

## Appendix 4a: Potential Housing Sites: Summary of the suitability, availability, achievability and constraints of each site assessed

### Key to abbreviations

PDL = previously developed land

Rural = outside development limits as shown on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map

BDLP = Borough of Darlington Local Plan

TPO = tree preservation order.

LDF = Local Development Framework.

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
7	<b>Darlington Timber Supplies</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban PDL</li> <li>• close to shops and services</li> <li>• accessible to sustainable travel choices</li> <li>• possible noise issues with adjacent uses</li> <li>• a sewer crosses the site</li> <li>• low risk of contamination</li> </ul>	Yes	<p>Currently in business use.</p> <p>Owner did indicate intention to sell in short term, but intentions now uncertain.</p> <p>Covenant in favour of the Council for part of site.</p>	Yes	<p>Existing use would need to be relocated or closed.</p> <p>Site would be attractive for semis.</p>	<p>Relocation or closure of existing business.</p> <p>Release of covenant.</p>
8	<b>Harrowgate Hill</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• greenfield urban fringe</li> <li>• junction improvements likely to be required</li> <li>• poor accessibility by sustainable modes currently</li> <li>• loss of amenity.</li> </ul>	Yes		Yes	<p>The scheme presumes existing electricity pylons are not relocated. Housing capacity would double if they were repositioned.</p> <p>Site would be attractive for family housing.</p>	<p>Possible relocation of pylons.</p> <p>Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.</p>
9	<b>Oakmeadows</b>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• greenfield rural</li> <li>• sewage capacity restrictions at the 2 possible sewage treatment works</li> <li>• medium risk of contamination.</li> <li>• Highway improvements will be required at junction.</li> <li>• Separates village from Virginia estate.</li> </ul>	Not known		No		<p>Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.</p>

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
10	<b>Green Street Motors</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban PDL.</li> <li>Allocation for Cross Town Route now no longer relevant</li> <li>Part of site in Flood Zone 2</li> <li>Industrial noise and railway noise adjacent.</li> <li>Abuts Scheduled Ancient Monument ( Skerne Bridge)</li> <li>High risk of contamination.</li> <li>Good access to shops, services and choice of travel modes.</li> <li>Strong buffers required along railways and river.</li> </ul>	Yes	Owner committed to relocation in short term.		Not likely to be attractive to market. High costs of site preparation.	Relocation of existing business. Remediation of likely contamination.
11	<b>Eastmount Road</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban PDL</li> <li>Within HSE middle and outer zone for Transco Gas Holder.</li> <li>Industrial and railway noise</li> <li>Medium contamination risk.</li> <li>likely that highway improvements will be required</li> <li>Good access to shops, services and choice of modes of travel.</li> <li>northern strip subject to Policy E3 in BDLP.</li> <li>Suitable if it can be assembled (though with gas holder constraint)</li> </ul>	No	Small part of north of site has outline permission for 30 dwellings. However, the willingness of all landowners to sell is not known. Southern part in active employment use. Therefore not available (barring small part in north of site which has permission).	Yes	Some previous interest in the broader site, but unlikely to be viable in current market. Some development may be achievable when housing market recovers.	Gas holder currently limits the number of dwellings that can be built on the northern part of the site. (HSE Middle Zone). Noise. Proximity of active waste site with potential emissions to site. Wildlife buffer zones required. New bus stops required.
12	<b>Ward Bros</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban PDL</li> <li>High risk of contamination.</li> <li>Part of site E3 open space.</li> <li>Cross Town Route allocation no longer relevant</li> <li>Good access to shops, services and choice of modes of travel.</li> <li>Within HSE outer zone for Major</li> </ul>	Yes	Planning application recently granted to relocate existing business – site available within next 2 years. Owner committed to relocation in short term.		Not likely to be attractive to market. High costs of site preparation.	Remediation of likely contamination.

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
13	<b>Mowden Hall</b>	Yes	<p>Industrial Hazard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industrial and railway noise.</li> <li>• May be wildlife habitats along southern part of site. Strong buffers required along railways and river.</li> <li>• Site is former South Durham Iron Works, foundry and wagon works. Full archaeological assessment required, and building recording, evaluation trenching may be needed depending on results of assessment.</li> <li>• likely that significant highway works will be required.</li> <li>• A sewer crosses the site.</li> <li>• ? capacity of local highway network</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly Urban PDL, part of site is open land in open spaces audit.</li> <li>• TPO trees and a grade II listed building. Ed Pease. Possible archaeological interest.</li> <li>• Bat survey.</li> <li>• Low risk of contamination.</li> <li>• junction improvements would be required if using existing accesses.</li> <li>• Includes urban open space of 4* quality and medium value.</li> <li>• A water main(s) crosses the site and NWL.</li> <li>• ? capacity of local highway network.</li> <li>• Good access to shops and</li> </ul>	No	Site owned by DCSF on behalf of the Crown. Current public sector occupants previously planned to remove to town centre, those plans now cancelled so the site is no longer available.			Local highway improvements may be required.

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
14	Hall Farm	No	<p>services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield urban fringe.</li> <li>• Overhead power cables</li> <li>• Remote from shops and services.</li> <li>• partially within Flood Zone 3</li> <li>• road traffic noise.</li> <li>• Cocker Beck – a riparian habitat for water voles – protected by law.</li> <li>• Low risk of contamination.</li> <li>• Significant highway improvements would be required.</li> <li>• A water main(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>• ? capacity of local highway network, particularly at junctions on the A68 at Cockerton Green and Staindrop Road.</li> <li>• Good access to shops and services, and to bus and cycle routes if loops into site made.</li> <li>• loss of countryside, agricultural land, visual and amenity benefits.</li> </ul>	Yes				<p>Impact on the strategic and local highway network would need to be examined in detail.</p> <p>Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.</p>
15	The Paddock	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• mostly Greenfield rural</li> <li>• remote from most shops and services.</li> <li>• high contamination risk.</li> <li>• road needs bringing up to adoptable standard.</li> <li>• Travel choice from the village is limited.</li> <li>• Loss of countryside and agricultural land.</li> </ul>	Yes				<p>Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.</p>

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
17	Roundhill Road	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greenfield rural</li> <li>Good access to shops, services and choice of modes of travel.</li> <li>Part of site in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</li> <li>a re-design of the existing road layout likely to be required, and upgrading pedestrian and cycle facilities.</li> <li>A sewer(s) crosses the site.</li> </ul>	Yes			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residential development only being proposed on western field (1.2ha).</li> </ul>	Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.
18	Middleton Lane	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greenfield rural</li> <li>Good access to shops, services and choice of modes of travel.</li> <li>Part of site in conservation area, and an area of high landscape value.</li> <li>Roman road at western boundary. Site would require archaeological assessment and evaluation pre-determination.</li> <li>Highway requirements depend on the number of accesses.</li> <li>A sewer(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>Loss of countryside and agricultural land.</li> </ul>	Yes				Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.
19	Bishopton Lane	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greenfield rural</li> <li>part of site remote from shops and services, and bus routes.</li> <li>Small part of site within flood zone 3 and flood zone 2.</li> <li>River Skerne is an important wildlife corridor.</li> <li>Site has potential to contain archaeological deposits.</li> <li>High contamination risk.</li> </ul>	Yes				Impact on the strategic and local highway network would need to be examined in detail.  Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
20	Great Burdon	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bishopton Lane unsuitable as access to development in current condition.</li> <li>A water main(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>Likely to be major network (local and trunk road) implications. May require construction of northern by-pass linking A1150 or A66(T) to the A167.</li> <li>listed building: Adjacent: Water Mill, Millatts Farm (I).</li> <li>Large visual impact given the size of the site.</li> <li>Rural Greenfield</li> <li>Included as part of Eastern Urban Fringe strategic development location in the adopted Core Strategy 2011.</li> <li>Most of site remote from shops and services - would put further pressure Whinfield centre.</li> <li>Part of site is within flood zone 3 and flood zone 2.</li> <li>HSE Intermediate Pressure Pipes run across the site.</li> <li>Road noise – A66 and DETC.</li> <li>Possible protected species associated with water bodies. River Skerne wildlife corridor.</li> <li>Site contains a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SM 34848; PRN 6689) as well as several potential archaeological cropmark sites which may date to the Iron Age.</li> <li>Low risk of contamination.</li> </ul>	Yes		Yes	Core Strategy states that delivery is expected from 2021 onwards	<p>Impact on the strategic and local highway network would need to be examined in detail.</p> <p>Now in principle suitable for development, though with constraints on various parts of the site and potential transport requirements that push it into delivery in the latter part of the 15 year period, and beyond.</p>

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
22	<b>West Park</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major highway network implications. Accesses likely to require signalised junctions or roundabouts. Access from A1150 would be the preferred option.</li> <li>Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site.</li> <li>There would be a loss of agricultural land and visual impact</li> <li>Rural greenfield</li> <li>New site for DMRFC occupying 8.8ha in the north/middle part of this site. Permitted 01/02/11.</li> <li>May 2011: Included as part of North West Urban Fringe strategic development location in the adopted Core Strategy.</li> <li>good access to most shops and services.</li> <li>Road traffic noise</li> <li>May be protected species along watercourse through site.</li> <li>Site has potential to contain archaeological deposits which must be thoroughly assessed prior to determination of any planning permission.</li> <li>Low risk of contamination.</li> <li>Access from Edward Pease Way would require a roundabout or signalised junction.</li> <li>There would be major network implications (local and trunk road network), particularly at existing roundabouts on the A68.</li> </ul>	Yes		Yes	Core Strategy states that delivery in the North West Urban Fringe is expected from 2016 onwards	Impact on the strategic and local highway network would need to be examined in detail.  Now in principle suitable for development.

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
23	Heighington	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A water main(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>• loss of countryside, visual impact and loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>• Rural greenfield</li> <li>• good access to some local services. Acceptable bus service.</li> <li>• May have low archaeological potential.</li> <li>• Contamination: low risk.</li> <li>• It is unlikely that an access from Redworth Road would be acceptable. An access from Highside Road would require highway improvements. Existing highway network has limitations</li> <li>• Site is on high ground and would be very visible.</li> </ul>	Yes				Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.
24	Redworth	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield rural</li> <li>• Remote from shops and services, and access by non car modes.</li> <li>• Road traffic noise</li> <li>• An archaeological assessment and further evaluation works (pre-determination) may be required.</li> <li>• Low risk of contamination.</li> <li>• An access onto the A6072 would be likely to be unacceptable.</li> <li>• A sewer(s) crosses the site.</li> </ul>	Yes				
25	Middleton St George	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield rural</li> <li>• good access to some shops and services.</li> <li>• Possible protected species on site.</li> <li>• Archaeological evaluation may be required pre-determination</li> </ul>	Yes				Scale of development is likely to have impact on local and strategic (A66/A67 Morton Palms junction) highway network.



Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
			<p>depending on results of assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A single highway access would require significant highway improvements (eg ghost island).</li> <li>Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site</li> <li>Existing sewage treatment works capacity to be addressed by 2010.</li> </ul>					Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.
<b>26</b>	<b>Hopetown Park</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban PDL</li> <li>Planning consent granted for 110 units on the site.</li> <li>good access to shops and services and bus routes</li> <li>high risk of contamination</li> </ul>	Yes	Landowner not contactable but no reason to believe they have intentions other than for housing development as permitted.	Yes	Not viable in short term. May come forward for 50-60 dwellings in year 6-10.	Most recent uses offices. May be contamination issues with residential use.
<b>27</b>	<b>Maxgate Farm</b>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural Greenfield</li> <li>remote from most shops and services.</li> <li>Possible protected species.</li> <li>Archaeological evaluation may be required pre-determination depending on results of assessment.</li> <li>Significant highway improvements likely to be required (eg ghost island).</li> <li>Both a Water Main and Sewer crosses the site.</li> <li>Existing sewage treatment works capacity to be addressed by 2010.</li> </ul>	Yes				Scale of development is likely to have impact on local and strategic (A66/A67 Morton Palms junction) highway network. Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.
<b>29</b>	<b>Burtree Lane</b>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural PDL</li> <li>Remote from shops and services</li> </ul>	Yes	Could be considered as part of site 49) Construction of more	Yes	Low density.	Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
30	Durham Road (Grangefields)	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A water main(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>Mostly Greenfield rural</li> <li>Remote from shops and services.</li> <li>Reasonable public transport links.</li> <li>Development to be avoided in Flood Zone 2 and 3. Majority of site within Flood Zone 1.</li> <li>Road and rail noise</li> <li>Protect riparian habitat.</li> <li>an archaeological assessment may be required.</li> <li>Significant highway safety concerns at a large increase in the number of turning movements off A167.</li> <li>A sewer(s) crosses the site.</li> </ul>	Yes	<p>than 1 or 2 dwellings would be out of keeping with the area.</p>		<p>One or two single dwellings of similar size and location within the site to those on adjoining sites could be acceptable. High density housing would not be acceptable.</p>	<p>likely to be adopted before 2013.</p> <p>Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.</p> <p>Significant highway safety concerns at a large increase in the number of turning movements off A167.</p>
32	Land at Snipe Lane	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural Greenfield</li> <li>remote from shops and services and bus services</li> <li>Road and rail noise, and noise from football stadium.</li> <li>adjacent to Geneva Woods LNR.</li> <li>There is a former Engineering/ Chemical Works on the land directly to the west of the site.</li> <li>Significant improvement works would be required to Snipe Lane up to a standard suitable for adoption. Traffic problems on football match days.</li> <li>Highways Agency unlikely to permit any intensification of use of existing access onto the</li> </ul>	Yes				<p>Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.</p> <p>Highways Agency unlikely to permit any intensification of use of existing access onto the A66(T).</p>

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
34	Beaumont Hill	No	<p>A66(T).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural Greenfield</li> <li>A site investigation is likely to be required due to the past industrial uses.</li> <li>Good access to shops and services and choice of travel.</li> <li>Separates Beaumont Hill from Harrowgate Hill – loss of visual/amenity benefit and agricultural land.</li> <li>Low risk potential contamination.</li> <li>Satisfactory access would be achievable with improvements (eg ghost island).</li> <li>A sewer(s) crosses the site</li> <li>Nearby sewage pumping station would require 15m separation from habitable buildings</li> </ul>	Yes	Single ownership	Yes	Suitable for detached and semi-detached dwellings.	Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.
38	Rushpool Cottage	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural PDL</li> <li>Remote from shops and services.</li> <li>Drainage and flooding problems in the past.</li> <li>No public foul sewers in the area.</li> <li>Possible industrial noise if units remain.</li> <li>Possible great crested newts.</li> <li>High risk of contamination.</li> <li>It is likely that a satisfactory access can be achieved.</li> <li>No major network implications</li> <li>A sewer(s) crosses the site.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 owners in agreement to promote residential development.</li> <li>Current commercial uses are short term lets who could be relocated.</li> <li>Historical events from the caravan site have resulted in some problems for Rushpool Cottage, but conditions attached to a recent planning permission for expansion of the</li> </ul>			

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
39	East of Whessoe Road	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly Greenfield urban fringe</li> <li>• Remote from most services, and bus stops.</li> <li>• Southern part of site allocated for employment, part is E3 open land.</li> <li>• Site within Flood Zone 1</li> <li>• Rail noise</li> <li>• Adjacent to electricity transformer station.</li> <li>• May have great crested newts on site.</li> <li>• Site includes an existing wildlife corridor.</li> <li>• The site has some potential to contain archaeological resources.</li> <li>• High risk of contamination.</li> <li>• A water main(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>• Likely to be a significant impact on the local highway network, in particular junctions on North Road at Burtree Lane, Longfield Road and Whessoe Road.</li> </ul>	Yes	caravan park require new drainage facilities to be provided by the operators of that facility.		Suitable for semi detached housing.	
40	Skerningham	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural Greenfield</li> <li>• Only parts of the site are close to shops services and sustainable travel options.</li> </ul>	Yes	. - However the net developable area can take this into consideration, coupled with proposals for			

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
41	Whessoe Road	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of site within Flood Zone 3, most in flood zone 1.</li> <li>• Protect riparian habitat. Skermingham Plantation SNCI falls within site. May be Great crested newts and bats on site.</li> <li>• Archaeological potential of this site could be classified as medium-high.</li> <li>• High risk of contamination of part due to Barmpton landfill.</li> <li>• there would be major network implications that could probably only be resolved by construction of a northern by-pass, linking the A66(T) or A1150 to the A167.</li> <li>• Access from existing local road network (Glebe Road) would not be acceptable. There is an 18T weight limit on the existing single lane rail bridge.</li> <li>• No sewerage or water infrastructure in the vicinity.</li> <li>• There would be loss of countryside and significant visual impact.</li> <li>• would have a detrimental effect on the tranquillity of the area – CPRE have identified the area as 'significantly tranquil'.</li> <li>• Urban PDL</li> <li>• Holds outline planning permission for around 250 dwellings</li> <li>• Railway line, topography</li> <li>• Employment land allocation.</li> <li>• May be great crested newts on</li> </ul>	Yes	The site is available for development now. The north part of the site is vacant and cleared. The South Works is currently occupied under	Yes		

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
42	Coniscliffe Grange	No	<p>site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to contain industrial archaeology remains.</li> <li>• Contamination = high risk.</li> <li>• Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site.</li> <li>• A Transport Assessment is currently being prepared to be submitted as part of a planning application.</li> <li>• Central portion of site trees - may be of ecological significance.</li> <li>• Rural Greenfield</li> <li>• A water main(s) crosses the site</li> <li>• Overhead electricity pylons across site.</li> <li>• Most of site remote from shops and services.</li> <li>• Part of site within Flood Zone 2</li> <li>• within HSE middle zone: Major Industrial Hazard. Broken Scar water works.</li> <li>• site borders the Baydale Beck, an SNCI. Protect riparian habitat – water voles.</li> <li>• No recorded archaeological sites currently (2008) within site but spot finds of Roman coin hoards in local area.</li> <li>• Access available from Staindrop Road or Coniscliffe Road, but would require improvements to the alignment of Staindrop Road with provision of roundabouts at Staindrop Road and Coniscliffe Road, and a link road between</li> </ul>	Yes	Single ownership			<p>Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.</p> <p>within HSE middle zone: Major Industrial Hazard. Broken Scar water works.</p> <p>major highway network implications, in particular at junctions on the A68 at Cockerton Green and Staindrop Road.</p>

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
43	Neasham Road	No	<p>the two roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there would be major network implications on the wider highway network, in particular at junctions on the A68 at Cockerton Green and Staindrop Road.</li> <li>Rural Greenfield</li> <li>Good access to local services. Sustainable travel options less good.</li> <li>Road and railway noise.</li> <li>May be great crested newts on site. LNR/SNCI within 500 metres of the site.</li> <li>site has the potential to have little/no archaeology.</li> <li>Contamination: high risk.</li> <li>likely that highway improvements would be required at the access onto Neasham Road (eg ghost island).</li> <li>there would be an impact on the trunk road network.</li> <li>Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site</li> <li>There would be a loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>Proximity of Darlington Football Stadium could bring issues, e.g. parking on match days, noise if music concerts held, etc.</li> <li>Noise from adjacent industrial use renders the site unsuitable for housing development.</li> <li>Urban PDL</li> </ul>	Yes	<p>Pending the signing of an S106 agreement, the site will hold a planning permission for housing as part of the development funding package that has been prepared for facilitating the relocation of the DfAM market operation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A further study by WYG on potential Ecological Issues (e.g. great crested newts) has also shown that there are no such impediments to immediate development</li> </ul>			Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.
44	Amec	No		Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site could be developed from 2012 onwards</li> <li>Proposed for a mix of</li> </ul>			<p>Noise.</p> <p>Remediation of contamination.</p> <p>Preparation of a scheme that minimises residential</p>

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designated as "Employment land". Site occupied by AMEC</li> <li>Good transport and access to services.</li> <li>1.2 hectares of the site, in the vicinity of Blackett Road, lies within Flood Zone 3. Majority of site within Flood Zone 1.</li> <li>May contain great crested newts</li> <li>Contamination: high risk.</li> <li>Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site</li> <li>Need to examine access to the site that minimises conflict with industrial traffic.</li> </ul>		housing and employment.			amenity and access conflict with neighbouring industrial uses and traffic, and avoids Flood Zone 3.
<b>45</b>	<b>Memorial Hospital</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban PDL</li> <li>Currently used for hospital staff accommodation. Good accessibility to shops and services.</li> <li>24/7 hospital activity adjacent. Plans for increasing A&amp;E.</li> <li>contamination: low risk</li> <li>A sewer(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>No major network implications</li> <li>Many trees on site, some with TPOs.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently on the market as a potential housing site.</li> </ul>	Yes	Potential to convert existing staff flats	
<b>46</b>	<b>Merrybent Full</b>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural Greenfield</li> <li>Remote from shops and services</li> <li>traffic noise from A1 &amp; A67</li> <li>may be protected species such as great crested newts.</li> <li>As of 2008 there were few recorded archaeological sites in</li> </ul>	Yes	The site is available now, and as there are no ownership difficulties, Owners would consider mixed use.			Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.



Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
47	<b>Merrybent Frontage</b>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the vicinity.</li> <li>Significant highway improvements would be required at the access (eg ghost island)..</li> <li>Rural Greenfield</li> <li>Remote from shops and services</li> <li>Significant road traffic noise from A1 and A67</li> <li>may be protected species such as great crested newts.</li> <li>As of 2008 there were few recorded archaeological sites in the vicinity.</li> <li>Highway improvements would be required at access (eg ghost island).</li> <li>A sewer(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>There would be loss of countryside and agricultural land with its visual and amenity benefits.</li> </ul>	Yes	The site is available now, and as there are no ownership difficulties, Owners would consider mixed use.			Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.
48	<b>Albert Road</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban PDL</li> <li>Good access to shops services and transport options.</li> <li>Part of site is E3 open land.</li> <li>Allocation of land for Cross</li> <li>Town Route no longer relevant.</li> <li>Development should not be located in Flood Zone 2 or 3.</li> <li>Rail traffic and industrial noise</li> <li>No archaeological constraints at this site, but abuts the Scheduled Ancient Monument of</li> </ul>	Yes	Persimmon Homes have a legal interest in most of the multiple ownerships on the site			Outstanding land ownerships to secure. Site affected by proposals for junction improvements at North Road/Albert Road.

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
49	Harrowgate Village	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Skerne Bridge.</li> <li>There is an Intermediate Pressure Pipe directly east of the site.</li> <li>R. Skerne is water vole habitat. Also may be Great Crested Newts.</li> <li>Cycle route into town along R. Skerne</li> <li>Contamination: high risk. DBC hold environmental reports for some of the site.</li> <li>A sewer(s) crosses the site</li> <li>Site slightly affected by planned junction improvements at North Road/Albert Road.</li> <li>o/s limits Greenfield</li> <li>good access from part of site to most shops, services and public transport.</li> <li>Protect riparian habitats – water voles</li> <li>Significant improvements would be required to local highway network at access points into the site.</li> <li>Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site.</li> <li>There are major network implications particularly the impact on the A167. Likely that significant improvements to the wider highway network would be required and this may require construction of a northern by-pass linking the A167 to the</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>jointly owned by Taylor Wimpey, Yuill Homes and Persimmon Homes.</li> <li>agricultural tenancies on site that will require 12 month's notice.</li> </ul>		Suitable for family housing.	<p>There are major highway network implications particularly the impact on the A167. May require construction of a northern by-pass linking the A167 to the A66(T) or the A1150.</p> <p>Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.</p>

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
			A66(T) or the A1150. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There would be a loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>Electricity transmission lines on site.</li> </ul>					
49a	Harrowgate Village (part)	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>as above.</li> <li>This part of site has relatively good access to shops and services.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>as above</li> </ul>		Suitable for family housing	Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.
50	Woodburn Nurseries	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban PDL</li> <li>Good access to shops, services and public transport.</li> <li>adjacent SNCI- possible bat impact</li> <li>adjacent listed buildings and historic parkland</li> <li>likely that significant improvements would be required at the Salutation Road/Coniscliffe Road junction to accommodate an improved access.</li> <li>Allocated as "Open land".</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently in operational use.</li> <li>No Council resolution to dispose.</li> </ul>		Suitable for detached housing.	Subject to satisfactory highway access arrangements.
51	Cocker Beck Open Space	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural greenfield</li> <li>Remote form some shops and services</li> <li>partially within Flood Zone 3</li> <li>protect riparian habitat - water voles :</li> <li>potential for archaeological activity.</li> <li>works required to improve alignment of Staindrop Road and provide satisfactory junction (eg roundabout).</li> </ul>	No	No Council resolution to dispose.			Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.  Major implications on the wider highway network, in particular at junctions on the A68 at Cockerton Green and Staindrop Road.

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
52	<b>Branksome</b>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>major implications on the wider network, in particular at junctions on the A68 at Cockerton Green and Staindrop Road.</li> <li>Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site</li> <li>loss of countryside and agricultural land and visual and amenity benefits.</li> <li>Noise from the motorway on western part of site.</li> <li>Electricity transmission lines present.</li> <li>Urban greenfield</li> <li>Remote form some shops and services</li> <li>E3 open land (4* quality, high value), green wedge, wildlife corridor.</li> <li>Partially within Flood Zone 3</li> <li>Protect riparian habitats – water voles</li> <li>potential for archaeological activity.</li> <li>Access can be achieved from Malvern Crescent, however it is likely that junction improvements would be required (eg ghost island).</li> <li>A sewer(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>Trees at south of site may have wildlife value.</li> <li>Whole site is playing field. Sport England would resist the loss of this land unless Policy E4 met.</li> </ul>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possibly combine with other sites.</li> </ul>			

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
53	Sherbourne Close	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban Greenfield</li> <li>E3 open space; currently a 3* quality medium value informal recreation site.</li> <li>Good access to some shops and services</li> <li>Protect riparian habitats – water voles</li> <li>potential for archaeological activity.</li> <li>A sewer(s) crosses the site</li> </ul>	Yes	<p>Link with adjacent sites ?</p> <p>No Council resolution to dispose.</p>			
54	Stag House Farm	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural Greenfield</li> <li>Included as part of North West Urban Fringe strategic development location in the Core Strategy 2011.</li> <li>Remote from shops and services.</li> <li>Adjoins former railway/cycle path</li> <li>A scheduled ancient monument (SAM 28547) Archdeacon Newton DMV lies on the west side of the A1 256m to the NW.</li> <li>site within 250 metres of a former landfill.</li> <li>Access to the site would be available from Newton Lane.</li> <li>Provision of roundabout for access to the site a likely requirement.</li> <li>A water main(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>there would be major highway network implications particularly at junction onto the A68 at Cockerton Green and Bates Avenue.</li> </ul>	Yes	No Council resolution to dispose.	Yes	Core Strategy includes expectation the North West Urban Fringe will be developed from 2016 onwards.	Major implications on the wider highway network, in particular at junctions on the A68 at Cockerton Green and Staindrop Road.

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Road noise from motorway significant.</li> <li>Electricity transmission lines cross site.</li> </ul>					
<b>55</b>	<b>Mayfair Road Open Space</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban, Greenfield.</li> <li>2* quality and medium value informal recreation open space. E3 open land.</li> <li>Adjoins public right of way</li> <li>Archaeology pre-determination assessment required.</li> <li>low risk contamination.</li> <li>A sewer(s) crosses the site</li> <li>The site is near to a sewage pumping station; 15 m separation to habitable buildings required.</li> <li>Reasonably good access to shops services and choice of transport.</li> <li>Tree and grass area at north of site may have ecological value.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could form part of surplus school site to the west.</li> <li>Not for first 5 years - relationship with nearby surplus school sites</li> </ul>			
<b>56</b>	<b>Salters Lane West</b>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside limits, Greenfield</li> <li>Remote from shops and services and public transport.</li> <li>Rail noise.</li> <li>establish whether protected species (water vole) is still present before development.</li> <li>Archaeology pre-determination assessment required.</li> <li>An access from Glebe Road is available though it is not adopted at the access to the site.</li> <li>Significant concerns about use of this because of limitations of</li> </ul>	No	In agricultural use. No Council resolution to dispose.			<p>Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.</p> <p>Would be major highway network implications that could probably only be resolved by construction of a northern by-pass linking the A66(T) or A1150 to the A167.</p>

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
57	<b>Salters Lane East</b>	No	<p>Glebe Road/Salters Lane North junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A water main(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>would be major network implications that could probably only be resolved by construction of a northern by-pass linking the A66(T) or A1150 to the A167.</li> <li>Electricity transmission line crosses northern part of the site.</li> <li>High risk of surface water flooding along western edge.</li> <li>Rural Greenfield</li> <li>Railway noise</li> <li>Remote from shops services and public transport.</li> <li>Archaeology pre-determination assessment required.</li> <li>No existing acceptable access to the site (18T weight limit on single lane rail bridge).</li> <li>Site lies outside drainage area.</li> <li>A water main(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>there would be major network implications that could probably only be resolved by construction of a northern by-pass linking the A66(T) or A1150 to the A167.</li> <li>Salters Lane footpath runs through site.</li> <li>Loss of agricultural land.</li> </ul>	No	<p>In agricultural use. No Council resolution to dispose.</p> <p>Drainage: A feasibility study would be needed to assess drainage options.</p>			<p>Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.</p> <p>Would be major highway network implications that could probably only be resolved by construction of a northern by-pass linking the A66(T) or A1150 to the A167.</p>
58	<b>Sparrow Hall Drive Open Space</b>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban Greenfield</li> <li>3* quality, medium value open space for children and young people.</li> </ul>	Yes	No Council resolution to dispose			

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
59	<b>Muscar House Farm</b>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good access to shops and services, by a choice of modes of travel.</li> <li>• Public right of way and access to golf course</li> <li>• Low archaeological potential in this area.</li> <li>• low risk of contamination.</li> <li>• Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site.</li> <li>• Greenfield rural</li> <li>• Remote from shops and services, and transport options.</li> <li>• Eastern boundary of site partially within Flood Zone 3.</li> <li>• Protect riparian habitat of R. Skerne.</li> <li>• Formal playspace required, footpath along river with minimum 100m corridor either side of the river, extension of allotments and linkage to countryside PROW.</li> <li>• Would need an environmental master plan providing before development takes place.</li> <li>• Archaeology: Several recorded prehistoric cropmark sites in immediate vicinity.</li> <li>• Contamination = low risk.</li> <li>• Allotments access point could provide acceptable access</li> <li>• Development of the whole site would have major network implications (local and trunk road network) and likely require construction of a northern by-</li> </ul>	Yes				<p>Amendment to planning policy would be required; allocations document not likely to be adopted before 2013.</p> <p>Any development would be restricted to 150 dwellings and require significant open space provision.</p>



Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
60	<b>Feethams</b>	Yes	<p>pass linking the A1150 or A66(T) to the A167. Development of 150 dwellings could be accommodated with a Transport Assessment provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likely to have impacts at the A66(T)/A1150 ("Great Burdon").</li> <li>• Urban PDL</li> <li>• Good access to shops services and travel options.</li> <li>• Part of site identified for employment and multistorey car park in the adopted Local Plan.</li> <li>• Feethams Planning and Development Brief for mixed use agreed by Council in November 2008 - could include an element of housing.</li> <li>• Site lies predominately within Flood Zone 2.</li> <li>• Commercial and road traffic noise.</li> <li>• River Skerne: very important wildlife corridor.</li> <li>• High potential for archaeological remains of many periods. Potential high risk of contamination. DBC hold environmental reports.</li> <li>• Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site;</li> <li>• Part is landscape amenity open space.</li> </ul>	Yes	Land all in Council ownership.		Suitable for affordable/starter homes.	Housing element dependent on realisation of a mixed use scheme for the whole site.
61	<b>Park Place South</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban PDL</li> <li>• Currently used as a car park.</li> </ul>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role not defined in parking strategy, therefore availability</li> </ul>			

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good access to shops and services and transport options.</li> <li>• Site lies entirely within Flood Zone 2.</li> <li>• Commercial noise</li> <li>• Likely to be some made ground</li> <li>• A sewer(s) crosses the site.</li> </ul>		<p>unknown.</p> <p>No Council resolution to dispose.</p>			
<b>62</b>	<b>Park Place North</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban PDL</li> <li>• site formerly a health centre, now a car park, heavily used by people visiting the Civic Theatre..</li> <li>• Good access to shops and services and transport options.</li> <li>• Site lies entirely within Flood Zone 2 .</li> <li>• Commercial noise</li> <li>• A sewer(s) crosses the site.</li> </ul>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role not defined in parking strategy, therefore availability unknown.</li> </ul> <p>No Council resolution to dispose.</p>			
<b>63</b>	<b>Police Station</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban PDL</li> <li>• In use as a police station.</li> <li>• Good access to shops and services and transport options.</li> <li>• Site lies entirely within Flood Zone 2.</li> <li>• Commercial and road traffic noise</li> <li>• Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site</li> <li>• Allocated as Central Area Office Development.</li> </ul>	No	<p>No known intention to dispose.</p>			
<b>64</b>	<b>Blackett Road</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban Greenfield and PDL</li> <li>• Good access to shops and services and transport options.</li> <li>• part of site allocated for employment uses in adopted Local Plan.</li> <li>• Road and industrial noise.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any development here would need further surveys and is likely to need a licence and mitigation.</li> <li>• No Council</li> </ul>		<p>Suitable for affordable housing and starter homes.</p>	

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
65	Eastbourne School	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great crested newts recorded nearby.</li> <li>• Potential for railway archaeology.</li> <li>• High risk of contamination. DBC hold Environmental Reports for this site. Part of the site has been remediated through the Council's Derelict Land Programme. Any remediation costs are likely to be high.</li> <li>• Blackett Road is a private road.</li> <li>• A sewer(s) crosses the site and NWL.</li> <li>• There are limitations on the existing highway network.</li> <li>• Part of site allocated as Employment Land, part allocated as "Open land".</li> <li>• Need to retain/redesign existing open space with quality improvements.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council resolution to dispose in place.</li> <li>• Available from September 2009.</li> </ul>		Suitable for semi-detached dwellings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could require Site 66 below for access.</li> <li>• Not suitable for development until lost pitches are replaced elsewhere- not likely to be in first five year period.</li> </ul>

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
66	<b>Banks Road Open Space</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• limitations on the existing highway network.</li> <li>• Part of wider site allocated as "Open land" and identified for outdoor sports facilities in the Open spaces strategy.</li> <li>• Continued Sport England opposition to housing development on the site, until replacement pitches can be provided for those lost at St Aidans Academy and also those sports facilities on site.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shape of site will restrict density.</li> <li>• No Council resolution to dispose.</li> </ul>			
67	<b>Firth Moor Open Space</b>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban Greenfield</li> <li>• Good access to shops and services and travel options.</li> <li>• significant improvements would be required for an access onto McMullen Road.</li> <li>• Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site.</li> <li>• 2 star quality, medium value open space in OSS.</li> <li>• Western part of site is playing field, part of Hundens Park, and Sport England would resist the loss unless Policy E4 was met.</li> </ul>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Council resolution to dispose.</li> </ul>			

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
71	<b>Town Centre Fringe</b>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Great crested newts. Further survey work, and a licence and mitigation likely to be needed.</li> <li>adjacent to Maidendale Fishing and Nature Reserve</li> <li>Archaeology: works on site to south found little of significance.</li> <li>low risk of contamination.</li> <li>Electric Sub Station on site.</li> <li>Access can be from Salters Lane, but junction improvements (eg ghost island) likely to be required.</li> <li>Possible residential/commercial traffic conflict.</li> <li>likely significant impact on the McMullen Road/Yarm Road roundabout.</li> <li>Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site.</li> <li>This site is being proposed as a temporary playing field to replace the pitches/teams being displaced as a result of the Eastbourne Academy development, and may be needed to offset the loss of playing field at Hundens Park.</li> <li>Urban PDL Area</li> <li>Good access to shops and services, and sustainable travel options.</li> <li>Northern part of area is allocated for employment.</li> <li>Railway and road noise around the periphery and along key routes through the area.</li> </ul>	No	Area has been identified for intervention including mixed use development in the Darlington Gateway Strategy 2006.			DBC is currently considering preparing an Action Area Plan for this area.

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part of site within flood zone 2 and 3: most in Flood Zone 1 .</li> <li>Within HSE middle and outer zones for a Major Industrial Hazard: Transco Gas Holder</li> <li>Protect River Skerne riparian habitat.</li> <li>Archaeology: Entire area requires pre-determination assessment.</li> <li>Most of area is actively used, but there are significant pockets of unused and underused land.</li> <li>high risk of contamination.</li> <li>Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site</li> <li>Wider Transport Study required for the Inner Ring Road being commissioned.</li> <li>Likely to have impacts on the Strategic road network at A1 Junction 59</li> <li>Conservation area and listed buildings within the area.</li> </ul>					
72	Lingfield Point	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban PDL and Greenfield</li> <li>Already part redeveloped.</li> <li>Remote from shops and services and public transport.</li> <li>Highway implications for DETC/A66 junction and at Morton Palms.</li> <li>Road traffic and industrial noise adjacent SNCI to the west.</li> <li>Most of site identified for employment uses in the adopted</li> </ul>	Yes	Outline planning application for mixed use development including 1200 dwellings has been approved		Suitable for a mix of housing.	Resolution of strategic transport issues at DETC/A66 junction and at Morton Palms required.

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
73	Hunters Green	No	<p>Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High risk of contamination.</li> <li>Both a Water Main and Sewer cross the site.</li> <li>A Transport Assessment is currently being carried out</li> <li>Some of the land is identified as open space in the Open spaces strategy: outdoor sports facility, informal recreation and wildlife site.</li> </ul>	Not known				Amendment to planning policy would be required; LDF core strategy not likely to be adopted before 2011 and allocations document not before 2012
74	St Margarets Close	No	<p>Rural Greenfield</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remote from some shops and services</li> <li>site separates Middleton St. George and Middleton One Row.</li> <li>High archaeological potential associated with roman road. unadopted Roman Way would need to be brought up to adoptable standard.</li> </ul> <p>Rural Greenfield</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remote from some shops and services</li> <li>site separates Middleton St. George and Middleton One Row.</li> <li>Landscape value and amenity issues in conservation area.</li> <li>Pre determination archaeological assessment required.</li> <li>May require significant highway</li> </ul>	Not known				Amendment to planning policy would be required; LDF core strategy not likely to be adopted before 2011 and allocations document not before 2012

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
75	Land North of Faverdale	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>improvements (eg ghost island). Sewer(s) crosses the site.</li> <li>Greenfield urban fringe</li> <li>High archaeological potential</li> <li>Small area of site in flood zones 2/3</li> <li>Potential noise from adjacent uses and transport corridors</li> <li>A watercourse runs through the site</li> <li>Part of site is identified for employment uses in RSS</li> <li>Development would have a significant impact on strategic road network (SRN)</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is currently actively used for agriculture</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would have a significant impact on SRN, but access may be improved if the Cross Town Route is implemented.</li> <li>Amendment of planning policy would be required for site to be considered suitable.</li> </ul>	
76	Darlington Memorial Hospital site 2	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PDL site is close to existing residential uses and services.</li> <li>No significant constraints to residential development</li> </ul>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not likely to be released as surplus to hospital needs in near future.</li> </ul>			
77	Land at Church View, Bishopston	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is outside development limits of Bishopston, and has poor access to services.</li> <li>Greenfield land</li> </ul>	Yes			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor access to services, therefore not a sustainable location.</li> <li>Outside village limits to development</li> <li>Amendment of planning policy would be required for site to be considered suitable.</li> </ul>	
78	Land at High Street, Bishopston	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is outside development limits of Bishopston, and has poor access to services.</li> <li>Greenfield land</li> </ul>	Yes			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor access to services, therefore not a sustainable location</li> <li>Outside village limits to development</li> <li>Amendment of planning</li> </ul>	



Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
79	Sadberge Reservoir	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is outside development limits of Sadberge</li> <li>Limited local services</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is in single ownership</li> <li>Site would be attractive to local developers</li> </ul>			<p>policy would be required for site to be considered suitable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor access to services, therefore not a sustainable location</li> <li>Outside village limits to development</li> <li>Amendment of planning policy would be required for site to be considered suitable.</li> </ul>
80	Broken Scar Water Treatment Works	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is located in close proximity to major hazard (chlorine store), which currently prevents development.</li> <li>Access would be gained from third party land- site is therefore unlikely to be deliverable in 0-5 years</li> </ul>	Yes				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All of the site is within major hazard (chlorine store) consultation zone, which would be considered to prevent development.</li> </ul>
81	Former DFC Football Ground	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brownfield site- benefits from close proximity to town centre</li> <li>Serious flood risk problems over nearly all of site are now identified</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Holds planning permission for 146 dwellings.</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site located in flood zone 3</li> <li>Issues associated with gaining access/highways implications.</li> </ul>
82	Elm Tree Farm	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is outside development limits of Darlington.</li> <li>Greenfield land</li> <li>PP recently granted for new access to the golf club from Sparrow Hall Drive across part of the site.</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is currently actively used for agriculture</li> <li>Main landowner has indicated he is willing to sell.</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside limits to development.</li> <li>Amendment of planning policy would be required for site to be considered suitable.</li> </ul>
83	North of Stockton Road, Sadberge	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is outside development limits of Sadberge.</li> <li>Greenfield land</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is currently actively used for agriculture</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outside village limits to development</li> <li>Amendment of planning policy would be required for site to be considered</li> </ul>

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
84	Former Springfield School (residual)	Yes	• Brownfield site- benefits from close proximity to services	Yes	Site is immediately available for development	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site appears to benefit from no significant constraints to development</li> <li>• Considered potentially suitable for mid-market family housing, low cost housing and/or affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<p>suitable.</p>
85	Land to the rear of Scargill shops	Yes	• Brownfield site- benefits from close proximity to services	Yes	Site is generally available, but requires a Council resolution to sell.	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considered potentially suitable for older persons' and/or affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Viability issues due to location and the current housing market puts deliverability in the 6-10yrs. As does the lack of a Council resolution to sell.</li> </ul>
86	Former Eastbourne Nursery	Yes	• Brownfield site- benefits from close proximity to services	Yes	Council resolution to dispose in place	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considered potentially suitable for older persons' and/or affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Viability issues due to location and the current housing market puts deliverability in the 6-10yrs</li> <li>• Eastbourne Park is a heritage asset. Should follow terraced form of surrounding streets.</li> </ul>
87	Land at Southampton Street	Yes	• Brownfield site- benefits from close proximity to services	No	11/00180/DC- Permission for new road, pavements, landscaping etc. occupies whole site			
88	Land to the south of Bowes Court	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield site- benefits from close proximity to town centre</li> <li>• New College close by – source of education and employment</li> <li>• Includes some open space of 2*</li> </ul>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site was affected by the protected corridor of the Cross Town Route. However, the reservation is expected</li> </ul>	Yes (pt)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-site Listed Building and trackbed of former Stockton-Darlington railway line considerably limit the developable area of the</li> </ul>

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
89	Land at Back Greenwell Street	Yes	In residential area and in theory could be suitable for a small development.	No	<p>to be lifted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site requires a Council resolution to sell</li> </ul>	No	<p>Access difficulties – would have to be via Chatsworth Terrace. Difficult to create an acceptable form of development with backs of housing on all sides. Constraints may render unviable.</p>	<p>site. The route of the Stockton-Darlington railway, including its trackbed, is of national historic significance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Buffer zone to west boundary. GCN area.</li> <li>Lack of Council resolution to sell puts deliverability in the 6-10yrs.</li> </ul> <p>Could be public open space to reduce POS requirements on any redeveloped Cattle mart/Car park site nearby. High risk of land contamination.</p>
90	Central Park	Yes	Has been granted planning permission for mixed use (including housing) in the past. Included as a strategic site in new Core Strategy.	Yes	Great majority in public ownership and available.	Yes	<p>Changes to the housing market since the original permission was granted mean this site is no longer likely to deliver the same number of dwellings as it was expected to before, at least in the short term.</p>	<p>High risk of land contamination. Strong wildlife and open space constraints. Heritage constraints (listed buildings). Ownership issues remain on some land.</p>
91	Harewood House and Lodge	Yes	Yes, though heritage considerations exclude anything other than conversion of the existing buildings.	No	Currently in use by Social services	No	<p>Achievable, but not with the numbers required of a SHLAA site.</p>	<p>As only conversion likely to be possible, would be below the 5 dwelling threshold for this study.</p>
92	Land to rear of Tyne Crescent	No	Not suitable – loss of public open space for the Pastures development	No	S106 restricts use of the site to public open			<p>Railway noise; underlying water main and sewer;</p>

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
			would not be acceptable.		space.			Snipe House Farm S106
93	Former depot, Grass Street	No	No- would entail loss of play area	No	Actively used as a children's play area.			Potential archaeology. Open space constraint (playground)
94	Ruck, Cockerton Club	Yes	Has previously been granted planning permission for housing.	Yes	Currently being marketed by administrators	No	Site size/shape makes a viable form of development difficult. Would be more achievable if combined with neighbouring Club land.	Adjacent to listed buildings and conservation area. Road noise. High risk of land contamination.
95	North of Stooperdale Offices	Yes	Yes, provided access problems could be overcome.	No	Could be available 6-15 years	No	Not developable as it stands due to lack of access.	Access problems would need to be overcome. Source Protection Zone. Proximity to nature reserve and LB. Possible issue of restrictive covenant.
96	Meadow south of Alverton Drive	Yes	Though some constraints on access.	Yes	Resolution to dispose. Currently being marketed.	No	In current form, unlikely to accommodate 5 or more dwellings. Therefore remove from SHLAA.	Access requirements would limit dwelling number.
97	St Modwen Site, Faverdale	No	Designated employment site. Poor proximity to services	Yes	Owner promoting for housing.	No	Access to site through significant employment area would make marketing of any new housing difficult.	Designated employment site. Some Grade 3a agricultural land. Access to site through significant employment area; highways constraints. No clear links to shops and services. Archaeologically sensitive. Significant open space, transport and biodiversity requirements.
98	Land adjacent to Carmel College	Yes	Yes. Good location.	Yes	Not in 0-5 years, but potentially further in	No	Unlikely to be deliverable in its	Negotiations required with Diocese/Sport England to

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
					future. Would require Council resolution to sell.		current configuration, but an equivalent amount of land in this location could be brought forward, subject to access.	secure acceptable access to the site. Distance from services and public transport. Major biodiversity impact.
99	Edgemoor Road	No	No. Culvert across site constrains housing numbers to below 5 dwellings.	Yes	Not in 0-5 years. Would require Council resolution to sell.	No	Below site size threshold.	Open space issues. Noise and possible archaeology. Culvert through centre of site.
100	Emley Moor Road	Yes	If there is not a shortfall of space overall in area.	Yes	Resolution to sell secured in Oct 11.	Yes	Yes – 1 <sup>st</sup> five years 22 dwellings.	Culvert along W edge of site can be avoided through layout. Open space issues.
101	Opposite Maidendale House	Yes	Subject to there not being a shortfall of space overall in the area. Must consider the open space implications of the plans for site 100.	Yes	Not in 0-5 years. Would require Council resolution to sell.	Yes		Open space issues. More work needed on suitability.
102	Eggleston View	No	Suitability queried, regarding effect of making incursions into green wedge land. Also site not deep enough to provide frontage development onto the green area.	Yes	Not in 0-5 years. Would require Council resolution to sell.	Yes	6-15 social dwellings a sensible number. Developable if green wedge issues can be overcome.	Open space, landscape and biodiversity constraints
103	Hammond Drive	No	Suitability queried, regarding effect of making incursions into green wedge land.	Yes	Not in 0-5 years. Would require Council resolution to sell.	Yes	An alternatively configured site could be developed if green wedge issues can be overcome. Numbers depend on site size/configuration that can be made suitable.	Open space, landscape and biodiversity constraints. Parts of site in Flood Risk Zone 3 need to be removed. Transport Assessment probably required.
104	22 Yiewsley Drive	Yes	Existing planning permission	Yes	Development has officially started.	Yes	Should be achievable, though covenant on land needs to be overcome.	Source Protection Zone 2. Biodiversity and open space constraints. Link with redevelopment of

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
								rugby club at West Park vital for development to be acceptable to Sport England.
105	Rear of Heron Drive	Yes	Existing planning permission	Yes	No current use	Yes	Likely to be resurrected with a scheme for 44 dwellings. 0-5 years	Landfill gas is a problem though capable of remediation. Highway improvements required at access point.
106	Harrowgate Hill Infant School	Yes	Has been granted permission for housing	Yes	No current use	Yes	Likely to be resurrected shortly by an RSL. 0-5 years	Historic character of surrounding area.
107	Cattle Market and Car Park	Yes	Has a planning brief.	No	Not currently available and will only become so when cattle mart relocation becomes viable.	Yes	Not a particularly attractive housing site, although close to station. Not likely to be delivered 0-5 years.	Numbers proposed reasonable. Archaeological and heritage constraints. Noise, and high risk of land contamination. Transport Assessment required.
108	Former Wentworth Self Drive	Yes	Has previously been granted permission for housing	Yes		Yes	Eastern part likely to be resurrected shortly for 26 units. Capacity of whole site = 30. Deliver 0-5 years.	Highway improvements required at access point. Noise, and high risk of land contamination. Historic character of much of surrounding area.
109	Rear of Minors Crescent	Yes	Providing play area can be replaced locally.	Yes	Council resolution to dispose.	Yes	Net increase of 12 units proposed taking into account this site and demolitions in adjacent streets as part of a more comprehensive regeneration. Mix of private and social housing.	Play area would have to be replaced locally.

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
110	Bridge House Middleton St. George East	No	Outside development limits. On the ground, the railway line forms a barrier in the village. Would not relate well to existing development.		In current employment use.		Deliver 0-5 years. -	Current policy constraint – outside development limits. Transport assessment required; significant works would be needed to provide adequate vehicle, public transport and pedestrian access. Open space requirements including on-site.
111	Bridge House Middleton St. George West	No	Outside development limits. On the ground, the railway line forms a barrier in the village. Would not relate well to existing development.		In current agricultural use		-	Current policy constraint – outside development limits. Transport assessment required; very significant works would be needed to provide adequate vehicle, public transport and pedestrian access. Open space requirements including on-site.
112	Heighington Lane, Heighington	No	Outside development limits.	Yes	In current agricultural use. Previous history of housing applications.			Current policy constraint – outside development limits. Transport assessment required; very significant works would be needed to provide adequate vehicle, public transport and pedestrian access. Open space requirements including on-site. Heritage constraints (CA adjacent and access would probably have to be through the CA.) Policy constraint could be overcome through site allocations DPD. Source Protection Zone. Archaeology. Heritage constraints: within CA, and LBs adjacent, therefore interior of site could not be developed.
113	Town Farm, Great Stainton	No	Outside development limits.	Yes	Yes, subject to relocation of farm operations.			Policy constraint could be overcome through site allocations DPD. Source

Site No.	Site Name	Suitable ?	Suitability details	Available ?	Availability details	Achievable ?	Achievability details	Constraints
114	Royal Mail Depot	No	Flood risk constraints would prevent development in isolation. Only suitable as part of wider masterplan proposals for the Town Centre Fringe. Premature to consider at this stage.	No	Would depend on plans of Royal Mail, unknown at this stage.			Protection Zone. Serious highways constraints. Heritage constraints- adjacent listed buildings. Potential archaeology. On-site open space would be required. Most of site in Flood Risk Zone 3a, with nearly all the remainder projected to be in 3a taking climate change into account. Transport Assessment required. Historic character of much of surrounding area.