dwellings	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No. DS5 Open Countryside	
Qty of Affordable units	No mandatory requirement and none offered	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	✓ - Remote
Relationship to settlement generally?		
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	✓
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	✓
	Low	
	Very Low	
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Highways "unsustainable location and there are fewer facilities for pedestrians. The width and alignment of the local roads in Petsoe End is unsuitable for an increase in vehicle traffic."
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Highways and Plan:MK DS5 & CT5	
Community benefits?	None	

Site Ref	002/2018	
Site Address	Site Withdrawn	
Area / No. of units?		
Compatible with Plan:MK		
Qty of Affordable units		
Location type?	Greenfield	
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	
Relationship to settlement generally?		
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	
Land use?	Specify Use	
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	
	No	
	Describe	
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	
Assessment		
Community benefits?		

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>003/2018</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Rectory Grange, Petsoe</b>	
Area / No. of units?	3.69 ha / 6 to 8 dwellings	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No. DS5 & CT2	
Qty of Affordable units	No mandatory requirement and none offered	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	✓ - Remote
Relationship to settlement generally?	Separated from settlement by the Nursery, another field and Newton Road.	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Highways "remote from the village and unconnected to it with footways. It is on an unlit rural road where the national speed limit applies. ... therefore, not acceptable including from a general sustainable point of view."
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	✓
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Highways, greenfield location, countryside location and Plan:MK DS5 & CT5	
Community benefits?	None	

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>004/2018</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>The Lodge, Newton Road, Emberton</b>	
Area / No. of units?	0.24 ha / One dwelling	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No. DS5 & CT2	
Qty of Affordable units	No mandatory requirement and none offered	
Location type?	Greenfield	
	Previously developed	✓
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	✓ - Remote
Relationship to settlement generally?	Separated from the development boundary.	
Flood Risk Designation? (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Garden/Tennis court
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Utilities constraints? (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	Not within the defined development boundary, detached from the core of the village.	
Community benefits?	None	



<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>005/2018</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Acorn Nursery, Emberton</b>	
Area / No. of units?	2.0 ha / 20 to 40 dwellings	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No, due to Conflict with DS5 – open countryside and CT2.	
Qty of Affordable units	7 - 13	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	✓ - Remote
Relationship to settlement generally?	Site is remote from defined village envelope.	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Horticultural nursery.
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Visibility is not acceptable and there are some conflicts with the adjacent access. A new access slightly further east could be acceptable including the provision of footways. This is a relatively large number of units which will generate pedestrian movements including across the A509. The footways in this area are not to standard and we have to consider the crossing of the A509. There are currently two uncontrolled crossing points of the A509 and one of these (probably the northern one) could be upgraded to a controlled crossing.
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	
Assessment	Is currently used as a nursery with a few buildings on site and offers some local employment. Is remote from the development boundary and separated from the village by the A509. Large volume of traffic could be generated. Connections to Emberton are not convenient for pedestrian access, and whilst this could be arguably	

	<p>improved, would need an enhanced crossing on the A509. Delays to traffic on the A509 could encourage rat running through the village to avoid cars queuing at the crossing.</p> <p>Safety concerns raised by residents about this location and local opposition to the number of houses proposed at the first round of consultation.</p> <p>Would provide more than 10 units and would therefore allow for the provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>No established need or requirement for this number of houses in the rural area or within the Neighbourhood Plan. Contrary to Plan:MK DS5 &amp; CT2.</p>
Community benefits?	Provision of affordable housing.

Site Ref	006/2018	
Site Address	Land South of Prospect Place	
Area / No. of units?	6.14 ha / Not Specified	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No. DS5 and CT2	
Qty of Affordable units	???	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	✓ - Remote
Relationship to settlement generally?	Removed from the existing settlement.	
Flood Risk Designation? (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Footpath from Prospect Place across to Hollington Wood and Petsoe End.
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Highways "similar to site 12", "it has not so far been demonstrated that right hand turners can safely be accommodated on the A509. I am not convinced based on accident history that this is an appropriate location for roadside services which would for north bound traffic create two right hand turns (one in and one out of the site)."
Utilities constraints? (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Highways considerations and remoteness from existing settlement as well as Plan:MK DS5	
Community benefits?	None	

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>007/2018</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Land North of West Pits, South of Emberton Park</b>	
Area / No. of units?	0.25 ha / 3 dwellings	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No. DS5 and CT2	
Qty of Affordable units	No mandatory requirement and none offered	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	✓
	Detached or remote	
Relationship to settlement generally?	At the back of houses in existing settlement area.	
Flood Risk Designation? (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	Highways "For a low number of units such as those proposed (3) then I would have no objections to this site."
Utilities constraints? (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	✓
	Unknown	
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Plan:MK DS5 and whilst Highways are comfortable it would add to the traffic congestion on West Lane and around the clock tower.	
Community benefits?	None	

Site Ref	008/2018	
Site Address	Rectory Farm, Newton Road, Emberton	
Area / No. of units?	0.33 ha / 5 dwellings	
Compatible with Plan:MK	Compatible with DS5. Not compatible with CT2.	
Qty of Affordable units	No mandatory requirement and none offered	
Location type?	Greenfield	
	Previously developed	✓
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	✓
Relationship to settlement generally?	Detached from current development boundary out in the countryside	
Flood Risk Designation? (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Highways "unsustainable location and there are fewer facilities for pedestrians. The width and alignment of the local roads in Petsoe End is unsuitable for an increase in vehicle traffic."
Utilities constraints? (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Highways and Plan:MK CT2.	
Community benefits?	None.	

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>009/2018</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Rectory Farm, Newton Road, Emberton</b>	
Area / No. of units?	0.35 ha / Five dwellings	
Compatible with Plan:MK	Compatible with DS5. Not compatible with CT2.	
Qty of Affordable units	No mandatory requirement and none offered	
Location type?	Greenfield	
	Previously developed	✓
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	✓
Relationship to settlement generally?	Detached from current development boundary out in the countryside	
Flood Risk Designation? (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Highways "unsustainable location and there are fewer facilities for pedestrians. The width and alignment of the local roads in Petsoe End is unsuitable for an increase in vehicle traffic."
Utilities constraints? (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Highways and Plan:MK CT2.	
Community benefits?	None.	



<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>010a/2018</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Manor Farm, Petsoe End – Newton Road</b>	
Area / No. of units?	Unknown – Submitted as an alternative option to other land at Manor Farm	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No. DS5 and CT2	
Qty of Affordable units	7+	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	Remote
Relationship to settlement generally?	Currently separated from development boundary by Acorn Nursery	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	✓
	Very Low	
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Highways “remote from the village and unconnected to it with footways. It is on an unlit rural road where the national speed limit applies. ... therefore, not acceptable including from a general sustainable point of view.
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	Detached from development boundary. Highways issues with the junction	
Community benefits?	None	

Site Ref	010b/2018	
Site Address	Manor Farm, Petsoe End - Corner adjacent Clay Farmhouse and Hill Farm	
Area / No. of units?	Unknown - Submitted as an alternative option to other land at Manor Farm	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No. DS5 and CT2	
Qty of Affordable units	Unknown	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	Remote
Relationship to settlement generally?	Is separated from the development boundary	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	✓
	Very Low	
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Highways "unsustainable location and there are fewer facilities for pedestrians. The width and alignment of the local roads in Petsoe End is unsuitable for an increase in vehicle traffic."
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	✓ No mains gas or sewerage in Petsoe
	No	
	Unknown	
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Highways and Plan:MK DS5 and CT2	
Community benefits?	none	

Site Ref	010c/2018	
Site Address	Manor Farm, Petsoe End - Petsoe End next to Emmott's Well	
Area / No. of units?	Unknown - Submitted as an alternative option to other land at Manor Farm	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No. DS5 and CT2	
Qty of Affordable units	Unknown	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	Remote
Relationship to settlement generally?	Is separated from existing development boundary	
Flood Risk Designation? (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	✓
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	✓
	Low	
	Very Low	
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Highways "unsustainable location and there are fewer facilities for pedestrians. The width and alignment of the local roads in Petsoe End is unsuitable for an increase in vehicle traffic."
Utilities constraints? (Specify type)	Yes	✓ No mains gas or sewerage in Petsoe
	No	
	Unknown	
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Highways and Plan:MK DS5 and CT2	
Community benefits?	none	

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>010d/2018</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Manor Farm, Petsoe End - rear of Springside &amp; Springside Pasture</b>	
Area / No. of units?	Unknown – Submitted as an alternative option to other land at Manor Farm	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No. DS5 and CT2	
Qty of Affordable units	Unknown	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	Remote
Relationship to settlement generally?	Is separated from existing development boundary	
Flood Risk Designation? (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Highways “unsustainable location and there are fewer facilities for pedestrians. The width and alignment of the local roads in Petsoe End is unsuitable for an increase in vehicle traffic.”
Utilities constraints? (Specify type)	Yes	✓ No mains gas or sewerage in Petsoe
	No	
	Unknown	
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Highways and Plan:MK DS5 and CT2	
Community benefits?	none	

Site Ref	011/2018	
Site Address	West Lane, Emberton	
Area / No. of units?	3.31 ha / 25 dwellings	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No. DS5	
Qty of Affordable units	8	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	✓
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	
Relationship to settlement generally?	Is adjacent to the development boundary.	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Part of the site is next to the Church and would obscure the views.
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Highways "I have concerns with this site for the number of units proposed and I consider it should be rejected for 25 units. However, perhaps a small number of units could be considered. If site 7 is accepted, then perhaps reducing site 11 down to say 5 units making a total of 8 units for this area. Obviously, there will still be some impact in terms of increased traffic and pedestrian activity"
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Plan:MK DS5. Also, even if no. units reduced to 5 then there would be a highway's impact on West Lane and around the clock tower.	
Community benefits?	If the site were for 10 units or more there would be a provision for affordable housing, however the highways issues and the restriction of the site size to keep the views of the church mean the site would probably be restricted to less than 10 units.	

Site Ref	012/2018	
Site Address	Land between Prospect Place and A509	
Area / No. of units?	2.0 ha / Unspecified no of dwellings / mixed use employment and roadside uses	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No. Is part of what has been designated a wildlife corridor.	
Qty of Affordable units	Unknown	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	Remote
Relationship to settlement generally?	None. Remote.	
Flood Risk Designation? (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Unused
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Highways "This has had an interim assessment and it has not so far been demonstrated that right hand turners can safely be accommodated on the A509. I am not convinced based on accident history that this is an appropriate location for roadside services which would for north bound traffic create two right hand turns (one in and one out of the site)."
Utilities constraints? (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	Not acceptable as it is part of a wildlife corridor in Plan:MK as well as policy DS5	
Community benefits?	None	



<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>013a/2018</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Land west of Honey Hill</b>	
Area / No. of units?	.054 ha / 1	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No, DS5	
Qty of Affordable units	None	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	Remote
Relationship to settlement generally?	None. Remote.	
Flood Risk Designation? (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Unused
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	Highways - no objection
Utilities constraints? (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Plan:MK DS5	
Community benefits?	None	

Site Ref	013b/2018	
Site Address	Land South of Newton Road	
Area / No. of units?	1.25 ha / 12-20	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No, DS5	
Qty of Affordable units	4 - 7	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	Remote
Relationship to settlement generally?	None. Remote.	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Unused
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	✓
	Describe	Highways "OK if access is off Honey Hill (subject to visibility). An access onto Newton Road might be acceptable but would need more details on location. The site would need connecting with the footway network."
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Plan:MK DS5	
Community benefits?	None	

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>014/2020</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Land North of Hulton Drive (Field 13)</b>	
Area / No. of units?	3.5 ha (not all of the site required for development of up to 10 dwellings)	
Compatible with Plan:MK	No, DS5 Open Countryside	
Qty of Affordable units	-	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	✓
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	
Relationship to settlement generally?	Northern edge of Emberton village.	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	✓ (drain runs across the centre of the site)
	Medium	
	Low	✓
	Very Low	
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	NPPF paragraph 197. Historic England encourages LPAs and Neighbourhood Plans to treat sites with ridge and furrow as non-designated heritage assets
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Access can be taken from Hulton Drive or Harvey Drive. Hulton Drive has on-street parking issues caused by visitors to the country park parking on the street to avoid parking charges. Harvey Drive is too narrow to serve the development. Hulton Drive would require significant tree removal to achieve an access point.
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	Not acceptable due to Plan:MK DS5	
Community benefits?	Potential for lower cost housing to be made available.	

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>001/2021</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Land South of West Lane, Emberton</b>	
Area / No. of units?	1.01 ha (smaller area could be developed)	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	✓
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	
Relationship to settlement generally?	Land adjacent to the development boundary, close to the Church.	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Public footpath bisects one of the fields.
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Grade II* Church to west and Grade II Stonepits House opposite. Listed Lychgate nearby.
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	West Lane is narrow and congested with parked vehicles. MKC Highways have commented to raise concerns on highway capacity in relation to other sites on West Lane.
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	✓
	Unknown	
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is well related to the village boundary and close to the village centre.</li> <li>• Access concerns remain for additional development on West Lane.</li> <li>• Additional properties have already been constructed on West Lane already.</li> <li>• Concerns over water pressure and sewerage capacity in this part of the village.</li> <li>• Part of the site is within the Conservation Area and within the setting of the Church.</li> <li>• Development would also be within the setting of Stonepits House, which is also a listed building.</li> </ul>	
Community benefits?	The site could offer some benefit if used for self-build housing.	

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>002/2021</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Harvey Drive, Emberton</b>	
Area / No. of units?	0.22 ha / 2 units	
Location type?	Greenfield	
	Previously developed	✓ Garden land
Within development boundary?	Outside	
	Within existing area	✓ Site is partly within the Plan:MK settlement boundary.
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	
Relationship to settlement generally?	Northern part of the village, easy access to the centre of the village and Emberton Country Park.	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Existing garden land.
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	Access road is suitable to support up to 5 dwellings, currently provides access for 3 dwellings.
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	✓
	Unknown	
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site would be within the proposed development boundary and represents an infill plot well related to the existing village.</li> <li>• Development would be limited to two units due to the access road.</li> <li>• New dwellings would have to be carefully designed to protect the amenity and privacy of neighbours, but gardens are generous in the area, so these issues are not considered to be insurmountable.</li> </ul>	
Community benefits?	Development would offer self-build opportunities.	

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>003/2021</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Acorn Nursery, Emberton</b>	
Area / No. of units?	2.0 ha / 20 to 40 dwellings	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	✓
Relationship to settlement generally?	Separated from Emberton village by the A509.	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Horticultural nursery.
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	MKC Highways have objected, unsustainable location.
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is currently used as a nursery with a few buildings on site, so provides some local employment.</li> <li>• The site is not located within or adjoining the development boundary and is defined as countryside by Plan:MK. Development would be contrary to Policy DS5.</li> <li>• Proposed dwelling numbers exceed the amount that would be supported within the village, on the basis of the household questionnaire results.</li> <li>• Feedback to earlier consultation indicated strong opposition to the development of the Acorn Nursery site from residents.</li> <li>• The site could provide affordable housing however, this would be located remote from the village.</li> <li>• MKC Highways have objected to the scheme on the basis of it being an unsustainable location with poor access arrangements for pedestrians and cycles.</li> </ul>	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large volume of traffic could be generated. Connections to Emberton are not convenient for pedestrian access, and whilst this could be improved, would need an enhanced crossing on the A509.</li> <li>• Delays to traffic on the A509 could encourage rat running through the village to avoid cars queuing at the crossing.</li> <li>• Safety concerns raised by residents about this location and local opposition to the number of houses proposed at the first round of consultation.</li> <li>• Would provide more than 10 units and would therefore allow for the provision of affordable housing.</li> <li>• No established need or requirement for this number of houses in the rural area or within the Neighbourhood Plan. Contrary to Plan:MK DS5 &amp; CT2.</li> </ul>
Community benefits?	Provision of affordable housing.

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>004/2021</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Dove Cottage, Petsoe End</b>	
Area / No. of units?	Two sites each 0.04 ha for one dwelling	
Location type?	Greenfield	
	Previously developed	✓
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	
	Detached or remote	✓
Relationship to settlement generally?	Outside of the settlement within the countryside.	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Existing buildings within paddocks.
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals are for the conversion of existing buildings to create new dwellings for family members.</li> <li>Conversion of existing buildings is supported in principle, and may be possible using development rights.</li> <li>Details of the buildings and their suitability for conversion would be required to determine if both buildings, or one of the buildings could be converted to a dwelling.</li> </ul>	
Community benefits?	Providing housing for family members with a connection to the Parish.	

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>005/2021</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Land at West Lane, Emberton</b>	
Area / No. of units?	0.4 ha / 2 to 4 dwellings	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	✓
	Detached or remote	
Relationship to settlement generally?	Outside of the existing development boundary, but adjacent to it.	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Agricultural
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Footpath from runs diagonally across the centre of the site.
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Grade II* Listed Church. Grade II Listed West Lane House nearby and Listed Lychgate. Site is within the Conservation Area boundary.
Highway access constraints?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	West Lane is narrow and congested with parked vehicles. MKC Highways have commented to raise concerns on highway capacity in relation to other sites on West Lane.
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	
	Unknown	✓
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is well related to the development boundary and the centre of the village.</li> <li>• It is an important area of open space within the Conservation Area and setting of the Church, when viewed from the public footpath crossing the centre of the site.</li> <li>• Development here would significantly change and cause harm to the rural setting of the Church and this open area in the Conservation Area.</li> <li>• Whilst there are benefits from providing passing places and potentially parking for the Church, these would not outweigh the harm caused by development to the designated heritage assets.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Other less permanent or sympathetic use of the land could be considered as alternatives to housing development, such as parking for the Church or an expansion of the graveyard.</li></ul>
Community benefits?	Possible car parking benefits and passing places.

<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>006/2021</b>	
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>Land at Gravel Walk, Emberton</b>	
Area / No. of units?	0.15 ha / 1 dwelling	
Location type?	Greenfield	✓
	Previously developed	
Within development boundary?	Outside	✓
	Within existing area	
Relationship to development boundary?	Contiguous or rounding	
	Linear extension	✓ Site is partly within the Plan:MK settlement boundary.
	Detached or remote	
Relationship to settlement generally?	Adjacent to existing development boundary.	
Flood Risk Designation?  (tick all that apply)	Zone 3 (High Risk)	
	Zone 2 (Medium Risk)	
	Zone 1 (Low Risk)	✓
Surface Water Flooding risk?	High	
	Medium	
	Low	
	Very Low	✓
Land use?	Specify Use	Paddock / agricultural.
Public footpaths on site?	Yes	✓
	No	
	Describe	Footpath runs to one side of the site and across part of it.
Heritage constraints nearby?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	
Highway access constraints?	Yes	
	No	✓
	Describe	Site has direct access to Gravel Walk.
Utilities constraints?  (Specify type)	Yes	
	No	✓
	Unknown	
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of a single dwelling on the site has been allowed at appeal.</li> <li>• No further action to be taken.</li> </ul>	
Community benefits?	None	

## Our Preferred Option(s)

### *Windfall Development and Conversions*

A windfall development policy to meet small scale infill and individual dwelling needs would meet our obligations under Milton Keynes Council's suggested housing requirement for villages in the rural area of a single dwelling. It is also evident that there are buildings that could be converted to dwellings, which will deliver individual homes or small clusters of homes within the Parish, utilising permitted development rights.

### *Alterations to the Development Boundary*

The development boundary has been comprehensively reviewed to reflect the current residential curtilages in the village and rationalise the boundary where it bisected sites, in order to incorporate areas of gardens or more recent dwellings that had previously been excluded from the development boundary.

There are opportunities for sensitive and limited infill development to be delivered through windfall development proposals. This would support the aim to encourage the continued organic growth of the village, as seen from past planning permission trends, ensuring that new development can be incorporated into the village in a gradual manner.

The decision was taken not to expand the development boundary across the A509, as the road would ultimately create too great a barrier between houses in Petsoe End and Honey Hill and those in Emberton village, where the community facilities are located.

### *Land off Harvey Drive*

Land off Harvey Drive has been included as an allocation for two dwellings. The site is well related to the village and recreation area and development here would not have an adverse impact on any heritage assets, including listed buildings and the Conservation Area. The dwellings would have to be sensitively designed and orientated to protect neighbouring amenity, which could also be preserved through new landscaping. The site is already in residential use as garden land and was partly within the existing development boundary, which has been revised to include the whole site.



Prepared with the support of Town Planning Services

The Exchange, Colworth Park, Sharnbrook, Bedfordshire, MK44 1LZ

01234 924 920

[www.townplanning.services](http://www.townplanning.services)

Document Version 18613 edit 9

