



Hartlepool Local Planning Framework

Local Plan

Deliverability Risk Assessment



September 2017



Contents

No	Subject	Page
1	Introduction	3
2	Development Delivery Scenarios	4
	Expected Delivery Scenario	4
3	Economic Viability of Local Plan Sites	5
	Developer Assumptions	7
	Developer Contribution Delivery Scenarios	7
	Economic Viability of Development Sites	13
	High Quality Greenfield (Rural) Housing Development	17
	High Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge / Villages) Housing Development	17
	Market Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge) Housing Development	17
	High Quality Urban Housing Development	18
	Market Quality Urban Housing Development	18
	Office Development	19
	Industrial Development	19
	Retail and Commercial Development	21
	Economic Viability Conclusion	21
4	Deliverability of Local Plan Sites	22
	Housing Provision Sites	22
	Strengthening the Local Economy Sites	22
	Retail and Commercial Development Sites	22
	Affordable Housing	23
	Site Deliverability Conclusion	23
	Appendix 1: Site Development Risk Assessments	36
	Appendix 2: Individual Economic Viability Assessments	79

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The following report outlines all the development sites identified or allocated in the Local Plan and assesses the economic viability of the development type bearing in mind the constraints and costs in delivering development in the current economic climate.
- 1.2 The report demonstrates whether development identified or allocated in the Local Plan can support developer contributions in principle and then as to what level to make the development acceptable in planning terms, before the development becomes economically unviable.
- 1.3 The aim of the report is to establish an overall risk to the development types identified in the Local Plan sites in delivering development over the next 15 years.

2. Development Delivery Scenarios

- 2.1 The Local Plan will deliver development identified or allocated sites over the next 15 years for residential, industrial, retail and commercial development along with other types of development.
- 2.2 The phasing of development will be dependent on economic conditions and prevailing markets cycles through the plan period. It must be appreciated that no sites identified or allocated in the Local Plan are restricted on when they can come forward for development, this takes into account the presumption that the infrastructure works required for the development of sites to western edge of the urban area and Wynyard can be facilitated by the developments. Essentially all sites are available for development whenever market conditions allow and economic viability allows.
- 2.3 In order to plan for the delivery of development over the next 15 years, a delivery scenario has been presented.

Expected Delivery Scenario

- 2.4 All sites identified or allocated in the Local Plan are anticipated to develop according to the expected delivery scenario outlined in tables 7, 9, 10 and 11 and reflected in the quantum of development identified in the Local Plan. The expected delivery scenario assumes that all the sites are available for development whenever market conditions allow and economic viability allows.
- 2.5 With regard to the future housing delivery the expected delivery scenario assumes the advocated housing provision target identified in the draft Local Plan. The expected delivery scenario for housing sites is illustrated in table 7.

3. Economic Viability of Local Plan Sites - Methodology

- 3.1 In order for identified and allocated sites in the Local Plan to deliver over the delivery scenario there is a need to investigate the overall economic viability of types of development that can come forward over the next 15 years.
- 3.2 Economic viability is a crucial element of the development process and is dependent on a number of factors, including build costs, infrastructure costs, achievable rental/sales values and market conditions. Where development is economically viable, in order for the development to be “sustainable” and acceptable in planning terms, it may be subject to developer contributions which essentially are another “cost” on development and therefore have an impact upon the economic viability of development sites.
- 3.3 As a result, the following development types identified in table 1 have been investigated and their economic viability demonstrated. The development types identified in table 1 include the vast majority of the anticipated development which will take place over the next 15 years. There may be other types of development that will come forward but these will not be included as anticipated development on identified or allocated sites.
- 3.4 Each typical site has a comparable specific site identified in the Local Plan; for instance the high quality Greenfield (Rural) development assumptions can be assumed as being similar to the Wynyard Park housing site allocation. Therefore where a typical site is seen as being economically viable and deliverable it can be assumed (providing no significant abnormalities are discovered) that the comparable development site can be delivered.
- 3.5 The development types identified in table 1 are the types of development where the Local Planning Authority would seek to secure developer contributions and therefore would have a potential impact upon economic viability. Only sites where developer contributions are envisaged to be necessary have been included in this assessment.

Table 1: Development Type

Development Type	Local Plan Site	Local Plan Site Example
Housing	High Quality Greenfield (Rural)	Wynyard
	High Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge / Villages)	Quarry Farm
	Market Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge)	High Tunstall
	High Quality Urban	Briarfields
	Market Quality Urban	Coronation Drive
Office	Prestige	Wynyard Park
	High Quality	Queens Meadow
	General	Oakesway
Industrial	Prestige	Wynyard Park
	High Quality	Queens Meadow
	General	Sovereign Park
Retail	Small	Local Centre
	Large	Marina Retail

Development Assumptions

- 3.6 In order to assess the economic viability and the ultimate deliverability of new development certain assumptions were made with regard to the value of development, development costs (including build costs, external costs, contingencies, finance costs etc). The development assumptions made are illustrated in tables 2 and 3.
- 3.7 The development assumptions have been made through researching local development indicators, standard development cost assumptions and through taking professional advice from local Agents and Borough Council officers.
- 3.8 The base build cost used for the assumptions is £80 sqft; this is consistent with and at the higher end of the range of base build costs experienced in Hartlepool. In addition it is within the region of the build cost information set out in the RICS Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) (lower quartile figure for New Build Estate housing, rebased to the Northern Region), which is £909sqm (£84.49 sq ft). Given the limitations of the samples used to inform BCIS (primarily being based on smaller scale developments) it is assumed that larger scale development will reduce this figure, therefore it is considered that the assumed figure of £80 sqft is reasonable and reflects the normal or usual figures expected in the majority of developments in the North East region, the Tees Valley sub region and the Borough of Hartlepool. Assumptions of 10% external costs and 3% contingency have been added to the base build cost figure. This approach is consistent with appeal decision APP/N2739/S/16/3149425. The individual site calculations are included as appendix 2 and can be provided on an Excel spreadsheet if required.

Developer Contribution Delivery Scenarios

- 3.9 Using the developer assumptions to estimate the base economic viability of each type of development anticipated to deliver on identified or allocated Local Plan sites, there could be the possibility to secure developer contributions as part of the development.
- 3.10 Some developer contributions, such as highway infrastructure improvements enable development to occur, such as highway improvements required by High Tunstall, Quarry Farm and at Wynyard, whereby if they weren't provided the development would not be able to be physically accessed effectively or would not be acceptable in highway terms. These "enabling" developer contributions are essentially non-negotiable and must be provided if a development is to take place. However in the interest of creating sustainable communities some developer contributions add to the overall quality of development and make the development more sustainable. Varying degrees of developer contributions can be secured depending upon type, impact and economic viability of development on the surrounding environment and the wider Borough.

3.11 In order to assess the effect developer contributions have on the economic viability various scenarios were assessed. Table 3 identifies the different scenarios and the individual developer contributions that would be sought as part of the new development. Appendix 2 details the individual assumed viability assessment and scale of contributions for the different scenarios.

Table 2: Development Type Assumptions

Development Type	Local Plan Site	Development Size	Market Value (per sq ft)	Land Value (per ha)	Build Cost (per sq ft)	Enabling Costs (% build cost)	Contingency (% build cost)	Professional Fees (% build cost)	Finance Rate (% land value)	Marketing & Sales (% value)	Developer Profit
Housing	High Quality Greenfield (Rural)	600dwellings	£235	£1,000,000	£80	10%	3%	8%	6%	3%	20%
	High Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge)	200dwellings	£200	£900,000	£80	10%	3%	8%	6%	3%	20%
	High Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge / Villages)*	1200dwellings	£185	£800,000	£80	10%	3%	8%	6%	3%	20%
	High Quality Urban	20dwellings	£200	£800,000	£80	10%	5%	8%	6%	3%	20%
	Market Quality Urban	65dwellings	£165	£500,000	£80	10%	5%	8%	6%	3%	20%
Office	Prestige	900sqm	£148 rent	n/a	£1,100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20%	17%
	High Quality	900sqm	£122 rent	n/a	£1,100	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20%	17%
	General	900sqm	£98 rent	n/a	£850	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20%	17%
Industrial	Prestige	900sqm	£50 rent	n/a	£450	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20%	17%
	High Quality	900sqm	£60 rent	n/a	£450	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20%	17%
	General	900sqm	£60 rent	n/a	£400	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20%	17%
Retail	Small	100sqm	£134 rent	n/a	£750	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20%	17%
	Large	800sqm	£118 rent	n/a	£750	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20%	17%

Table 3: Developer Contributions Assumptions

Developer Contribution	Estimated Cost
18% Affordable Housing	Offsite =18% of total dwellings x 40% of affordable house market value provided on the site. Or provision of 18% of dwellings on site provided as affordable houses.
10% On Site Renewables	Estimate of £3,000 per dwelling to cover the cost of installing renewable energy infrastructure. In terms of assumptions this is on 10% of the dwellings on site.
Improvement to buildings energy efficiency 10% above Building Regulations	The lowest figure a developer has achieved is £250 per dwelling and the highest was £550 per dwelling. The average has been estimated £400 per dwelling.
Off Site Highway Improvements	Specific to the site. For the sites to the west of the urban edge of Hartlepool, there is a requirement for a bypass around Elwick and a Grade Separated Junction on to the A19. Estimated cost of the works is £18,000,000. Similarly there are highway improvement requirements at Wynyard, estimated value of £5,000,000.
Education Provision	Specific to the site. For larger sites requirement for new primary schools, land allocation required as a minimum. Development does increase pressure on the education system. Contributions are required for both Primary and Secondary School places. Primary – 21.5 places required per 100 new dwellings, cost per place is £13,755. Secondary – 13.7 places required per 100 new dwellings, cost per place is £14,102. New 1 form entry primary schools required at Wynyard & High Tunstall.
Ecology	Specific to site – up to £300 per dwelling on developments closer than £6km to the coast. This is to mitigate the impact of development on the SPA.
Play Provision	Contributions used to build new or maintain existing children's play provision, multi use games areas including MUGAS and play areas. The standard requirement is assumed: £250 per dwelling At Wynyard onsite comprehensive provision required due to current lack of services.
Built Sports Facilities	Contributions used to fund necessary enhancement to Mill House (or other leisure centres) or to fund replacement facilities in the long term. The standard requirement is assumed: £250 per dwelling. At Wynyard onsite comprehensive provision required due to current lack of services.

Developer Contribution	Estimated Cost
Green Infrastructure	Contributions used to fund tree planting, footpath creation or enhancement, signage etc. to promote and enable access to the Borough's green infrastructure. The standard requirement is assumed: £250 per dwelling.
Other sports provision	Contributions used to fund playing pitches (£233.29 per dwelling), tennis courts (£57.02 per dwelling) and bowling greens (£4.97 per dwelling) : £295.28 per dwelling
Other	This could include developer contributions such as health provision, cycle routes, electric charging points, training and employment charters and coastal/flood defences were relevant.

3.12 The assumptions made in relation to the contributions as set out in Table 3 is a worst case scenario in relation to the developer contribution costs which may be required. For example, the cost of a primary school has been set out when considering Wynyard and High Tunstall, however there are alternative funding delivery options which could be pursued to remove or reduce these development costs.

3.13 Several of the local plan sites are linked to the delivery of the Elwick Junction and the Grade Separated Junction on to the A19. These costs have been factored into the viability testing at various levels to reflect the potential external funding options. The Council has submitted a bid to secure £10million funding from the National Productivity and Investment Fund (NPIF) (Department of Transport) and other funding options are being pursued such as The Housing Fund, which has been factored in to scenarios identified in the viability assumptions.

Table 4: Developer Contributions Scenario Assumptions

Scenario	Expectation
Enabling Developer Contributions	<p>Minimum level contributions which only actually enable the development to deliver and be physically accessed. These could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology Mitigation • Highway improvements.
Minimum Developer Contributions	<p>Minimum level of contributions on top of the enabling contributions to make the development acceptable. These could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology Mitigation • Highway improvements. • 18% affordable housing contribution. • Education provision • Open space / play provision.
Expected Developer Contributions	<p>The level of contributions on top of the enabling and minimum contributions that would be expected if all relevant Local Plan policies were imposed on new development. These could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology Mitigation • Highway improvements. • 18% affordable housing contribution. • Education provision • Open space / play provision. • Built sports facilities. • Green infrastructure. • Additional sports facilities. • 10% Renewables • Energy Efficiency • Other

Economic Viability of Development Sites

- 3.14 Taking into consideration the developer assumptions and the developer contributions estimates an assessment was made as the economic viability and subsequent deliverability of each typical site.
- 3.15 Tables 5a and 5b provide a summary to the % development risk associated with each development type compared to the developer contributions sought as part of the development. Tables 6 and 7 provide the actual financial assessment related to the development risk.

Table 5a: Economic Viability Assessment Risk (%) Outcomes – Residential Development

Development Type	Local Plan Typical Site	Expected Developer Contributions	Minimum Developer Contributions	Enabling Developer Contributions
Housing	<i>Assumed Position of no grant towards Elwick Bypass & Grade Separated Junctions (*Scenarios which apply)</i>			
	High Quality Greenfield (Rural)	94.7%	92.6%	87.3%
	High Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge / Villages)*	96.1%	95.6%	90.6%
	Market Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge)*	106.1%	105.5%	98.8%
	High Quality Urban*	105.6%	105.1%	100.1%
	Market Quality Urban	103.2%	102.4%	94.9%
	<i>Assumed Position of £10million NPIF Grant towards Elwick Bypass & Grade Separated Junctions (*Scenarios which apply)</i>			
	High Quality Greenfield (Rural)	N/A	N/A	N/A
	High Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge / Villages)*	93.8%	93.4%	88.4%
	Market Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge)*	103.1%	102.4%	95.8%
	High Quality Urban*	103.3%	102.8%	97.9%
	Market Quality Urban	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Assumed Position full grant secured towards Elwick Bypass & Grade Separated Junctions (*Scenarios which apply)</i>			
	High Quality Greenfield (Rural)	N/A	N/A	N/A
	High Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge / Villages)*	92.1%	91.6%	86.6%
	Market Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge)*	100.7%	100.0%	93.3%
	High Quality Urban*	101.6%	101.1%	96.1%
	Market Quality Urban	N/A	N/A	N/A

Table 5b: Economic Viability Assessment Risk (%) Outcomes – Residential Development

Development Type	Local Plan Typical Site	Enabling Developer Contributions	Minimum Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions
Office	Prestige	92%	98%	n/a
	High Quality	100%	106%	n/a
	General	105%	113%	n/a
Industrial	Prestige	108%	124%	n/a
	High Quality	93%	106%	n/a
	General	85%	98%	n/a
Retail	Small	74%	80%	n/a
	Large	81%	88%	n/a

3.16 Tables 5a and 5b illustrate the development risk as a percentage. Typically, where a site is in excess of 100% it is assumed that it is not economically viable and therefore would not come forward for development assuming the developer assumptions remain the same and the current economic climate remains consistent. If a site is at or below 100% there is essentially some “slack” in the economic viability of the development and therefore would be deliverable over the next 15 years, these are shown as green within the table.

3.17 However given external funding possibilities for the Strategic Highway Infrastructure outlined in 3.13, scenarios within 3% excess of 100% risk have been shown as orange in Table 5a and 5a. As it is must be appreciated that even if a site is in excess of 100% risk certain aspects of the development could be changed to allow the site to be economically viable; such as a reduced developer profit or a reduced capital receipt for the land value.

3.18 Table 6 illustrates the same development risk, based on the same assumptions but is represented as a financial sum.

Table 6: Economic Viability Assessment Risk (£) Outcomes Residential Development

Development	High Quality Greenfield (Rural)	High Quality Greenfield (Urban edge/Villages) *	Market Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge)*	High Quality Urban*	Market Quality Urban
Area (Ha) (Developable land)	£35.00	£8.00	£50.00	£1.50	£2.50
Number of dwellings	£600.00	£200.00	£1,200.00	£20.00	£65.00
Average Dwelling Size	£1,500.00	£1,500.00	£1,200.00	£1,500.00	£1,200.00
Revenue (£ sq ft)	£235.00	£200.00	£185.00	£200.00	£165.00
Development Value	£211,500,000.00	£60,000,000.00	£266,400,000.00	£6,000,000.00	£12,870,000.00
Total Costs	£179,645,750.00	£51,937,750.00	£248,382,450.00	£5,762,950.00	£12,198,920.00
Development Surplus	£31,854,250.00	£8,062,250.00	£18,017,550.00	£237,050.00	£671,080.00

S106 Deliverability Scenarios					
1) Expected Contributions *	£20,640,289.68	£5,705,117.56	£34,190,450.36	£570,511.76	£1,077,552.49
<i>Development Surplus</i>	£11,213,960.32	£2,357,132.44	-£16,172,900.36	-£333,461.76	-£406,472.49
1a) Expected Contributions**		£4,371,783.56	£26,190,446.36	£437,178.36	
<i>Development Surplus</i>		£3,690,466.44	-£8,172,896.36	-£200,128.36	
1b) Expected Contributions***		£3,305,117.56	£19,790,450.36	£330,511.76	
<i>Development Surplus</i>		£4,757,132.44	-£1,772,900.36	-£93,461.76	
2) Minimum Contributions*	£16,290,289.68	£5,406,061.56	£32,396,114.36	£540,606.16	£980,359.29
<i>Development Surplus</i>	£15,563,960.32	£2,656,188.44	-£14,378,564.36	-£303,556.16	-£309,279.29
2a) Minimum Contributions**		£4,072,727.56	£24,396,110.36	£407,272.76	
<i>Development Surplus</i>		£3,989,522.44	-£6,378,560.36	-£170,222.76	
2b) Minimum Contributions***		£3,006,061.56	£17,996,114.36	£300,606.16	
<i>Development Surplus</i>		£5,056,188.44	£21,435.64	-£63,556.16	
3) Enabling Contributions*	£5,000,000.00	£2,450,000.00	£14,700,000.00	£245,000.00	£19,500.00
<i>Development Surplus</i>	£26,854,250.00	£5,612,250.00	£3,317,550.00	-£7,950.00	£651,580.00
3a) Enabling Contributions**		£1,116,666.00	£6,699,996.00	£111,666.00	
<i>Development Surplus</i>		£6,945,584.00	£11,317,554.00	£125,384.00	
3b) Enabling Contributions***		£50,000.00	£300,000.00	£5,000.00	
<i>Development Surplus</i>		£8,012,250.00	£17,717,550.00	£232,050.00	

* This assumes no grant is secured for Elwick Bypass and Grade Separated Junction.

** This assumes £10million NPIF grant is secured for Elwick Bypass and Grade Separated Junction.

*** This assumes full grant is secured for Elwick Bypass and Grade Separated Junction.

Table 7: Economic Viability Assessment Risk (£) Outcomes Office, Residential and Retail Development

Development Type	Local Plan Site	Development Size (Dwellings or floorspace)	Development Value	Development Costs	Development Surplus	Enabling Developer Contributions	Minimum Developer Contributions
Office	Prestige	900	£1,665,000	£1,535,202	£129,798	£0	£90,000
	Economic Viability Surplus					£129,798	£39,798
	High Quality	900	£1,372,500	£1,370,403	£2,097	£0	£90,000
	Economic Viability Surplus					£2,097	-£87,903
	General	900	£1,102,500	£1,153,377	-£50,877	£0	£90,000
Economic Viability Surplus					-£50,877	-£140,877	
Industrial	Prestige	900	£562,500	£606,825	-£44,325	£0	£90,000
	Economic Viability Surplus					-£44,325	-£134,325
	High Quality	900	£675,000	£626,940	£48,060	£0	£90,000
	Economic Viability Surplus					£48,060	-£41,940
	General	900	£675,000	£570,690	£104,310	£0	£90,000
Economic Viability Surplus					£104,310	£14,310	
Retail	Small	100	£167,500	£123,699	£43,801	£0	£10,000
	Economic Viability Surplus					£43,801	£33,801
	Large	800	£1,180,000	£960,984	£219,016	£0	£80,000
	Economic Viability Surplus					£219,016	£139,016

3.19 When considering the development assumptions and developer contribution scenarios similar patterns start to emerge. The following paragraphs outline the broad pattern of development risk by each development type category.

High Quality Greenfield (Rural) Housing Development

3.20 High quality housing, including executive housing is seen as being economically viable and therefore deliverable as a development type. Further to this, developer contributions could be sought at the enabling, minimum and expected developer contribution scenarios, as identified in tables 5a and 6.

3.17 Based upon the development assumptions and the developer contributions scenarios it is established that high quality greenfield housing is economically viable in the Borough. Therefore it is assumed (providing no severe development abnormalities are discovered) that the following Local Plan sites are deliverable:

- Wynyard Park North
- Wynyard Park South
- North Pentagon

High Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge / Villages) Housing Development

3.18 High quality housing, including executive housing is seen as being economically viable and therefore deliverable as a development type. Further to this, developer contributions could be sought at the enabling, minimum and expected developer contribution scenarios, as identified in tables 5a and 6.

3.19 Based upon the development assumptions and the developer contributions scenarios it is established that high quality greenfield housing is economically viable in the Borough. Therefore it is assumed (providing no severe development abnormalities are discovered) that the following Local Plan sites are deliverable:

- Quarry Farm
- Elwick Village
- Hart – Nine Acres
- Hart – Glebe Farm

Market Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge) Housing Development

3.20 Market quality housing is seen as being economically viable and therefore deliverable as a development type. In the event that no grant is secured the developer contributions could be sought at the enabling level and still leave the development economically viable.

3.21 When the scenario assumes no grant is secured market quality Greenfield (urban edge) housing, development becomes non economically viable

when the minimum and expected developer contribution scenario is applied. Hence the cost of the Strategic Highway prohibits the achievement of the minimum and expected developer contributions, however in the scenario where the £10million NPIF grant is secured, the risk of the development is reduced to 102.4%. Given the assumptions include the delivery of a primary school (which could secure external funding), as well as 20% developer profit, certain aspects of the development could be changed to allow the site to be economically viable at the minimum contributions level; such as a reduced developer profit or a reduced capital receipt for the land value. In the scenario where full external funding is secured for the bypass this further increases the economic viability.

3.22 It is established that market quality greenfield housing is economically viable in the Borough. Therefore it is assumed (providing no severe development abnormalities are discovered) that the following Local Plan sites are deliverable:

- High Tunstall

High Quality Urban Housing Development

3.23 High quality brownfield housing is seen as being economically viable and therefore deliverable as a development type. Developer contributions could be sought at the enabling level. Table 5a does show a higher level of risk in relation to this type of development, this is due to the development being to the west of the urban area and therefore required to contribute to the Elwick Junction and the Grade Separated Junction on to the A19, hence impacting on viability. However once grant scenarios are applied, viability improves. Notwithstanding this, the assumptions included are 'worst case scenario' hence certain aspects of the development could be changed to allow the site to be economically viable at the minimum contributions level; such as a reduced developer profit or a reduced capital receipt for the land value.

3.24 It is established that high quality brownfield housing is economically viable in the Borough. Therefore it is assumed (providing no development severe abnormalities are discovered) that the following Local Plan sites are deliverable:

- Briarfields
- Windfall sites (although not accounted for in the housing provision numbers)

Market Quality Urban Housing Development

3.25 Market quality brownfield housing is seen as being economically viable and therefore deliverable as a development type. Again, developer contributions could be sought at the enabling and is within the realm of being economically viable at the minimum level (assuming the impact of the worst case scenario assumptions as previously discussed).

3.26 It is established that market quality brownfield housing is economically viable in the Borough. Therefore it is assumed (providing no severe development abnormalities are discovered) that the following Local Plan sites are deliverable:

- Extant Residential Planning Permissions
- Residential Sites Identified in the Urban Area
- Windfall sites (although not accounted for in the housing provision numbers)

Office Development

3.27 The current economic climate continues to have a negative effect on office development, whereby only prestige and high quality type developments are seen as being viable but with investor confidence low in the property market speculative development is not currently happening. Historically, only enabling or minimum developer contributions have been sought as part of office developments (highway improvements and/or green infrastructure) so as a result there are no scenarios for expected, maximum or aspirational levels.

3.28 Only prestige office development could have the potential to support developer contributions above what would enable the development. Therefore assuming the requirement to deliver developer contributions as part of the development is reduced the following Local Plan sites are deliverable:

- Wynyard Business Park
- Queens Meadow Business Park

However there is concern with regard to the economic viability and subsequent deliverability of office development on general employment sites identified in the Local Plan.

Industrial Development

3.29 In contrast to office development, the lower the quality of the industrial development in terms of build quality and furnishings has a positive impact on the economic viability. Prestige development is seen as being unviable, whereas high quality and general industrial developments are seen as being economically viable. Again, historically, only enabling or minimum developer contributions have been sought as part of industrial developments (highway improvements and/or green infrastructure) so as a result there are no scenarios for expected, maximum or aspirational levels. Where development is expected to provide developer contributions, there is an impact on economic viability.

3.30 Therefore assuming the requirement to deliver developer contributions as part of the development is reduced the following Local Plan sites are deliverable:

- Wynyard Business Park
- Queens Meadow Business Park
- Oakesway Industrial Park
- Longhill / Sandgate
- Usworth Road
- Sovereign Park
- Park View West
- Brenda Road East
- South Works
- Tofts Farm East/Hunter House
- Brenda Road West.
- Graythorp Industrial Estate
- Graythorp Yard
- Zinc Works Road
- The Port
- Phillips Tank Farm

Retail and Commercial Development

- 3.31 All retail development is seen as being economically viable and can support enabling and minimum levels of developer contributions. As a result, where retail development is possible and/or appropriate in the town centre, edge of town centre areas, retail and leisure parks and in local centres it is seen as being economically viable and deliverable over the next 15 years.

Economic Viability Conclusion

- 3.32 As summarised in tables 5 and 6, with a few exceptions, the majority of development anticipated to deliver over the next 15 years is economically viable and can support the minimum developer contributions being imposed on the development it still resulting in an economically viable development.
- 3.33 As the requirement to provide developer contributions increases the economic viability of the identified and allocated sites in the Local Plan decreases, therefore the Local Planning Authority may have to be selective in the type, amount and level of developer contributions required on each development scheme to ensure that development remains economically viable and can be delivered.
- 3.33 However, the economic viability of future development is not exclusively controlled by the Local Planning Authority. Where developer contributions are essential for the scheme to be considered acceptable in planning terms and be a sustainable development, there may be scope for the developer to take a reduced profit and/or the landowner receive a reduce capital receipt for the purchase/rent of the development land for instance, in order to increase the economic viability of the development. As a result, where Local Plan sites are shown to be not economically viable based on the development assumptions there still may be room for negotiation to make the development economically viable.

4. Deliverability of Local Plan Sites

- 4.1 Having established that the majority of development types and therefore identified and allocated sites in the Local Plan are economically viable the next stage is to assess each site and demonstrate that it is actually deliverable, considering site specific constraints.
- 4.2 Tables 8 to 11 outline the identified and allocated sites in the Local Plan and illustrates the quantum of development proposed, the predicted estimated phasing of development over the plan period and potential issues with regard to the deliverability of each site.
- 4.3 Appendix 1 contains each site identified for development in the Local Plan and illustrates the issues that could affect its deliverability and ultimately advocates a risk factor of low, medium or high. Tables 8 to 11 summarise all the individual site tables that are contained in Appendix 1 and gives an overall view with regard to the deliverability of each development site identified or allocated in the Local Plan.

Housing Provision Sites

- 4.4 There is an overall low risk to all of the housing sites identified or allocated in the Local Plan when considering the principle of the development when considering the expected delivery scenarios. Further to this it is demonstrated that all housing sites can support the enabling still be economically viable in the worst case scenario when it comes to external funding provision and development cost.

Strengthening the Local Economy Sites

- 4.5 There is an overall low risk to the delivery of development on the employment sites identified or allocated in the Local Plan. However, certain types of development were not economically viable in the continued current economic climate. For sites that were, in principle, economically viable it is demonstrated that they can support the enabling and minimum developer contribution scenarios and still be economically viable.

Retail and Commercial Development Sites

- 4.6 There is an overall low risk to retail and commercial development on sites identified or allocated in the Local Plan. All development was assessed as being economically viable and could support the enabling and minimum developer contribution scenarios and still be economically viable.

Affordable Housing

- 4.7 The assumptions made within this document in relation to affordable housing have included off site provision. Table 8 details the % of onsite provision which would generate the same level of development revenue. This has assumed the average dwelling size for the purposes of the calculation; this in reality would change to reflect the aspirations of the Hartlepool Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2015 which could impact the revenue. For example the build costs could reduce if smaller dwellings were required. However the table demonstrates that all development could achieve on site affordable to meet the policy requirement of HGS9 (Affordable Housing Provision).
- 4.8 A further consideration for the delivery of affordable housing on site in high quality market areas is the ability of Registered Providers to meet the affordable sales vales, in this situation it may be necessary to consider off site contributions.

Site Deliverability Conclusion

- 4.9 Having assessed the economic viability of sites and then their subsequent deliverability there is an overall low risk to sites identified or allocated in the Local Plan.

Table 8: Off site / On site Affordable Housing Revenue Comparison

Development	High Quality Greenfield (Rural)	High Quality Greenfield (Urban edge)	Market Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge)	High Quality Urban	Market Quality Urban
Number of dwellings	600	200	1200	20	65
Average Dwelling Size (sqft)	1500	1500	1200	1500	1200
Revenue (£ sq ft)	£ 235.00	£ 200.00	£ 185.00	£ 200.00	£ 165.00

Revenue from 'off site' affordable					
Development Revenue (Affordable off site)	£ 211,500,000.00	£ 60,000,000.00	£ 266,400,000.00	£ 6,000,000.00	£ 12,870,000.00
Affordable housing contribution if off site (based on policy requirement of 18%)	£ 5,784,605.28	£ 1,928,201.76	£ 11,569,210.56	£ 482,050.44	£ 626,665.57
Equivalent Revenue	£ 205,715,394.72	£ 58,071,798.24	£ 254,830,789.44	£ 5,517,949.56	£ 12,243,334.43

Equivalent Level of 'on site' affordable to achieve comparable revenue					
% of Affordable Housing	6.5%	8.0%	10.5%	18.0%	12.0%
On site number dwellings	39	16	126	3.6	7.8
Revenue @ 60% (£ per sqft)*	£ 141.00	£ 120.00	£ 111.00	£ 120.00	£ 99.00
Revenue of affordable unit	£ 211,500.00	£ 180,000.00	£ 133,200.00	£ 180,000.00	£ 118,800.00
Total Revenue from affordable	£ 8,248,500.00	£ 2,880,000.00	£ 16,783,200.00	£ 648,000.00	£ 926,640.00
Remaining Market Housing (Quantum)	561	184	1074	16.4	57.2
Revenue (£ sq ft)	£ 235.00	£ 200.00	£ 185.00	£ 200.00	£ 165.00
Average Dwelling (£)	£ 352,500.00	£ 300,000.00	£ 222,000.00	£ 300,000.00	£ 198,000.00
Revenue from market housing	£ 197,752,500.00	£ 55,200,000.00	£ 238,428,000.00	£ 4,920,000.00	£ 11,325,600.00
Total revenue (inc affordable)	£ 206,001,000.00	£ 58,080,000.00	£ 255,211,200.00	£ 5,568,000.00	£ 12,252,240.00

Assumptions

* Registered providers pay 60% of the market value.

Table 9: Expected Growth Housing Provision Assumed position as of the Publication Stage of the Local Plan

Housing Provision Sites			Current Development			Cumulative Development Delivery				Delivery Issues	
Site No	Policy	Site Name	Dwelling Capacity	Developed Dwellings	Dwellings Remaining	1 st 5 Year Area (ha)	2 nd 5 Years Area (ha)	3 rd 5 Years Area (ha)	% Dev by 2031	Identified Development Delivery Constraints	Overall Delivery Risk
1	Hsg1	Extant Planning Permissions	3793	0	3793	53%	83%	100%	100%	Only "deliverable sites" have been included in the Local Plan, sites with high infrastructure costs etc or those on undeliverable sites have not been included in the Local Plan. Therefore there is a low risk to the delivery of the sites included.	Low
2	Hsg1	Identified Urban Area	169	0	169	50%	56%	100%	100%	Only "deliverable sites" have been included in the Local Plan.	Low
3	Hsg1 / Hsg5	High Tunstall	1200	0	1200	12.5%	50%	100%	100%	<p>The site would be required to provide, as a minimum, the following as part of the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology Mitigation • Highway infrastructure improvements. • 10% affordable housing contribution. • 10% Renewables. • Open space / play provision. • Green wedge and infrastructure. <p>The developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and the sites are seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the enabling and minimum developer contribution scenarios.</p>	Low (Medium)*

Housing Provision Sites			Current Development			Cumulative Development Delivery				Delivery Issues	
Site No	Policy	Site Name	Dwelling Capacity	Developed Dwellings	Dwellings Remaining	1 st 5 Year Area (ha)	2 nd 5 Years Area (ha)	3 rd 5 Years Area (ha)	% Dev by 2031	Identified Development Delivery Constraints	Overall Delivery Risk
4	Hsg1/ Hsg6	Wynyard Park	732	0	732	22%	59%	100%	100%	<p>The site would be required to provide, as a minimum, the following as part of the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology Mitigation • Highway infrastructure improvements. • 10% affordable housing contribution. • 10% Renewables. • Open space / play provision. • Green wedge and infrastructure. <p>The developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and the sites are seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the enabling and minimum developer contribution scenarios.</p>	Low
5	Hsg1/ Hsg5a	Quarry Farm	220	0	220	30%	80%	100%	100%	<p>The site would be required to provide, as a minimum, the following as part of the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology Mitigation • Highway infrastructure improvements. • 10% affordable housing contribution. • 10% Renewables. • Open space / play provision. • Green wedge and infrastructure. <p>The developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and the sites are seen as</p>	Low

Housing Provision Sites			Current Development			Cumulative Development Delivery				Delivery Issues	
Site No	Policy	Site Name	Dwelling Capacity	Developed Dwellings	Dwellings Remaining	1 st 5 Year Area (ha)	2 nd 5 Years Area (ha)	3 rd 5 Years Area (ha)	% Dev by 2031	Identified Development Delivery Constraints	Overall Delivery Risk
										being deliverable bearing in mind the enabling and minimum developer contribution scenarios.	
6	Hsg1/ Hsg7	Elwick	35	0	35	0%	100%	100%	100%	<p>The site would be required to provide, as a minimum, the following as part of the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecology Mitigation • Highway infrastructure improvements. • 10% affordable housing contribution. • 10% Renewables. • Open space / play provision. • Green wedge and infrastructure. <p>The developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and the sites are seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the enabling and minimum developer contribution scenarios.</p>	Low
7	Hsg1 / Hsg8	Hart	50	0	15	60%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low

Table 10: Strengthening the Local Economy Sites

Employment Sites			Current Development Area			Cumulative Development Delivery				Delivery Issues	
Site No	Policy	Site Name	Gross Area (ha)	Developed Area (ha)	Available Area (ha)	1 st 5 Year Area (ha)	2 nd 5 Years Area (ha)	3 rd 5 Years Area (ha)	% Dev by 2031	Identified Development Delivery Constraints	Overall Delivery Risk
8	EMP1	Wynyard Business Park	32.7	0	32.7	0%	30%	50%	50%	There are the low/medium risks associated with highway network implications and medium risk to associated infrastructure costs however there is an overall low risk to delivery.	Low
9	EMP2	Queens Meadow Business Park	65.0	20.3	44.7	40%	60%	85%	85%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
10	EMP3	Oakesway	38.8	20.2	18.6	52%	75%	90%	90%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
11	EMP3	Longhill / Sandgate	73.8	72.8	1.0	99%	99%	99%	99%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
12	EMP3	Usworth Road	14.1	13.1	0.97	98%	98%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
13	EMP3	Sovereign Park	20.9	9.5	11.4	45%	70%	75%	75%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low

Employment Sites			Current Development Area			Cumulative Development Delivery				Delivery Issues	
Site No	Policy	Site Name	Gross Area (ha)	Developed Ares (ha)	Available Area (ha)	1 st 5 Year Area (ha)	2 nd 5 Years Area (ha)	3 rd 5 Years Area (ha)	% Dev by 2031	Identified Development Delivery Constraints	Overall Delivery Risk
14	EMP3	Park View West	19.3	18.07	1.23	95%	95%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
15	EMP3	Brenda Road	3.6	3.6	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
16	EMP4	South Works	131.3	131.3	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
17	EMP3	Tofts Farm East / Hunter House	44.2	43.6	0.6	99%	99%	99%	99%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
18	EMP3	Graythorp Industrial Estate	13.1	13.1	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
19	EMP3	Zinc Works Road	3.0	3.0	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
20	EMP4	Graythorp Waste Site	4.0	1.9	2.1	50%	50%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low

Employment Sites			Current Development Area			Cumulative Development Delivery				Delivery Issues	
Site No	Policy	Site Name	Gross Area (ha)	Developed Ares (ha)	Available Area (ha)	1 st 5 Year Area (ha)	2 nd 5 Years Area (ha)	3 rd 5 Years Area (ha)	% Dev by 2031	Identified Development Delivery Constraints	Overall Delivery Risk
21	EMP4	The Port	106.1	37.1	79.0	30%	40%	50%	60%	There are no identified development delivery constraints. 79ha are covered by an Enterprise Zone LDO.	Low
22	EMP4	North Graythorp	27.1	13.5	13.6	40%	45%	50%	60%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
23	EMP4	Phillips Tank Farm	150	150	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
24	EMP4	Graythorp Yard	47.8	47.8	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
25	EMP4	West of Seaton Channel	76.7	76.7	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints.	Low
26	EMP5	Nuclear Power Station	121.3	0	121.3	0	25%	100%	100%	To be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning)	Low

Table 11: Retail and Commercial Development Sites

Retail and Commercial Sites			Current Development Area			Cumulative Development Delivery				Delivery Issues	
Site No	Policy	Site Name	Gross Area (ha)	Developed Area (ha)	Available Area (ha)	1 st 5 Year Area (ha)	2 nd 5 Years Area (ha)	3 rd 5 Years Area (ha)	% Dev by 2031	Identified Development Delivery Constraints	Overall Delivery Risk
27	RC2	The Town Centre	38.8	38.8	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
28	RC4	Avenue Road / Raby Road	3.1	3.1	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
29	RC5	The Brewery and Stranton	6	6	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	Whilst partly within flood zones 2/3, not considered a significant constraint to deliverability. Likely build out through years 0-5 and 5-10.	Low/ Medium
30	RC6	East of Stranton	1.18	0.62	0.56	53%	53%	100%	100%	Small area of site in flood zones 2/3. No other identified risk, the site has no abnormal financial constraints associated with build costs. The site is close to the town centre and an abundance of car parking so a business here is likely to be profitable and thus required planning obligations could be achieved. Considered likely build out in years 10-15 as town grows.	Low
31	RC7	Lynn Street	8.67	8.07	0.6	93%	100%	100%	100%	Significant part of site in flood zones 2 and 3. Mitigation measures would need to be agreed with the Environment Agency and an FRA would need to demonstrate flood risk can be successfully managed throughout the lifetime of the development. Anticipated further development in years 5-10 once college established and ISQ policies take effect.	Medium
32	RC8	Mill House	5.27	4.84	0.43	92%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints. Build out considered likely in years 5-10.	Low

Retail and Commercial Sites			Current Development Area			Cumulative Development Delivery				Delivery Issues	
Site No	Policy	Site Name	Gross Area (ha)	Developed Area (ha)	Available Area (ha)	1 st 5 Year Area (ha)	2 nd 5 Years Area (ha)	3 rd 5 Years Area (ha)	% Dev by 2031	Identified Development Delivery Constraints	Overall Delivery Risk
33	RC9	Park Road West	1.6	1.6	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
34	RC10	West Victoria Road	1.42	1.42	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
35	RC11	York Road South	3.72	3.29	0.43	88%	100%	100%	100%	Small part of area in flood risk zones 2/3. Site has no abnormal financial constraints that could lead to excessive build costs. Site is within walking distance of town centre and a high level of residential properties, development here is likely to be profitable and planning obligations are likely to be achieved. Build out considered likely in years 10-15.	Low
36	RC12	The Marina	34.5	32.26	2.24	93.5%	100%	100%	100%	Significant part of area in flood zone 3. Mitigation measures would need to be agreed with the Environment Agency and an FRA would need to demonstrate flood risk can be successfully managed throughout the lifetime of the development. Anticipated build out year 5-10.	Low/ Medium
37	RC13	West of Marina Way	9.5	9.5	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
38	RC14	Trincomalee Wharf	6.86	4.42	2.44	82%	100%	100%	100%	Whilst partly within flood zones 2/3, not considered a significant constraint to deliverability. Likely build out through years 0-5 and 5-10.	Low/ Medium
39	RC15	Tees Bay	9.96	8.61	1.35	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints. Approval for vacant site, delivery likely in years 0-5.	Low
40	RC16	Clavering Road	0.2	0.2	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low

Retail and Commercial Sites			Current Development Area			Cumulative Development Delivery				Delivery Issues	
Site No	Policy	Site Name	Gross Area (ha)	Developed Area (ha)	Available Area (ha)	1 st 5 Year Area (ha)	2 nd 5 Years Area (ha)	3 rd 5 Years Area (ha)	% Dev by 2031	Identified Development Delivery Constraints	Overall Delivery Risk
41	RC16	King Oswy Drive	0.66	0.66	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
42	RC16	Middle Warren	0.68	0.68	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
43	RC16	Brus Corner	0.24	0.24	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
44	RC16	Durham Street	0.35	0.35	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
45	RC16	Northgate	0.59	0.59	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	Majority of site is in flood zone 3. Mitigation measures would need to be agreed with the Environment Agency and an FRA would need to demonstrate flood risk can be successfully managed throughout the lifetime of any new development however no sites available for new build.	Medium
46	RC16	Wiltshire Way / Throston	0.60	0.60	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
47	RC16	Raby Road / Brougham	0.48	0.48	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
48	RC16	Raby Road / Hart Lane	0.64	0.64	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
49	RC16	Murray Street	1.63	1.63	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
50	RC16	Oxford Road	0.68	0.68	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
51	RC16	Brenda Rd / Sydenham Rd	0.4	0.4	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
52	RC16	Catcote Road	0.57	0.57	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low

Retail and Commercial Sites			Current Development Area			Cumulative Development Delivery				Delivery Issues	
Site No	Policy	Site Name	Gross Area (ha)	Developed Area (ha)	Available Area (ha)	1 st 5 Year Area (ha)	2 nd 5 Years Area (ha)	3 rd 5 Years Area (ha)	% Dev by 2031	Identified Development Delivery Constraints	Overall Delivery Risk
53	RC16	Belle Vue Way	0.43	0.43	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
54	RC16	Brierton Lane	0.46	0.46	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
55	RC16	Wynyard Road	2.37	2.37	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
56	RC16	Owton Manor West	0.59	0.59	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
57	RC16	Owton Manor East	0.26	0.26	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
58	RC16	Jutland Road	0.28	0.28	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
59	RC16	Fens	0.98	0.98	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
60	RC16	Elizabeth Way	0.47	0.47	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
61	RC16	Claxton	2.8	0	2.8	20%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
62	RC16	Chatham Road	0.25	0.25	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
63	RC16	Davison Drive	0.15	0.15	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
64	RC16	Duke Street North	0.09	0.09	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
65	RC16	Duke Street South	0.008	0.008	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
66	RC16	High Tunstall	2.4	0	2.4	20%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
67	RC16	Miers Avenue	0.38	0.38	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low

Retail and Commercial Sites			Current Development Area			Cumulative Development Delivery				Delivery Issues	
Site No	Policy	Site Name	Gross Area (ha)	Developed Area (ha)	Available Area (ha)	1 st 5 Year Area (ha)	2 nd 5 Years Area (ha)	3 rd 5 Years Area (ha)	% Dev by 2031	Identified Development Delivery Constraints	Overall Delivery Risk
68	RC16	Powlett Road East	0.02	0.02	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
69	RC16	Seaton Front	1.44	1.44	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	Small part of site in flood risk zone 2/3. There are no other identified development delivery constraints	Low
70	RC16	Spring Garden Rd/ Stockton Rd	0.07	0.07	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
71	RC16	Stockton Road / Cornwall Street	0.59	0.59	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
72	RC16	The Former Powlett Pub	0.17	0.17	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
73	RC16	The Former Saxon Pub	0.17	0.17	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
74	RC16	Warren Road	0.33	0.33	0	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low
75	RC16	Wynyard Park	8.9	0	8.9	100%	100%	100%	100%	There are no identified development delivery constraints	Low

Appendix 1: Site Development Risk Assessments

(1) Extant Planning Permissions		
Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	All of the existing planning permissions are within the urban area and close to existing services.
Flooding Issues	Low	There are issues and concerns with regard to flooding at some of the sites. The issues were raised, addressed and dealt with at the planning application stage.
Site Constraints	Low	<p>Site constraint costs would have been addressed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Because of the changing economic circumstances, land values have fallen and are struggling to recover to pre credit crunch levels. If values are not sufficient to cover the established costs of dealing with site constraints this may result in development being economically unviable.</p> <p>However it must be appreciated that only "deliverable sites" have been included in the Local Plan, sites with onerous constraints etc or those on undeliverable sites have not been included in the Local Plan. Therefore there is a low risk to the delivery of the sites included.</p>
Land Contamination	Low	<p>Land contamination costs would have been addressed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Because of the changing economic circumstances, land values have fallen and are struggling to recover to pre credit crunch levels. If values are not sufficient to cover the established costs of dealing with contamination this may result in development being economically unviable.</p> <p>However it must be appreciated that only "deliverable sites" have been included in the Local Plan, sites with contamination mitigation costs etc or those on undeliverable sites have not been included in the Local Plan. Therefore there is a low risk to the delivery of the sites included.</p>
Transport Access	Low	Transport issues were raised, addressed and dealt with at the planning application stage.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Utility service issues were raised, addressed and dealt with at the planning application stage.
Highway Network Implications	Low	Highway issues were raised, addressed and dealt with at the planning application stage.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	<p>Infrastructure costs will have been established at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Because of the changing economic circumstances, land values have fallen and are struggling to recover to pre credit crunch levels. If values are not sufficient to cover the established infrastructure costs this may result in development being economically unviable.</p> <p>However it must be appreciated that only "deliverable sites" have been included in the Local Plan, sites with high infrastructure costs etc or those on undeliverable sites have not been included in the Local Plan. Therefore there is a low risk to the delivery of the sites included.</p>
Developer Contributions	Low	<p>Developer contribution costs will have been established at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Because of the changing economic circumstances, land values have fallen and are struggling to recover to pre credit crunch levels. If values are not sufficient to cover the established developer contribution costs this may result in development being economically unviable.</p>
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(2) Identified Urban Area

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	All of the sites are within the urban area and close to existing services.
Flooding Issues	Low	<p>Only 3 sites are within flood zones 2 and 3 and have the potential to prevent housing development on the site without adequate mitigation.</p> <p>There are other sites that are in flood zones 2 and 3 however the Environment Agency does not see any obstacle to housing development.</p> <p>The vast majority of the sites are not in flood zones 2 and 3 and therefore do not have any identified flood risk.</p>
Site Constraints	Low	<p>There are no identified site constraints identified at SHLAA assessment stage.</p> <p>Because of the changing economic circumstances, land values have fallen and are struggling to recover to pre credit crunch levels. If values are not sufficient to cover the established costs of dealing with site constraints this may result in development being economically unviable.</p> <p>However it must be appreciated that only "deliverable sites" have been included in the Local Plan, sites with onerous constraints etc or those on undeliverable sites have not been included in the Local Plan. Therefore there is a low risk to the delivery of the sites included.</p>
Land Contamination	Medium	Coronation Drive has contamination within the site, these would have to be factored into the abnormal costs of the site, this will impact on the level of contributions secured on the site.
Transport Access	Low	All of the sites are within the urban area and were able to incorporate adequate transport access.
Utility Service Provision	Low	All of the sites are nearby existing utility service provision.
Highway Network Implications	Medium	Impacts on the Highway network were raised on sites to the western side of the urban area. Contributions towards the Elwick Bypass and Grade Separated Junction have been factored into the viability assessments. If grant is not secured this will impact on the contributions secured on these sites.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Only "deliverable sites" have been included in the Local Plan, sites with high infrastructure costs etc or those on undeliverable sites have not been included in the Local Plan.
Developer Contributions	Low	Assuming only enabling or minimum developer contributions are expected as part of the developments, there is no prohibitive impact on economic viability, therefore there is a low risk.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(3) High Tunstall

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	<p>The sites are on the western edge of Hartlepool where existing services exist.</p> <p>However it is envisioned that any new development in the west will incorporate new services such as a new local centre, primary school and community facilities.</p>
Flooding Issues	Low	<p>Areas of the sites are in flood zone however, with adequate mitigation, the Environment Agency does not see any obstacle to housing development. The vast majority of the sites are not in flood zones 2 and 3 and therefore do not have any identified flood risk.</p> <p>It is expected that any surface water run-off and subsequent flood risk will be mitigated through the incorporation of SUDs throughout the development.</p>
Site Constraints	Low	<p>Site constraints include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) High pressure gas main 2) Biodiversity interest 3) Public rights of way <p>None of the identified site constraints would prove to be prohibitive and can be effectively incorporated into the design of the development.</p>
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs, however a small former gravel pit in southern area of site and gas migration from adjacent landfill site require investigation.
Transport Access	Low	There would be access implications, however these could be overcome through the development of a new road access to the west of existing housing, serving the new development from Elwick Road.

(3) High Tunstall

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Utility Service Provision	Low	All of the sites are nearby existing water services. However there is an existing major high pressure water mains on the site and diversions may be required. Any new development would be required to provide it's own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which cannot be added to the existing infrastructure of the urban area.
Highway Network Implications	Medium	Site is only deliverable with the implementation of the Elwick Bypass and Grade Separated Junction onto the A19. However this is shown as deliverable through contributions.
Infrastructure Costs	Medium	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and the sites are seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs; this is assessed as the 'worst case scenario' and on the assumption that no grant is achieved. 1) Highway requirements 2) Ecology Mitigation If grant funding is secured towards the bypass, the following will also be secured: 3) Education provision 3) Green Infrastructure The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and the sites are seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the enabling, minimum and expected developer contribution scenarios dependent on the level of grant secured towards the bypass.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low / Medium	Despite the high / medium risk associated with transport access and High Network and the associated infrastructure costs there is an overall low / medium risk to delivery.

(4) Wynyard Park

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The sites are on the northern edge of the Wynyard Woods and west of Wynyard Park where existing services exist to some extent although the sites are relatively isolated from the main urban areas of Hartlepool and Billingham. Access to existing services will be primarily through private car.
Flooding Issues	Low	The sites are not in flood zones 2 and 3 and therefore do not have any identified flood risk. It is expected that any surface water run-off and subsequent flood risk will be mitigated through the incorporation of SUDs throughout any new development, where possible.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit housing being developed on the site.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the A689 and/or from the existing infrastructure at Wynyard Business Park.
Utility Service Provision	Low	All of the sites are nearby existing utility provision at wider Wynyard.
Highway Network Implications	Low	Strategic infrastructure contributions are required to ensure the deliverability of this site, the viability assumptions consider these to be deliverable.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Strategic approach is being taken to road and community infrastructure.
Developer Contributions	Low	Expected level of developer contributions considered to be viable.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(5) Quarry Farm

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Nearby services exist in the main urban area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The site is not in flood zones 2 and 3 and therefore do not have any identified flood risk. It is expected that any surface water run-off and subsequent flood risk will be mitigated through the incorporation of SUDs throughout any new development, where possible.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit housing being developed on the site.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Can be accessed from the creation of a new access into Naisberry Park Estate.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Nearby existing utility provision at Quarry Farm 1 and Naisberry Park.
Highway Network Implications	Medium	Site is only deliverable with the implementation of the Elwick Bypass and Grade Separated Junction onto the A19. However this is shown as deliverable through contributions.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Costs established in the high quality greenfield housing development scenario were proven to be economically viable.
Developer Contributions	Low	Enabling, minimum and expected developer contributions were proven to be economically viable.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(6) Elwick

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Nearby services exist in the village and in the main urban area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The site is not in flood zones 2 and 3 and therefore do not have any identified flood risk. It is expected that any surface water run-off and subsequent flood risk will be mitigated through the incorporation of SUDs throughout any new development, where possible.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit housing being developed on the site.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the existing village.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Nearby existing utility provision at the village.
Highway Network Implications	Medium	Site is only deliverable with the implementation of the Elwick Bypass and Grade Separated Junction onto the A19. However this is shown as deliverable through contributions.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Costs established in the high quality and market quality greenfield housing development scenario were proven to be economically viable.
Developer Contributions	Low	Enabling, minimum and expected developer contributions were proven to be economically viable at different levels dependent on level of grant towards the Elwick Bypass and Grade Separated Junction which is required.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(7) Hart

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Nearby services exist in the village and in the main urban area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The site is not in flood zones 2 and 3 and therefore do not have any identified flood risk. It is expected that any surface water run-off and subsequent flood risk will be mitigated through the incorporation of SUDs throughout any new development, where possible.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit housing being developed on the site.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the existing village.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Nearby existing utility provision at the village.
Highway Network Implications	Medium	Impacts on the Local Highway network need mitigation and improvements.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Costs established in the high quality and market quality greenfield housing development scenario were proven to be economically viable.
Developer Contributions	Low	Enabling, minimum and expected developer contributions were proven to be economically viable.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(8) Wynyard Business Park

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is located to the north of the existing Wynyard settlement. Whilst not being a sequentially preferred site there are existing services located within Wynyard Village. Notwithstanding this, given the nature of the uses permitted (business and general industrial development) it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any future development of the site.
Flooding Issues	Low	Whilst a watercourse (flood zone 2 and 3) abuts the site to the northern edge the defined site is located within flood zone 1 and therefore there is not considered to be any identified flood risk.
Site Constraints	low	The whole of the site has planning permission for employment uses including a new hospital and suitable mitigation measures has been identified and agreed to meet the site constraints. Site constraints include: 1) High pressure gas main 2) Water mains 3) Biodiversity interest 4) Archaeology None of the identified site constraints would prove to be prohibitive and have been effectively incorporated into the design of the proposed development.
Land Contamination	Low	There are not considered to be any major land contamination risks associated with the site
Transport Access	Low	The site is in close proximity to the main highways of the A689 and the A19. Whilst there are currently no bus links from Hartlepool to Wynyard the section 106 as part of the planning permission for for the new hospital upon the site stipulates that one should be provided following the completion of the aforementioned development. .
Utility Service Provision	Low	Utility service issues were raised, addressed and dealt with at the planning application stage. There is a high pressure gas main running through the site. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the urban area.
Highway Network Implications	Low/Med	Transport issues were raised, addressed and dealt with at the planning application stage. However there is wider strategic issues with the highway network and long term capacity issue at the critical A689/19 junction.
Infrastructure Costs	Med	Infrastructure costs will have been established at the planning application stage. The major cost are associated with the following: 1) A689/A19 mitigation 2) Landscape buffer 3) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contribution costs will have been established at the planning application stage.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There are the low/medium risks associated with highway network implications and medium risk to associated infrastructure costs however overall there is a low risk to delivery.

(9) Queens Meadow Business Park

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Low	The site is located within flood zone 1 and therefore there is not considered to be any identified flood risk.
Site Constraints	Low	The wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications upon the site. The only foreseen constraint could potentially be the relationship between proposed and existing land and buildings upon the site. Not only in terms of design but use. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively be considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is highly accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	It is considered that adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	The A689 Queens Meadow junction has been constructed with enough capacity to allow the development of the site to proceed with minimal impact to the highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any further development of the site is seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs: 1) Landscaping, restoration, creation or enhancement of habitats and/or woodland. 2) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(10) Oakesway

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Med	Areas of the sites are in flood zone 2 and 3. Any future development proposals located within these areas will need to provide adequate mitigation measures in consultation with the Environment Agency.
Site Constraints	Med	The site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications upon the site. The only foreseen constraint could potentially be the relationship between proposed and existing land and buildings upon the site. Not only in terms of design but use. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively be considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that the comprehensive development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network. The Highways Agency when consulted with regard to the site being allocated as an Enterprise Zone raised no concerns.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(11) Longhill/Sandgate

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Low	The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017) shows that 2.6% of the site is within flood zone 2 and 11.3% are within flood zone 3a. The area within flood zone 3a has historically been associated with flooding. The majority of this area is already developed with existing uses including a Tesco store, builders merchants, a McDonald's outlet, the Council's recycling yard and an engineering company. It is considered that flood risk can be mitigated and managed through site layout and design to reduce it to an acceptable level. The remainder of the site is located within flood zone 1 and therefore there is not considered to be any identified flood risk.
Site Constraints	Med	The wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. There is only a small proportion of the site available for development. A further constraint could potentially be the relationship between proposed and existing land and buildings upon the site. Not only in terms of design but use. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	It is considered that adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any future development proposals within the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network to a level whereby mitigation measures would be required.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(12) Usworth Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses permitted (subject to the consideration of material planning considerations) it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Low	The site is located within flood zone 1 and therefore there is not considered to be any identified flood risk.
Site Constraints	Med	The wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. There is only a small proportion of the site available for development. A further constraint could potentially be the relationship between proposed and existing land and buildings upon the site. Not only in terms of design but use. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any further development or re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(13) Sovereign Park

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Med	A large area of the site is located in flood zone 2 and 3. Any future development proposals located within these areas will need to provide adequate mitigation measures in consultation with the Environment Agency.
Site Constraints	Med	The wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. The only foreseen constraint could potentially be the relationship between proposed and existing land and buildings upon the site. Not only in terms of design but use. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	It is considered that adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any further development or re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(14) Park View West

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Low	The site is located within flood zone 1 and therefore there is not considered to be any identified flood risk.
Site Constraints	Med	The wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. There is only a small proportion of the site available for development. A further constraint could potentially be the relationship between proposed and existing land and buildings upon the site. Not only in terms of design but use. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any further development or re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs		Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(15) Brenda Road East

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Low	The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017) shows that 9.01% of the site is located within flood zone 3. Any future development proposals located within these areas will need to provide adequate mitigation measures in consultation with the Environment Agency.
Site Constraints	Med	The wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. The only foreseen constraint could potentially be the relationship between proposed and existing land and buildings upon the site. Not only in terms of design but use. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any further development or re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(16) South Works

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Low	99.8% of the site is located within flood zone 1 and therefore there is not considered to be any identified flood risk. Moreover, there is no vacant land available upon the site.
Site Constraints	Low	There is no vacant land available within the site for future development In terms of any re-development of the existing site the wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. It is not considered that there would be any constraints which would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any re-development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any future re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable given the existing infrastructure in situ. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(17) Tofts Farm East / Hunter House

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Low	The site is located within flood zone 1 and therefore there is not considered to be any identified flood risk.
Site Constraints	Med	The wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. The only foreseen constraint could potentially be the relationship between proposed and existing land and buildings upon the site. Not only in terms of design but use. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any further development or re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(18) Graythorp Industrial Estate

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Low	The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017) shows that 99.6% of the site is located within flood zone 1 and therefore there is not considered to be any identified flood risk.
Site Constraints	Med	The wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. There is only a small proportion of the site available for development. A further constraint could potentially be the relationship between proposed and existing land and buildings upon the site. Not only in terms of design but use. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any further development or re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs where applicable: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(19) Zinc Works Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any re- development on the site. Notwithstanding this, there is no land available within the site for future development.
Flooding Issues	Medium	The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017) shows that 99.8% of the site is located within flood zone 3 Any future development proposals located within this area will need to provide adequate mitigation measures in consultation with the Environment Agency.
Site Constraints	Med	There is no vacant land available within the site for future development There are biodiversity interests in the immediate which would need to be considered as part of any development proposal. In terms of any re-development of the existing site the wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. it is not considered that there would be any other constraints which would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any future re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable given the existing infrastructure in situ and also bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs if applicable: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(20) Graythorp Waste Site

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Low	The site is located within flood zone 1 and therefore there is not considered to be any identified flood risk.
Site Constraints	Med	The wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. The only foreseen constraint could potentially be the relationship between proposed and existing land and buildings upon the site. Not only in terms of design but use. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any further development or re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs where applicable: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(21) the Port

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Low	The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017) shows that 11.2% of the site is within flood zone 3. Any future development proposals located within these areas will need to provide adequate mitigation measures in consultation with the Environment Agency. Notwithstanding this, it is prudent to state that given the nature of the uses associated with the site a waterside location is required. In terms of a sequential test the site would be considered as an exceptional circumstance.
Site Constraints	Med	<p>The wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications.</p> <p>There are biodiversity interests in the immediate which would need to be considered as part of any development proposal.</p> <p>The only other foreseen constraint could potentially be the relationship between proposed and existing land and buildings upon the site. Not only in terms of design but use. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.</p>
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any further development or re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	<p>Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs where applicable:</p> <p>1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision.</p> <p>The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.</p>
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(22) North Graythorp

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Low	The site is located within flood zone 1 and therefore there is not considered to be any identified flood risk.
Site Constraints	Med	The wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. The only foreseen constraint could potentially be the relationship between proposed and existing land and buildings upon the site. Not only in terms of design but use. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that this would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any further development or re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs where applicable: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(23) Phillips Tank Farm

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Med	Areas to the south of the site are in flood zone 2 and 3. Notwithstanding this, there is no vacant land available within the site for any future new development. However, any re-development upon the site, dependent upon location would be required to provide adequate mitigation measures.
Site Constraints	Med	There is no vacant land available within the site for any new future development. In terms of any re-development of the existing site the wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. It is not considered that there would be any constraints which would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any future re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable given the existing infrastructure in situ and also bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs if applicable: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(24) Graythorp Yard

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Med	Areas of the sites are in flood zone 2 and 3. Any future re-development proposals located within these areas will need to provide adequate mitigation measures in consultation with the Environment Agency. Notwithstanding this, it is prudent to state that given the nature of the uses associated with the site a waterside location is required. In terms of a sequential test the site would be considered as an exceptional circumstance.
Site Constraints	Med	There is no vacant land available within the site for any new future development In terms of the re-development of the existing site the wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications. It is not considered that there would be any constraints which would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any new development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any future re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable given the existing infrastructure in situ and also bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs if applicable: 1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

(25) West of Seaton Channel

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	The site is within the urban area and close to existing services. Given the nature of the uses proposed it is not considered necessary to provide further services to support any further future development on the site.
Flooding Issues	Med / High	The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017) shows that 100% of the site is in flood zone 2 and 3. Any future re-development proposals located within these areas will need to provide adequate mitigation measures in consultation with the Environment Agency. Notwithstanding this, it is prudent to state that given the nature of the uses associated with the site a waterside location is required. In terms of a sequential test the site would be considered as an exceptional circumstance.
Site Constraints	Med	<p>There is no vacant land available within the site for any future development</p> <p>In terms of any re-development of the existing site the wider site constraints associated with the site as a whole have been considered in the determination of previous planning applications.</p> <p>There are biodiversity interests in the immediate which would need to be considered as part of any development proposal.</p> <p>It is not considered that there would be any constraints which would prove to be prohibitive unless material considerations determined otherwise and this could be effectively considered in the determination of any future development proposal.</p>
Land Contamination	Med	Whilst there may be traces of contaminated land upon the site given the previous uses which have operated upon it, this can be assessed at the planning application stage through a Preliminary Risk Assessment and if required mitigation measures proposed and implemented.
Transport Access	Low	The site is located within the urban area and benefits from links to existing road, bus and footpath links. The site is accessible from the main transport interchange located in the town.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Adequate capacity exists to supply water to the site and other utilities. Any re-development would be required to provide its own bespoke sewer and surface water infrastructure which can not be added to the existing infrastructure of the area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	It is not considered that any future re-development of the site would create a significant impact upon the surrounding highway network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	<p>Infrastructure costs have been assessed through economic viability testing and any re-development of the site is seen as being deliverable given the existing infrastructure in situ and also bearing in mind the following infrastructure costs if applicable:</p> <p>1) Roads, drainage, utility etc provision.</p> <p>The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.</p>
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions have been assessed, alongside identified infrastructure costs, through economic viability testing and any further development or re-development of the sites is seen as being deliverable bearing in enabling or minimum developer contribution scenarios. The details of the economic viability assessment are in appendix 2.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery

Hartlepool has been shortlisted as a potential location for a new nuclear power station and as such this plan is required to safeguard land to ensure that a new power station is deliverable if needed.

If chosen for a new power station it is likely that there will be a period of increased activity in the area as a new power station will need to be operational before decommissioning can begin on the existing power station. It is however recognised that this is one of the most important local employers and there appears to be support in general from the community within Hartlepool.

The assessment of some of the key areas of infrastructure which will need to be assessed is considered within the Local Infrastructure Plan, however it is not anticipated that there are any issues which would question the deliverability of the development.

As it is a scheme of national significance, the ultimate decision on whether to permit the development of a new power station will not be taken by the Borough Council and as such no dedicated policy is included within this plan. However, as part of the consultation process the Council will assess any future development against the other policies within this plan as a consultee in the national process.

The Department of Energy and Climate Change have previously appraised the safeguarded land in a published document titled Draft National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (November 2009). The table below has been completed with reference to the aforementioned publication and extracts taken where possible. It is prudent to outline that the site will be appraised formally as part of the consideration of any future planning application by the Planning Inspectorate.

(26) Nuclear Power Station		
Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments (comments taken from the Draft National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (November 2009))
Proximity to Services	To be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning)	The nominated site at Hartlepool surrounds the existing Hartlepool nuclear power station and is located at the mouth of the River Tees on the north side of Greatham Creek, opposite Seal Sands. The site is in the Seaton Ward of the Borough of Hartlepool in the Tees Valley. The site is in relatively close proximity of Seaton Carew and Greatham and the general demographics of Teeside. The Health and Safety Executive has advised that the site does not exceed the semi-urban criterion. The northern boundary of the site ranges from 200m to 600m from an area which exceeds the semi-urban criterion. Final delivery comments (if the new power station is progressed) to be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning) with Hartlepool Borough Council acting as a consultee.
Flooding Issues	To be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning)	The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017) shows that 60% of the site is located within flood zones 2 and 3. A Flood Risk Assessment will need to demonstrate that flood risk can be effectively managed throughout the lifetime of the development. Final delivery comments (if the new power station is progressed) to be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning) with Hartlepool Borough Council acting as a consultee.

(26) Nuclear Power Station

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments (comments taken from the Draft National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (November 2009))
Site Constraints	To be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning)	<p>The site has been considered with regard to the following potential constraints:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Demographics 2) Proximity to military activities 3) Flooding, tsunami and storm surge 4) Coastal processes 5) Proximity to hazardous industrial facilities and operations 6) Proximity to civil aircraft movements 7) Internationally designated sites of ecological importance 8) Nationally designated sites of ecological importance 9) Areas of amenity, cultural heritage and landscape value 10) Size of site to accommodate operation 11) Access to suitable sources of cooling <p>The 2009 study considers that appropriate mitigation measures could be implemented with regard to all of the above constraints. Notwithstanding this, all of the constraints above and more will be considered as part of any formal application to be considered by the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>Final delivery comments (if the new power station is progressed) to be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning) with Hartlepool Borough Council acting as a consultee.</p>
Land Contamination	To be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning)	<p>Final delivery comments (if the new power station is progressed) to be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning) with Hartlepool Borough Council acting as a consultee.</p>
Transport Access	To be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning)	<p>Final delivery comments (if the new power station is progressed) to be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning) with Hartlepool Borough Council acting as a consultee.</p>
Utility Service Provision	To be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning)	<p>Final delivery comments (if the new power station is progressed) to be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning) with Hartlepool Borough Council acting as a consultee.</p>
Highway Network Implications	To be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning)	<p>Final delivery comments (if the new power station is progressed) to be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning) with Hartlepool Borough Council acting as a consultee.</p>
Infrastructure Costs	To be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning)	<p>Final delivery comments (if the new power station is progressed) to be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning) with Hartlepool Borough Council acting as a consultee.</p>

(26) Nuclear Power Station

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments (comments taken from the Draft National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (November 2009))
Developer Contributions	To be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning)	Final delivery comments (if the new power station is progressed) to be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning) with Hartlepool Borough Council acting as a consultee.
Overall Delivery Risk	To be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning)	Final delivery comments (if the new power station is progressed) to be determined by The Planning Inspectorate (National Infrastructure Planning) with Hartlepool Borough Council acting as a consultee.

(27) The Town centre

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(28) Avenue Road/Raby Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(29) The Brewery and Stranton

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Medium	Approx. 20% of site within flood zone 3. Any future re-development proposals located within these areas will need to provide adequate mitigation measures in consultation with the Environment Agency. In terms of a sequential test the site would be considered as an exceptional circumstance.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low/Med	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(30) East of Stranton

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	Approx 5% of site in flood zone 2, approx 5% of site in flood zone 3. Not considered to be a significant risk to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(31) Lynn Street

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	High	Significant areas of the sites are in flood zone 2 and 3. Any future re-development proposals located within these areas will need to provide adequate mitigation measures in consultation with the Environment Agency. In terms of a sequential test the site would be considered as an exceptional circumstance.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Medium	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(32) Mill House

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(33) Park Road West

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(34) West Victoria Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(35) York Road South

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	Approx. 16% of site in flood zone 3a. Not considered to be a significant risk to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(36) The Marina

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Med/High	Areas of the sites are in flood zone 2 and 3. Any future re-development proposals located within these areas will need to provide adequate mitigation measures in consultation with the Environment Agency. Notwithstanding this, it is prudent to state that given the nature of the uses associated with the site a waterside location is required. In terms of a sequential test the site would be considered as an exceptional circumstance.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low/Med	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(37) West of Marina Way

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(38) Trincomalee Wharf

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Medium	Approx. 10% of site in flood zone 2, approx. 10% of site in flood zone 3. Any future re-development proposals located within these areas will need to provide adequate mitigation measures in consultation with the Environment Agency. In terms of a sequential test the site would be considered as an exceptional circumstance.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low/Med	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(39) Tees Bay

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(40) Clavering Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(41) King Oswy Drive

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(42) Middle Warren

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(43) Brus Corner

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(44) Durham Street

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(45) Northgate

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	High	The site is approx. 97% in flood zone 3. Mitigation measures would need to be agreed with the Environment Agency and an FRA would need to demonstrate flood risk can be successfully managed throughout the lifetime of any new development however it is noted that no sites are available for new build.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Medium	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(46) Wiltshire Way/Throston

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(47) Raby Road/Brougham

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(48) Raby Road/Hart Lane

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(49) Murray Street

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(50) Oxford Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(51) Brenda Road/Sydenham Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(52) Catcote Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(53) Belle Vue Way

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(54) Brierton Lane

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(55) Wynyard Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(56) Owton Manor West

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(57) Owton Manor East

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(58) Jutland Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(59) Fens

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(60) Elizabeth Way

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(61) Claxton

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services will exist in and around the immediate area through wider site delivered.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	There will be utility provision in the immediate area through wider site delivery.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(62) Chatham Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery..
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(63) Davison Drive

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(64) Duke Street North

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(65) Duke Street South

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(66) High Tunstall

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services will exist in and around the immediate area through wider site delivered.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	There will be utility provision in the immediate area through wider site delivery.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(67) Miers Avenue

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(68) Powlett Road East

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(69) Seaton Front

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	13% of the site is in flood zones 2 and 3. Not considered to be a significant risk to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(70) Spring Garden Road/Stockton Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(71) Stockton Road/Cornwall Street

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(72) The Former Powlett Pub

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(73) The Former Saxon Pub

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(74) Warren Road

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services exist in and around the immediate area.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	Existing utility provision exists in the immediate area.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

(75) Wynyard Park

Deliverability Criteria	Risk	Delivery Comments
Proximity to Services	Low	Services will exist in and around the immediate area through wider site delivered.
Flooding Issues	Low	The SFRA process has not identified any significant flooding related constraints to delivery.
Site Constraints	Low	There are no identified site constraints that would prohibit development.
Land Contamination	Low	The SHLAA process identified no major identified contamination costs.
Transport Access	Low	Access can be gained from the local road network.
Utility Service Provision	Low	There will be utility provision in the immediate area through wider site delivery.
Highway Network Implications	Low	There are no identified negative impacts on the highway network or strategic road network.
Infrastructure Costs	Low	Infrastructure costs were established as being deliverable in the development assumptions assessments with regard to small and large retail developments.
Developer Contributions	Low	Developer contributions costs, broadly in line with the minimum developer contributions scenario were established as being deliverable with regard to small and large retail developments.
Overall Delivery Risk	Low	There is an overall low risk to delivery.

Appendix 2: Individual Economic Viability Assessments

High Quality Greenfield (Rural) Housing Development - Costs

Development	Costs
Area (Ha) (Developable land)	35
Number of dwellings	600
Average Dwelling Size (Sqft)	1500
Revenue (£ sq ft)	£ 235.00
Average Dwelling (£)	£ 352,500.00
Development Revenue	£ 211,500,000.00
Average Dwelling Size (Sqft)	1500
Build Cost (£ sq ft) including preliminaries	£ 80.00
Build Cost (£) - Per Dwelling	£ 120,000.00
Enabling / External (10% build costs)	£ 12,000.00
Total Build Costs per dwelling	£ 132,000.00
Total Build Costs (inc enabling)	£ 79,200,000.00
Contingency (% of build costs)	3%
Contingency (£)	£ 2,376,000.00
Professional Fees (% of build cost)	8%
Professional Fees (£)	£ 6,336,000.00
Marketing & Sales (% Development Revenue)	3.0%
Marketing & Sales (£)	£ 6,345,000.00
Developer Profit (% on GDV)	20%
Developer Profit (£)	£ 42,300,000.00
Disposal Legal Fees @ £500 per dwelling	£ 300,000.00
Land Value	£ 35,000,000.00
Cost per Ha	£ 1,000,000.00
Cost per Acre	£ 404,678.08
Finance (6% of land value)	£ 2,100,000.00
Stamp Duty defined using GOV.uk	£ 5,163,750.00
Legal Fees @ 0.5% of Land Value	£ 175,000.00
Agents Fees @1% of Land Value	£ 350,000.00
Development Revenue	£ 211,500,000.00
Total Development Cost	£ 179,645,750.00
Development Surplus	£ 31,854,250.00

High Quality Greenfield (Rural) Housing Development – Contribution requirements and Scenarios

Contribution	Cost	Notes	Expected	Minimum	Enabling
Highway improvements.	£ 5,000,000.00	Based on £5million / 600 new dwellings approx £8000 per dwelling. This is a worst case scenario as SBC should fund approx 48% of this from S106.	✓	✓	✓
18% affordable housing contribution.	£ 5,784,605.28	Off site contribution	✓	✓	
Education provision - Primary	£ 4,100,000.00	Cost of new Primary School 1 form Primary School	✓	✓	
Education provision - Secondary	£ 1,159,184.40	Off site contribution	✓	✓	
Open space / play provision.	£ 246,500.00	Based on provision of a range of play facilities across the site.	✓	✓	
Ecology Mitigation		Not required due to location.	✓	✓	✓
Built sports facilities.	£ 2,210,000.00	See Breakdown Below	✓		
Green infrastructure.	£ 150,000.00	£250 per dwelling	✓		
10% Renewables.	£ 180,000.00	Assumed £3,000 per dwelling for 10% of the total number of dwellings on site	✓		
Energy Efficiency	£ 240,000.00		✓		
Cycle Route	£ 570,000.00		✓		
Public Transport	£ 1,000,000.00	Assumed cost for 10 years based on provider information.	✓		
			£ 20,640,289.68	£ 16,290,289.68	£ 5,000,000.00

S106 Deliverability Scenarios	
1) Expected Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 20,640,289.68
Total Development Costs	£ 200,286,039.68
Development Surplus	£ 11,213,960.32
Deliverability %	94.7%
2) Minimum Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 16,290,289.68
Total Development Costs	£ 195,936,039.68
Development Surplus	£ 15,563,960.32
Deliverability %	92.6%
3) Enabling Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 5,000,000.00
Total Development Costs	£ 184,645,750.00
Development Surplus	£ 26,854,250.00
Deliverability %	87.3%

High Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge) Housing Development - Costs

Development	Costs
Area (Ha) (Developable land)	8
Number of dwellings	200
Average Dwelling Size	1500
Revenue (£ sq ft)	£ 200.00
Average Dwelling (£)	£ 300,000.00
Development Revenue	£ 60,000,000.00
Average Dwelling Size (Sqft)	1500
Build Cost (£ sq ft) including preliminaries	£ 80.00
Build Cost (£) - Per Dwelling	£ 120,000.00
Enabling / Externals (10% build costs)	£ 12,000.00
Total Build Costs per dwelling	£ 132,000.00
Total Build Costs (inc enabling)	£ 26,400,000.00
Contingency (% of build costs)	3%
Contingency (£)	£ 792,000.00
Professional Fees (% of build cost)	8%
Professional Fees (£)	£ 2,112,000.00
Marketing & Sales (% Development Revenue)	3.00%
Marketing & Sales (£)	£ 1,800,000.00
Developer Profit (% on GDV)	20%
Developer Profit (£)	£ 12,000,000.00
Disposal Legal Fees @ £500 per dwelling	£ 100,000.00
Land Value	£ 7,200,000.00
Cost per Ha	£ 900,000.00
Cost per Acre	£ 364,210.27
Finance (6% of land value)	£ 432,000.00
Stamp Duty defined using GOV.uk	£ 993,750.00
Legal Fees @ 0.5% of Land Value	£ 36,000.00
Agents Fees @1% of Land Value	£ 72,000.00
Development Revenue	£ 60,000,000.00
Total Development Cost	£ 51,937,750.00
Development Surplus	£ 8,062,250.00

High Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge) Housing Development – Contribution requirements and Scenarios

Contribution	Cost	Notes	Expected	Minimum	Enabling
Highway improvements - No Grant In Place	£ 2,400,000.00	Based on £18million / 1500 new dwellings approx £12000 per dwelling	✓	✓	✓
18% affordable housing contribution.	£ 1,928,201.76	Based on 18% off site contribution	✓	✓	
Education provision - Primary	£ 591,465.00		✓	✓	
Education provision - Secondary	£ 386,394.80		✓	✓	
Open space / play provision.	£ 50,000.00	£250 per dwelling	✓	✓	
Ecology Mitigation	£ 50,000.00	£250 per dwelling - due to location of development	✓	✓	✓
Built sports facilities.	£ 50,000.00	£250 per dwelling	✓		
Green infrastructure.	£ 50,000.00	£250 per dwelling	✓		
Additional sports facilities.	£ 59,056.00	£295.28 per dwelling	✓		
10% Renewables.	£ 60,000.00	Assumed £3,000 per dwelling for 10% of the total number of dwellings on site	✓		
Energy Efficiency	£ 80,000.00	£400 per dwelling	✓		
			£ 5,705,117.56	£ 5,406,061.56	£ 2,450,000.00

If Grant funding is secured					
Highway improvements - NPIF Grant @ £10million	£ 1,066,666.00		£ 4,371,783.56	£ 4,072,727.56	£ 1,116,666.00
Highway improvements - Full Grant	£ -		£ 3,305,117.56	£ 3,006,061.56	£ 50,000.00

S106 Deliverability Scenarios	
1) Expected Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 5,705,117.56
Development Surplus	£ 2,357,132.44
Deliverability %	96.1%
1a) Expected Contributions - This assumes £10million NPIF grant is secured for bypass.	£ 4,371,783.56
Development Surplus	£ 3,690,466.44
Deliverability %	93.8%
1b) Expected Contributions - This assumes grant is secured for full cost of bypass.	£ 3,305,117.56
Development Surplus	£ 4,757,132.44
Deliverability %	92.1%
2) Minimum Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 5,406,061.56
Development Surplus	£ 2,656,188.44
Deliverability %	95.6%
2a) Minimum Contributions - This assumes £10million NPIF grant is secured for bypass.	£ 4,072,727.56
Development Surplus	£ 3,989,522.44
Deliverability %	93.4%
2b) Minimum Contributions - This assumes grant is secured for full cost of bypass.	£ 3,006,061.56
Development Surplus	£ 5,056,188.44
Deliverability %	91.6%
3) Enabling Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 2,450,000.00
Development Surplus	£ 5,612,250.00
Deliverability %	90.6%
3a) Enabling Contributions - This assumes £10million NPIF grant is secured for bypass.	£ 1,116,666.00
Development Surplus	£ 6,945,584.00
Deliverability %	88.4%
3b) Enabling Contributions - This assumes grant is secured for full cost of bypass.	£ 50,000.00
Development Surplus	£ 8,012,250.00
Deliverability %	86.6%

Market Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge) Housing Development – Costs

Development	Costs
Area (Ha) (Developable land)	50
Number of dwellings	1200
Average Dwelling Size	1200
Revenue (£ sq ft)	£ 185.00
Average Dwelling (£)	£ 222,000.00
Development Revenue	£ 266,400,000.00
Average Dwelling Size (Sqft)	1200
Build Cost (£ sq ft) including preliminaries	£ 80.00
Build Cost (£) - Per Dwelling	£ 96,000.00
Enabling / Externals (10% build costs)	£ 9,600.00
Total Build Costs per dwelling	£ 105,600.00
Total Build Costs (inc enabling)	£ 126,720,000.00
Contingency (% of build costs)	3%
Contingency (£)	£ 3,801,600.00
Professional Fees (% of build cost)	8%
Professional Fees (£)	£ 10,137,600.00
Marketing & Sales (% Development Revenue)	3.00%
Marketing & Sales (£)	£ 7,992,000.00
Developer Profit (% on GDV)	20%
Developer Profit (£)	£ 53,280,000.00
Disposal Legal Fees @ £500 per dwelling	£ 600,000.00
Land Value	£ 37,500,000.00
Cost per Ha	£ 750,000.00
Cost per Acre	£ 303,508.56
Finance (6% of land value)	£ 2,250,000.00
Stamp Duty defined using GOV.uk	£ 5,538,750.00
Legal Fees @ 0.5% of Land Value	£ 187,500.00
Agents Fees @1% of Land Value	£ 375,000.00
Development Revenue	£ 266,400,000.00
Total Development Cost	£ 248,382,450.00
Development Surplus	£ 18,017,550.00

Market Quality Greenfield (Urban Edge) Housing Development – Contribution requirements and Scenarios

Contribution	Cost	Notes	Expected	Minimum	Enabling
Highway improvements.	£ 14,400,000.00	Based on £18million / 1500 new dwellings approx £12000 per dwelling	✓	✓	✓
18% affordable housing contribution.	£ 11,569,210.56	Based on 18% off site contribution	✓	✓	
Education provision - Primary	£ 3,508,535.00	Cost of new Primary School 1 form Primary School - contributions from other sites have been factored in to meet the overall cost of school delivery	✓	✓	
Education provision - Secondary	£ 2,318,368.80		✓	✓	
Open space / play provision.	£ 300,000.00	£250 per dwelling	✓	✓	
Ecology Mitigation	£ 300,000.00	£250 per dwelling	✓	✓	✓
Built sports facilities.	£ 300,000.00	£250 per dwelling	✓		
Green infrastructure.	£ 300,000.00	£250 per dwelling	✓		
Additional sports facilities.	£ 354,336.00	£295.28 per dwelling	✓		
10% Renewables.	£ 360,000.00	Assumed £3,000 per dwelling for 10% of the total number of dwellings on site	✓		
Energy Efficiency	£ 480,000.00	£400 per dwelling	✓		
			£ 34,190,450.36	£ 32,396,114.36	£ 14,700,000.00

If Grant funding is secured					
Highway improvements - NPIF Grant @ £10million	£ 6,399,996.00		£ 26,190,446.36	£ 24,396,110.36	£ 6,699,996.00
Highway improvements - Full Grant	£ -		£ 19,790,450.36	£ 17,996,114.36	£ 300,000.00

S106 Deliverability Scenarios	
1) Expected Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 34,190,450.36
Development Surplus	-£ 16,172,900.36
Deliverability %	106.1%
1a) Expected Contributions - This assumes £10million NPIF grant is secured for bypass.	£ 26,190,446.36
Development Surplus	-£ 8,172,896.36
Deliverability %	103.1%
1b) Expected Contributions - This assumes grant is secured for full cost of bypass.	£ 19,790,450.36
Development Surplus	-£ 1,772,900.36
Deliverability %	100.7%
2) Minimum Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 32,396,114.36
Development Surplus	-£ 14,378,564.36
Deliverability %	105.4%
2a) Minimum Contributions - This assumes £10million NPIF grant is secured for bypass.	£ 24,396,110.36
Development Surplus	-£ 6,378,560.36
Deliverability %	102.4%
2b) Minimum Contributions - This assumes grant is secured for full cost of bypass.	£ 17,996,114.36
Development Surplus	£ 21,435.64
Deliverability %	100.0%
3) Enabling Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 14,700,000.00
Development Surplus	£ 3,317,550.00
Deliverability %	98.8%
3a) Enabling Contributions - This assumes £10million NPIF grant is secured for bypass.	£ 6,699,996.00
Development Surplus	£ 11,317,554.00
Deliverability %	95.8%
3b) Enabling Contributions - This assumes grant is secured for full cost of bypass.	£ 300,000.00
Development Surplus	£ 17,717,550.00
Deliverability %	93.3%

High Quality Urban Housing Development – Costs

Development	Costs
Area (Ha) (Developable land)	1.5
Number of dwellings	20
Average Dwelling Size	1500
Revenue (£ sq ft)	£ 200.00
Average Dwelling (£)	£ 300,000.00
Development Revenue	£ 6,000,000.00
Average Dwelling Size (Sqft)	1500
Build Cost (£ sq ft) including preliminaries	£ 80.00
Build Cost (£) - Per Dwelling	£ 120,000.00
Enabling / Externals (10% build costs)	£ 12,000.00
Total Build Costs per dwelling	£ 132,000.00
Total Build Costs (inc enabling)	£ 2,640,000.00
Contingency (% of build costs)	5%
Contingency (£)	£ 132,000.00
Professional Fees (% of build cost)	8%
Professional Fees (£)	£ 211,200.00
Marketing & Sales (% Development Revenue)	3%
Marketing & Sales (£)	£ 180,000.00
Developer Profit (% on GDV)	20%
Developer Profit (£)	£ 1,200,000.00
Disposal Legal Fees @ £500 per dwelling	£ 10,000.00
Land Value	£ 1,200,000.00
Cost per Ha	£ 800,000.00
Cost per Acre	£ 323,742.46
Finance (6% of land value)	£ 72,000.00
Stamp Duty defined using GOV.uk	£ 99,750.00
Legal Fees @ 0.5% of Land Value	£ 6,000.00
Agents Fees @1% of Land Value	£ 12,000.00
Development Revenue	£ 6,000,000.00
Total Development Cost	£ 5,762,950.00
Development Surplus	£ 237,050.00

High Quality Urban Housing Development – Contribution requirements and Scenarios

Contribution	Cost	Notes	Expected	Minimum	Enabling
Highway improvements.	£240,000.00	Based on £18million / 1500 new dwellings approx £12000 per dwelling	✓	✓	✓
18% affordable housing contribution.	£192,820.18	18% Affordable Housing off site	✓	✓	
Education provision - Primary	£ 59,146.50		✓	✓	
Education provision - Secondary	£ 38,639.48		✓	✓	
Open space / play provision.	£ 5,000.00	£250 per dwelling	✓	✓	
Ecology Mitigation	£ 5,000.00	£250 per dwelling	✓	✓	✓
Built sports facilities.	£ 5,000.00	£250 per dwelling	✓		
Green infrastructure.	£ 5,000.00	£250 per dwelling	✓		
Additional sports facilities.	£ 5,905.60	£295.28 per dwelling	✓		
10% Renewables.	£ 6,000.00	Assumed £3,000 per dwelling for 10% of the total number of dwellings on site	✓		
Energy Efficiency	£ 8,000.00	£400 per dwelling	✓		
			£ 570,511.76	£ 540,606.16	£245,000.00

If Grant funding is secured					
Highway improvements - NPIF Grant @ £10million	£106,666.60		£ 437,178.36	£ 407,272.76	£111,666.60
Highway improvements - Full Grant	£ -		£ 330,511.76	£ 300,606.16	£ 5,000.00

S106 Deliverability Scenarios	
1) Expected Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 570,511.76
Development Surplus	-£ 333,461.76
Deliverability %	105.6%
1a) Expected Contributions - This assumes £10million NPIF grant is secured for bypass.	£ 437,178.36
Development Surplus	-£ 200,128.36
Deliverability %	103.3%
1b) Expected Contributions - This assumes grant is secured for full cost of bypass.	£ 330,511.76
Development Surplus	-£ 93,461.76
Deliverability %	101.6%
2) Minimum Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 540,606.16
Development Surplus	-£ 303,556.16
Deliverability %	105.1%
2a) Minimum Contributions - This assumes £10million NPIF grant is secured for bypass.	£ 407,272.76
Development Surplus	-£ 170,222.76
Deliverability %	102.8%
2b) Minimum Contributions - This assumes grant is secured for full cost of bypass.	£ 300,606.16
Development Surplus	-£ 63,556.16
Deliverability %	101.1%
3) Enabling Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 245,000.00
Development Surplus	-£ 7,950.00
Deliverability %	100.1%
3a) Enabling Contributions - This assumes £10million NPIF grant is secured for bypass.	£ 111,666.00
Development Surplus	£ 125,384.00
Deliverability %	97.9%
3b) Enabling Contributions - This assumes grant is secured for full cost of bypass.	£ 5,000.00
Development Surplus	£ 232,050.00
Deliverability %	96.1%

Market Quality Urban Housing Development – Cost

Development	Costs
Area (Ha) (Developable land)	2.5
Number of dwellings	65
Average Dwelling Size	1200
Revenue (£ sq ft)	£ 165.00
Average Dwelling (£)	£ 198,000.00
Development Revenue	£ 12,870,000.00
Average Dwelling Size (Sqft)	1200
Build Cost (£ sq ft) including preliminaries	£ 80.00
Build Cost (£) - Per Dwelling	£ 96,000.00
Enabling / External (10% build costs)	£ 9,600.00
Total Build Costs per dwelling	£ 105,600.00
Total Build Costs (inc enabling)	£ 6,864,000.00
Contingency (% of build costs)	5%
Contingency (£)	£ 343,200.00
Professional Fees (% of build cost)	8%
Professional Fees (£)	£ 549,120.00
Marketing & Sales (% Development Revenue)	3.00%
Marketing & Sales (£)	£ 386,100.00
Developer Profit (% on GDV)	20%
Developer Profit (£)	£ 2,574,000.00
Disposal Legal Fees @ £500 per dwelling	£ 32,500.00
Land Value	£ 1,250,000.00
Cost per Ha	£ 500,000.00
Cost per Acre	£ 202,339.04
Finance (6% of land value)	£ 75,000.00
Stamp Duty defined using GOV.uk	£ 106,250.00
Legal Fees @ 0.5% of Land Value	£ 6,250.00
Agents Fees @1% of Land Value	£ 12,500.00
Development Revenue	£ 12,870,000.00
Total Development Cost	£ 12,198,920.00
Development Surplus	£ 671,080.00

Market Quality Urban Housing Development – Contribution requirements and Scenarios

Contribution	Cost	Notes	Expected	Minimum	Enabling
Highway improvements.		Assumed no highway contribution above those outlined in development costs.	✓	✓	✓
18% affordable housing contribution.	£ 626,665.57	Off site affordable housing	✓	✓	
Education provision - Primary	£ 192,294.90		✓	✓	
Education provision - Secondary	£ 125,648.82		✓	✓	
Open space / play provision.	£ 16,250.00	£250 per dwelling	✓	✓	
Ecology Mitigation	£ 19,500.00	£300 per dwelling as assumed within 1km of coast	✓	✓	✓
Built sports facilities.	£ 16,250.00	£250 per dwelling	✓		
Green infrastructure.	£ 16,250.00	£250 per dwelling	✓		
Additional sports facilities.	£ 19,193.20	£295.28 per dwelling	✓		
10% Renewables.	£ 19,500.00	Assumed £3,000 per dwelling for 10% of the total number of dwellings on site	✓		
Energy Efficiency	£ 26,000.00	£400 per dwelling	✓		
			£ 1,077,552.49	£980,359.29	£19,500.00

S106 Deliverability Scenarios	
1) Expected Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 1,077,552.49
Development Surplus	-£ 406,472.49
Deliverability %	103.2%
2) Minimum Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 980,359.29
Development Surplus	-£ 309,279.29
Deliverability %	102.4%
3) Enabling Contributions - This assumes no grant is secured for bypass.	£ 19,500.00
Development Surplus	£ 651,580.00
Deliverability %	94.9%

Prestige Office Development

Prestige Office Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Site Info				
Size (gross sqm)				
Average Area (net lettable sqm)	900	900	900	
Values				
Average Rent (£ per sqm)	£148	£148	£148	
Yield (%)	8.00	8.00	8.00	Yield assumed to 8% across the board
Purchasers Costs (% of value)				Approximately 5.75% assuming 4% is stamp duty
Annual Income	£133,200	£133,200	£133,200	
Estimated Development Value	£1,665,000	£1,665,000	£1,665,000	Annual rent / yield x 100
Building Costs				
Construction Costs (Gross £ per sqm)	£1,100	£1,100	£1,100	Inc BREEAM VG
Actual Construction Cost	£990,000	£990,000	£990,000	
Roads	£49,500	£49,500	£49,500	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Utilities	£49,500	£49,500	£49,500	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Professional Fees (% of build costs)	£99,000	£99,000	£99,000	Approximately 10% of build costs
Building Contingencies (% of build costs)	£49,500	£49,500	£49,500	Approximately 5% of build costs
Build Costs Sub Total	£1,237,500	£1,237,500	£1,237,500	
Fees				
Letting Fees (% of annual income)	£13,320	£13,320	£13,320	Approximately 10% of annual income
Advertising Fees (% of annual income)	£1,332	£1,332	£1,332	Approximately 1% of annual income
Sales Fees (% of sale price)				Approximately 1.75% of sale price
Fees Sub Total	£14,652	£14,652	£14,652	
Return for Risk / Profit (% of value)	17%	17%	17%	17%
Actual Profit	£283,050	£283,050	£283,050	
Total Development Value	£1,665,000	£1,665,000	£1,665,000	
Total Development Costs	£1,535,202	£1,535,202	£1,535,202	
Total Development Surplus	£129,798	£129,798	£129,798	

Prestige Office Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Developer Contributions				
10% Off Site Affordable	£0	£0	£0	Not required
10% Renewables	£0	£0	£45,000	Estimate of £5000 per 100sqm
Code for Sustainable Homes	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Off Site Highway Improvements				
Education Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Health Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Open Space / Play Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Built Sports Facilities	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Green Infrastructure	£0	£0	£45,000	£5000sqm per 1000sqm
Public Art	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Training & Employment				Not required
Coastal and Flood Defences	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Other	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Total	£0	£0	£90,000	
Total Development Value	£1,665,000	£1,665,000	£1,665,000	
Total Development Costs	£1,535,202	£1,535,202	£1,625,202	
Total Development Surplus	£129,798	£129,798	£39,798	
% on Cost Risk	92%	92%	98%	

High Quality Office Development

High Quality Office Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Site Info				
Size (gross sqm)				
Average Area (net lettable sqm)	900	900	900	
Values				
Average Rent (£ per sqm)	£122	£122	£122	
Yield (%)	8.00	8.00	8.00	Yield assumed to 8% across the board
Purchasers Costs (% of value)				Approximately 5.75% assuming 4% is stamp duty
Annual Income	£109,800	£109,800	£109,800	
Estimated Development Value	£1,372,500	£1,372,500	£1,372,500	Annual rent / yield x 100
Building Costs				
Construction Costs (Gross £ per sqm)	£1,000	£1,000	£1,000	Inc BREEAM VG
Actual Construction Cost	£900,000	£900,000	£900,000	
Roads	£45,000	£45,000	£45,000	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Utilities	£45,000	£45,000	£45,000	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Professional Fees (% of build costs)	£90,000.0	£90,000.0	£90,000.0	Approximately 10% of build costs
Building Contingencies (% of build costs)	£45,000.00	£45,000.00	£45,000.00	Approximately 5% of build costs
Build Costs Sub Total	£1,125,000	£1,125,000	£1,125,000	
Fees				
Letting Fees (% of annual income)	£10,980.0	£10,980.0	£10,980.0	Approximately 10% of annual income
Advertising Fees (% of annual income)	£1,098.00	£1,098.00	£1,098.00	Approximately 1% of annual income
Sales Fees (% of sale price)				Approximately 1.75% of sale price
Fees Sub Total	£12,078.0	£12,078.0	£12,078.0	
Return for Risk / Profit (% of value)	17%	17%	17%	17%
Actual Profit	£233,325.0	£233,325.0	£233,325.0	
Total Development Value	£1,372,500	£1,372,500	£1,372,500	
Total Development Costs	£1,370,403.0	£1,370,403.0	£1,370,403.0	
Total Development Surplus	£2,097.0	£2,097.0	£2,097.0	

High Quality Office Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Developer Contributions				
10% Off Site Affordable	£0	£0	£0	Not required
10% Renewables	£0	£0	£45,000	Estimate of £5000 per 100sqm
Code for Sustainable Homes	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Off Site Highway Improvements				
Education Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Health Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Open Space / Play Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Built Sports Facilities	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Green Infrastructure	£0	£0	£45,000	£5000sqm per 1000sqm
Public Art	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Training & Employment				Not required
Coastal and Flood Defences	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Other	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Total	£0	£0	£90,000	
Total Development Value	£1,372,500	£1,372,500	£1,372,500	
Total Development Costs	£1,370,403	£1,370,403	£1,460,403	
Total Development Surplus	£2,097	£2,097	-£87,903	
% on Cost Risk	100%	100%	106%	

General Office Development

General Quality Office Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Site Info				
Size (gross sqm)				
Average Area (net lettable sqm)	900	900	900	
Values				
Average Rent (£ per sqm)	£98	£98	£98	
Yield (%)	8.00	8.00	8.00	Yield assumed to 8% across the board
Purchasers Costs (% of value)				Approximately 5.75% assuming 4% is stamp duty
Annual Income	£88,200	£88,200	£88,200	
Estimated Development Value	£1,102,500	£1,102,500	£1,102,500	Annual rent / yield x 100
Building Costs				
Construction Costs (Gross £ per sqm)	£850	£850	£850	Inc BREEAM VG
Actual Construction Cost	£765,000	£765,000	£765,000	
Roads	£38,250	£38,250	£38,250	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Utilities	£38,250	£38,250	£38,250	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Professional Fees (% of build costs)	£76,500.0	£76,500.0	£76,500.0	Approximately 10% of build costs
Building Contingencies (% of build costs)	£38,250.00	£38,250.00	£38,250.00	Approximately 5% of build costs
Build Costs Sub Total	£956,250	£956,250	£956,250	
Fees				
Letting Fees (% of annual income)	£8,820.0	£8,820.0	£8,820.0	Approximately 10% of annual income
Advertising Fees (% of annual income)	£882.00	£882.00	£882.00	Approximately 1% of annual income
Sales Fees (% of sale price)				Approximately 1.75% of sale price
Fees Sub Total	£9,702.0	£9,702.0	£9,702.0	
Return for Risk / Profit (% of value)	17%	17%	17%	17%
Actual Profit	£187,425.0	£187,425.0	£187,425.0	
Total Development Value	£1,102,500	£1,102,500	£1,102,500	
Total Development Costs	£1,153,377.0	£1,153,377.0	£1,153,377.0	
Total Development Surplus	-£50,877.0	-£50,877.0	-£50,877.0	

General Quality Office Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Developer Contributions				
10% Off Site Affordable	£0	£0	£0	Not required
10% Renewables	£0	£0	£45,000	Estimate of £5000 per 100sqm
Code for Sustainable Homes	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Off Site Highway Improvements				
Education Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Health Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Open Space / Play Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Built Sports Facilities	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Green Infrastructure	£0	£0	£45,000	£5000sqm per 1000sqm
Public Art	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Training & Employment				Not required
Coastal and Flood Defences	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Other	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Total	£0	£0	£90,000	
Total Development Value	£1,102,500	£1,102,500	£1,102,500	
Total Development Costs	£1,153,377	£1,153,377	£1,243,377	
Total Development Surplus	-£50,877	-£50,877	-£140,877	
% on Cost Risk	105%	105%	113%	

Prestige Quality Industrial Development

Prestige Quality Industrial Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Site Info				
Size (gross sqm)				
Average Area (net lettable sqm)	900	900	900	
Values				
Average Rent (£ per sqm)	£50	£50	£50	
Yield (%)	8.00	8.00	8.00	Yield assumed to 8% across the board
Purchasers Costs (% of value)				Approximately 5.75% assuming 4% is stamp duty
Annual Income	£45,000	£45,000	£45,000	
Estimated Development Value	£562,500	£562,500	£562,500	Annual rent / yield x 100
Building Costs				
Construction Costs (Gross £ per sqm)	£450	£450	£450	Inc BREEAM VG
Actual Construction Cost	£405,000	£405,000	£405,000	
Roads	£20,250	£20,250	£20,250	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Utilities	£20,250	£20,250	£20,250	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Professional Fees (% of build costs)	£40,500.0	£40,500.0	£40,500.0	Approximately 10% of build costs
Building Contingencies (% of build costs)	£20,250.00	£20,250.00	£20,250.00	Approximately 5% of build costs
Build Costs Sub Total	£506,250	£506,250	£506,250	
Fees				
Letting Fees (% of annual income)	£4,500.0	£4,500.0	£4,500.0	Approximately 10% of annual income
Advertising Fees (% of annual income)	£450.00	£450.00	£450.00	Approximately 1% of annual income
Sales Fees (% of sale price)				Approximately 1.75% of sale price
Fees Sub Total	£4,950.0	£4,950.0	£4,950.0	
Return for Risk / Profit (% of value)	17%	17%	17%	17%
Actual Profit	£95,625.0	£95,625.0	£95,625.0	
Total Development Value	£562,500	£562,500	£562,500	
Total Development Costs	£606,825.0	£606,825.0	£606,825.0	
Total Development Surplus	-£44,325.0	-£44,325.0	-£44,325.0	

Prestige Quality Industrial Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Developer Contributions				
10% Off Site Affordable	£0	£0	£0	Not required
10% Renewables	£0	£0	£45,000	Estimate of £5000 per 100sqm
Code for Sustainable Homes	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Off Site Highway Improvements				
Education Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Health Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Open Space / Play Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Built Sports Facilities	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Green Infrastructure	£0	£0	£45,000	£5000sqm per 1000sqm
Public Art	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Training & Employment				Not required
Coastal and Flood Defences	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Other	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Total	£0	£0	£90,000	
Total Development Value	£562,500	£562,500	£562,500	
Total Development Costs	£606,825	£606,825	£696,825	
Total Development Surplus	-£44,325	-£44,325	-£134,325	
% on Cost Risk	108%	108%	124%	

High Quality Industrial Development

High Quality Industrial Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Site Info				
Size (gross sqm)				
Average Area (net lettable sqm)	900	900	900	
Values				
Average Rent (£ per sqm)	£60	£60	£60	
Yield (%)	8.00	8.00	8.00	Yield assumed to 8% across the board
Purchasers Costs (% of value)				Approximately 5.75% assuming 4% is stamp duty
Annual Income	£54,000	£54,000	£54,000	
Estimated Development Value	£675,000	£675,000	£675,000	Annual rent / yield x 100
Building Costs				
Construction Costs (Gross £ per sqm)	£450	£450	£450	Inc BREEAM VG
Actual Construction Cost	£405,000	£405,000	£405,000	
Roads	£20,250	£20,250	£20,250	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Utilities	£20,250	£20,250	£20,250	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Professional Fees (% of build costs)	£40,500.0	£40,500.0	£40,500.0	Approximately 10% of build costs
Building Contingencies (% of build costs)	£20,250.00	£20,250.00	£20,250.00	Approximately 5% of build costs
Build Costs Sub Total	£506,250	£506,250	£506,250	
Fees				
Letting Fees (% of annual income)	£5,400.0	£5,400.0	£5,400.0	Approximately 10% of annual income
Advertising Fees (% of annual income)	£540.00	£540.00	£540.00	Approximately 1% of annual income
Sales Fees (% of sale price)				Approximately 1.75% of sale price
Fees Sub Total	£5,940.0	£5,940.0	£5,940.0	
Return for Risk / Profit (% of value)	17%	17%	17%	17%
Actual Profit	£114,750.0	£114,750.0	£114,750.0	
Total Development Value	£675,000	£675,000	£675,000	
Total Development Costs	£626,940.0	£626,940.0	£626,940.0	
Total Development Surplus	£48,060.0	£48,060.0	£48,060.0	

High Quality Industrial Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Developer Contributions				
10% Off Site Affordable	£0	£0	£0	Not required
10% Renewables	£0	£0	£45,000	Estimate of £5000 per 100sqm
Code for Sustainable Homes	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Off Site Highway Improvements				
Education Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Health Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Open Space / Play Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Built Sports Facilities	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Green Infrastructure	£0	£0	£45,000	£5000sqm per 1000sqm
Public Art	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Training & Employment				Not required
Coastal and Flood Defences	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Other	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Total	£0	£0	£90,000	
Total Development Value	£675,000	£675,000	£675,000	
Total Development Costs	£626,940	£626,940	£716,940	
Total Development Surplus	£48,060	£48,060	-£41,940	
% on Cost Risk	93%	93%	106%	

General Quality Industrial Development

General Quality Industrial Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Site Info				
Size (gross sqm)				
Average Area (net lettable sqm)	900	900	900	
Values				
Average Rent (£ per sqm)	£60	£60	£60	
Yield (%)	8.00	8.00	8.00	Yield assumed to 8% across the board
Purchasers Costs (% of value)				Approximately 5.75% assuming 4% is stamp duty
Annual Income	£54,000	£54,000	£54,000	
Estimated Development Value	£675,000	£675,000	£675,000	Annual rent / yield x 100
Building Costs				
Construction Costs (Gross £ per sqm)	£400	£400	£400	Inc BREEAM VG
Actual Construction Cost	£360,000	£360,000	£360,000	
Roads	£18,000	£18,000	£18,000	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Utilities	£18,000	£18,000	£18,000	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Professional Fees (% of build costs)	£36,000.0	£36,000.0	£36,000.0	Approximately 10% of build costs
Building Contingencies (% of build costs)	£18,000.00	£18,000.00	£18,000.00	Approximately 5% of build costs
Build Costs Sub Total	£450,000	£450,000	£450,000	
Fees				
Letting Fees (% of annual income)	£5,400.0	£5,400.0	£5,400.0	Approximately 10% of annual income
Advertising Fees (% of annual income)	£540.00	£540.00	£540.00	Approximately 1% of annual income
Sales Fees (% of sale price)				Approximately 1.75% of sale price
Fees Sub Total	£5,940.0	£5,940.0	£5,940.0	
Return for Risk / Profit (% of value)	17%	17%	17%	17%
Actual Profit	£114,750.0	£114,750.0	£114,750.0	
Total Development Value	£675,000	£675,000	£675,000	
Total Development Costs	£570,690.0	£570,690.0	£570,690.0	
Total Development Surplus	£104,310.0	£104,310.0	£104,310.0	

General Quality Industrial Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Developer Contributions				
10% Off Site Affordable	£0	£0	£0	Not required
10% Renewables	£0	£0	£45,000	Estimate of £5000 per 100sqm
Code for Sustainable Homes	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Off Site Highway Improvements				
Education Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Health Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Open Space / Play Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Built Sports Facilities	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Green Infrastructure	£0	£0	£45,000	£5000sqm per 1000sqm
Public Art	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Training & Employment				Not required
Coastal and Flood Defences	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Other	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Total	£0	£0	£90,000	
Total Development Value	£675,000	£675,000	£675,000	
Total Development Costs	£570,690	£570,690	£660,690	
Total Development Surplus	£104,310	£104,310	£14,310	
% on Cost Risk	85%	85%	98%	

Small Retail Development

Small Retail Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Site Info				
Size (gross sqm)				
Average Area (net lettable sqm)	100	100	100	
Values				
Average Rent (£ per sqm)	£134	£134	£134	
Yield (%)	8.00	8.00	8.00	Yield assumed to 8% across the board
Purchasers Costs (% of value)				Approximately 5.75% assuming 4% is stamp duty
Annual Income	£13,400	£13,400	£13,400	
Estimated Development Value	£167,500	£167,500	£167,500	Annual rent / yield x 100
Building Costs				
Construction Costs (Gross £ per sqm)	£750	£750	£750	Inc BREEAM VG
Actual Construction Cost	£75,000	£75,000	£75,000	
Roads	£3,750	£3,750	£3,750	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Utilities	£3,750	£3,750	£3,750	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Professional Fees (% of build costs)	£7,500.0	£7,500.0	£7,500.0	Approximately 10% of build costs
Building Contingencies (% of build costs)	£3,750.00	£3,750.00	£3,750.00	Approximately 5% of build costs
Build Costs Sub Total	£93,750	£93,750	£93,750	
Fees				
Letting Fees (% of annual income)	£1,340.0	£1,340.0	£1,340.0	Approximately 10% of annual income
Advertising Fees (% of annual income)	£134.00	£134.00	£134.00	Approximately 1% of annual income
Sales Fees (% of sale price)				Approximately 1.75% of sale price
Fees Sub Total	£1,474.0	£1,474.0	£1,474.0	
Return for Risk / Profit (% of value)	17%	17%	17%	17%
Actual Profit	£28,475.0	£28,475.0	£28,475.0	
Total Development Value	£167,500	£167,500	£167,500	
Total Development Costs	£123,699.0	£123,699.0	£123,699.0	
Total Development Surplus	£43,801.0	£43,801.0	£43,801.0	

Small Retail Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Developer Contributions				
10% Off Site Affordable	£0	£0	£0	Not required
10% Renewables	£0	£0	£5,000	Estimate of £5000 per 100sqm
Code for Sustainable Homes	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Off Site Highway Improvements				
Education Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Health Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Open Space / Play Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Built Sports Facilities	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Green Infrastructure	£0	£0	£5,000	£5000sqm per 1000sqm
Public Art	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Training & Employment				Not required
Coastal and Flood Defences	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Other	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Total	£0	£0	£10,000	
Total Development Value	£167,500	£167,500	£167,500	
Total Development Costs	£123,699	£123,699	£133,699	
Total Development Surplus	£43,801	£43,801	£33,801	
% on Cost Risk	74%	74%	80%	

Large Retail Development

Large Retail Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Site Info				
Size (gross sqm)				
Average Area (net lettable sqm)	800	800	800	
Values				
Average Rent (£ per sqm)	£118	£118	£118	
Yield (%)	8.00	8.00	8.00	Yield assumed to 8% across the board
Purchasers Costs (% of value)				Approximately 5.75% assuming 4% is stamp duty
Annual Income	£94,400	£94,400	£94,400	
Estimated Development Value	£1,180,000	£1,180,000	£1,180,000	Annual rent / yield x 100
Building Costs				
Construction Costs (Gross £ per sqm)	£750	£750	£750	Inc BREEAM VG
Actual Construction Cost	£600,000	£600,000	£600,000	
Roads	£30,000	£30,000	£30,000	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Utilities	£30,000	£30,000	£30,000	Approximately 5% of construction costs
Professional Fees (% of build costs)	£60,000.0	£60,000.0	£60,000.0	Approximately 10% of build costs
Building Contingencies (% of build costs)	£30,000.00	£30,000.00	£30,000.00	Approximately 5% of build costs
Build Costs Sub Total	£750,000	£750,000	£750,000	
Fees				
Letting Fees (% of annual income)	£9,440.0	£9,440.0	£9,440.0	Approximately 10% of annual income
Advertising Fees (% of annual income)	£944.00	£944.00	£944.00	Approximately 1% of annual income
Sales Fees (% of sale price)				Approximately 1.75% of sale price
Fees Sub Total	£10,384.0	£10,384.0	£10,384.0	
Return for Risk / Profit (% of value)	17%	17%	17%	17%
Actual Profit	£200,600.0	£200,600.0	£200,600.0	
Total Development Value	£1,180,000	£1,180,000	£1,180,000	
Total Development Costs	£960,984.0	£960,984.0	£960,984.0	
Total Development Surplus	£219,016.0	£219,016.0	£219,016.0	

Large Retail Development	Prestige Office	Enabling Developer Contributions	Expected Developer Contributions	Comments
Developer Contributions				
10% Off Site Affordable	£0	£0	£0	Not required
10% Renewables	£0	£0	£40,000	Estimate of £5000 per 100sqm
Code for Sustainable Homes	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Off Site Highway Improvements				
Education Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Health Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Open Space / Play Provision	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Built Sports Facilities	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Green Infrastructure	£0	£0	£40,000	£5000sqm per 1000sqm
Public Art	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Training & Employment				Not required
Coastal and Flood Defences	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Other	£0	£0	£0	Not required
Total	£0	£0	£80,000	
Total Development Value	£1,180,000	£1,180,000	£1,180,000	
Total Development Costs	£960,984	£960,984	£1,040,984	
Total Development Surplus	£219,016	£219,016	£139,016	
% on Cost Risk	81%	81%	88%	