
Appendix 5: High Level Technical Appraisal

Technical Assessment Purpose and Methodology used

- 1 In order to determine, from a technical perspective the most suitable site for the development of a new leisure centre, a technical assessment was carried out on each potential site.
- 2 This technical assessment represents a high-level site options appraisal and encompassed a number of factors which are considered to be key in determining whether a site is suitable for development for a leisure facility.
- 3 The process undertaken as part of the technical assessment was in two stages. In the first instance Alliance Leisure prepared a site options appraisal for each site. This included an assessment of a number of factors including:
 - (a) Surrounding uses;
 - (b) Heritage and Conservation;
 - (c) Footprint and Ownership;
 - (d) Microclimate;
 - (e) Accessibility and Transport links;
 - (f) Transport Analysis;
 - (g) Site Constraints;
 - (h) Opportunities afforded by site development;
 - (i) Test fit: an assessment of whether the different size of centres could be accommodated on the site.
- 4 These factors were then further refined by into a scoring matrix which although still at a high level included an additional layer of granularity. The areas set out in the **Table 1** below were considered separately and scored out of 10. These scores were then totalled to provide a score for each site, the maximum score obtainable for each site was 180.
- 5 **Table 1**

1. Footprint: can the site accommodate the proposal

2.Location: is the site central within the community?
3.Parking: can sufficient parking be accommodated on the site?
4.Accessibility: is the site easily accessible by cars/bikes/pedestrians?
5.Visibility: is the site visible from key points?
6.Opportunities: any unique opportunities available through development?
7. Topography: any fundamental constraint regarding topography?
8.Natural environment: any fundamental constraints regarding the natural environment?
9.Heritage: any fundamental constraints regarding heritage?
10. Ownership is the site currently owned by DCC?
11. Land: are there any specific land issues affecting the site
12.Regeneration and development: would development of the site bring about any opportunities
13.Transport: are there good transport links
14.Leisure:
15.Wellbeing
16.Buildability: does the development of the site bring any particular challenges
17.Affordability: any specific costs
18. Programme: Any site-specific risks to the programme

- 6 This information was then subjected to a more detailed review, challenge and refinement involving officers within the council. This was to test feasibility having regard to the programme aims and objectives and based on more detailed site-specific knowledge.
- 7 This process involved scoring out of 5 a number of key criteria. The criteria were weighted on a scale of 1 to 5 based on experience from previous capital investment decisions, with subsequent testing and moderation of the matrix to ensure that the resulting output represented “common sense”. Details of the criteria and weightings used are shown in **Table 2** below:

8 Table 2

Weighting 1	Weighting 2	Weighting 3	Weighting 4
Capital receipt loss/regen opportunities	Ecology	Contamination	Ownership
Trees	Special façade treatments	Flooding	Size and topography
Visibility	Temporary accommodation required e.g. site cabins	HRA	Highways
Views out	Construction impact	Heritage	Parking (planning requirement)
Programme – layer of works (consider bats etc)	Build location	Conservation	Proximity to town
Low carbon/Sustainability	Public Rights of Way	Archaeology	Proximity to residential areas
		Footpaths/Cycleways	Sequential assessment required
		Public transport links	Stacking
		Utilities	Maintaining service provision (so members remain)
		Existing pitches & co-location	Affordability
		Poverty proofing	Programme
		Wellbeing/inclusion/community cohesion/social value	

- 9 When determining the appropriate weighting to be applied to each factor, careful consideration was given to ensure that areas weren't missed or indeed double counted. For example, when considering the weighting applied to 'low carbon/sustainability it can be seen from the table above that this only received a weighting of 1. Low carbon and sustainability are both high priorities for the council.
- 10 As part of the technical appraisal the council's low carbon team independently prepared a detailed sustainability assessment for each site. It was found on reviewing these that many of the criteria used had already been scored under other headings within the technical appraisal. Examples include transport accessibility, proximity to residential areas, co-location opportunities and conservation. It was considered that leaving these as individually scored areas provided a more refined approach and gave greater importance, through the scoring and weighting used, to the

low carbon agenda than simply placing a single collective score on this area.

- 11 **Table 3** below sets out in more detail what was considered within each of the criteria as well as how the criteria was grouped against 10 main headings. The numbers in brackets reflect the weighting applied to each of the areas assessed.

Land	
Ownership (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the land owned by DCC? • Can any existing sites be sold if the scheme progress? • Are there any other regen opportunities? • Is there a requirement for a contaminated land condition? • Is there known contamination on the site • Are there any other underground known risks such as coal workings etc • Is the size large enough for the proposed development? • Is the topography of the site acceptable for the development? • Are there any flooding issues with the site?
Capital receipt/Regen opportunities (1)	
Contamination (3)	
Size and topography (4)	
Flooding (3)	
Effects on natural environment	
HRA (A Habitats Regulations Assessment) (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a HRA Assessment required for this site? • Are there any known heritage assets near the site? • There are non-designated heritage assets – these are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas, or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of their heritage interest but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets. • Designated heritage assets - The purpose of designating heritage assets is to ensure that the significance and character of the asset in question is protected through the planning system, to ensure they are passed on to future generations. • Is the site within a conservation area • Does the site affect a Conservation area • Are there mature trees on the site • Will any trees need protection during the work? • Will there be a requirement to remove any trees during the development? • Will any ecological surveys/appraisals be required before work can commence on the development?
Heritage (3)	
Conservation (3)	
Trees (1)	
Ecology (2)	

Archaeology (3)

- **Are there any areas of archaeological interest on or near the site?**
- **Is there a risk that any investigation work is required before the scheme commences?**
- **Is there a risk that the work could be halted on site due to archaeological discoveries?**

12 Table 3

Infrastructure	
Footpaths/Cycleways (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there existing footpath and cycleways to the site? • Can improvements be made to these as part of the work?
Public transport links (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there enough space on and around the site to make these improvements? • Are there good public transport links to the site?
Highways (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there a number of bus stops near to the site? • Are any highways improvements required to the site? • Will these be acceptable to the planning authority?
Parking (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are any further traffic surveys required? • Is there enough parking on the site already? • Is there space on the site for enough parking? • Can any areas of parking lost to the development be re-provided on the site? • Are there alternative locations identified to move areas of parking to if none of the above are possible?
Public Rights of Way (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there PROW on this site? • Are they affected by the development?
Utilities (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How close are existing public utilities to the site? • Are there any utilities on the site that would require a diversion? • Is there likely to be a loss of service to the surrounding buildings as a result of the work?
Proximity	
Visibility (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the new development be seen from main roads?
Proximity to town (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How close is the development to the centre of town? • Are the facilities and services nearby?
Proximity to residential areas (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How close is the development to residential areas?
Sequential assessment required (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a planning sequential assessment required as part of the planning process?
Design/planning	
Stacking (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the site large enough to build a single storey building? • Will scale and massing affect surrounding area?
Special façade treatments (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the building façade close to any other buildings which may be impacted? • Is the building in a location where façade treatments need to withstand the elements?
Views out (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any views out from the building?

Buildability	
Maintaining service provision (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the existing facility(s) remain open during the build so that building users do not go elsewhere?
Temporary accommodation required (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not the above, is any temporary accommodation required such a cabin? • Will the temporary facility put users off? • Or is relocation required to another location?
Construction impact (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the construction period affect the local community?
Programme/layers of work (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there many layers to the programme or is it relatively simple?
Build location (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How difficult will the build process be for the contractor?
Affordability	
Affordability (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the current cost compare with the original base cost estimates? • Note: Extra Over options excluded from scoring
Programme (4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the length of the programme compare to the other sites?
Leisure	
Co – location opportunities (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an opportunity to co locate the Leisure Centre with other complimentary building uses? • Examples include other leisure facilities, libraries, or other public buildings.
Outdoor facilities (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there space on the site for outdoor facilities?
Social values	
Inclusion (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to work with other complimentary services
Poverty proofing (3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equality of access for those who don't travel by car
Energy/carbon opportunities	
Low carbon/sustainability (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on sustainability assessment

- 13 A summary from the detailed assessment for each site, based on the criteria above is set out in the following pages along with further detailed explanation of the information behind the conclusions reached for each site.
- 14 It should be noted that at this stage in any site selection process the conclusions reached are based on factual information available, preliminary site investigations and through discussions with the various technical teams. It is not, at this stage in any site selection process normal practice to carry out extensive and costly site investigations for each site. This exercise will be carried out once a preferred site has been selected. This will allow further refinement of the information currently available on the preferred site and assist in quantifying some of the unknown elements.
- 15 As with any technical appraisal at this stage in a project there is a degree of subjectiveness that needs to be applied by the technical team.
- 16 **Table 4 Seaham summary assessment**

SEAHAM SITE	Existing	Dock Top	St John Square
Land	71	46	61
Natural environment	74	50	60
Infrastructure	82	57	74
Proximity	60	57	53
Design/planning	31	18	15
Buildability	52	40	47
Affordability	40	28	24
Leisure	27	21	21
Social value	30	24	30
Energy/Carbon opportunities	4	2	2
TOTAL	471/505	345/505	387/505

- 17 The following tables are colour coded for ease of reference: The colour coding reflects the allocation of points to each area.

	5 points
	4 points
	3 points
	2 points
	1 point

18 **Table 5 Seaham detailed technical assessment**

	Existing Site	Seaham Dock Top	St John's Square
Land			
Ownership (4)	Site is owned by DCC 20	Not all of the site that would be required is owned by DCC 8	Site is owned by DCC 20
Capital receipts/regeneration opportunities (1)	The existing site, given its size and location within proximity to other large residential areas would be ideal for residential development. 4	Possible claw back issues from previous developments on this site. Good site to support visitor and tourism aspiration. However current lack of car parking makes this more challenging. 2	Existing site suitable for housing but dependant on whether pitches have to remain Beneficial to support the development of the high street and surrounding areas as part of the visitor attractions 5
Contamination (3)	There is no requirement for a contaminated land condition however, SI would be required.	Being previously developed land, Made Ground will exist on site and there is the potential for some land contamination. Given the proposal the risks are considered low/moderate, depending on the	Being previously developed, Made Ground will exist on site and there is the potential for some land contamination and the requirement for ground gas protection measures. A land contamination

	Existing Site	Seaham Dock Top	St John's Square
	12	9	9
depth of the Made Ground, A land contamination condition would be required should this progress as the preferred site.		depth of the Made Ground, A land contamination condition would be required should this progress as the preferred site.	condition would be required should this progress as preferred site.
Size and topography (4)	Flat site which can accommodate all building options.	The site is tight for a development of this size with some aspects being extremely narrow. The site also slopes.	There are reservations about a development of this size on this site within the town centre. Site is constrained in terms of space. It is the smallest site of the three and is constrained by development on all sides.
	20	12	12
Flooding (3)	N/A as not on or adjacent to flood plain.	N/A as not on or adjacent to flood plain.	N/A as not on or adjacent to flood plain.
	15	15	15
Totals for land	71	46	61
Effects on natural environment			
HRA Habitat Regulations Assessment (3)	The site would likely be screened out from requiring HRA Appropriate Assessment.	An HRA Appropriate Assessment would be required due to proximity of SPA. The site is located within the 6km of the Durham heritage Coast. In line with Policy 42, any development proposal within the buffer must assess and mitigate against any negative impacts of development on the protected sites along the coast. Considered a leisure centre use would be acceptable	The site would likely be screened out from requiring HRA Appropriate Assessment

	Existing Site	Seaham Dock Top	St John's Square
	15	development on this site as proposed would neither sustain nor enhance the conservation area. Consideration should be given to the recommendations within the Conservation Management Plan if development is to be pursued on this site. The construction of a substantial leisure centre building in this location which has potential to be unavoidably block like in appearance would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. 6	9
Trees (1)	Some tree removal likely for new access. Any development should seek to minimise tree loss in the creation of a new access. 4	Not considered to be any implications. 5	No trees 5
Ecology (2)	At this stage it is considered that there would be no impact. 10	Considered that a geological appraisal of the whole site would be required. 6	As this is an existing car park site it is not considered that there would be no impact on ecology and no need to carry out ecology surveys. 10
Archaeology (3)	No impact 15	No impact 15	No impact 15

	Existing Site	Seaham Dock Top	St John's Square
Totals for natural environment	74	50	60
Infrastructure			
Footpaths/Cycleways (3)	Offer opportunities to improve footpath connections to Deneside Park and the surrounding residential properties. There should be provision for pedestrian and cycle access at the existing access and through the adjacent subway.	The constrained nature of the site leaves little space to accommodate improved footways and access routes. To further encourage active travel and meet requirements of Policy 21 detailed development proposals should make provision for cyclists, through designated cycle parking and storage areas and relevant infrastructure. It should be noted that the road is busy. This is a consideration for both pedestrians crossing the road to access town centre and for traffic.	Existing are in place and no change.
	12	3	15
Public Transport links (3)	Good transport links, with 7 bus stops in proximity. Walking possible from residential area. A large proportion of customers are able to reach the site within 10 mins on public transport.	The site is easily accessible by public transport. There are 6 bus stops in local proximity.	Good public transport links within the town centre. There are 5 bus stops within local proximity.
	15	15	15
Highways (4)	New vehicular access could work but at a cost. There would be no pedestrian access here but will remain to the north of the site.	It should be noted that the road is busy. This is a consideration for both pedestrians crossing the road to the centre and for traffic management.	As existing

	Existing Site	Seaham Dock Top	St John's Square
	16	12	20
Parking (4)	No adverse parking comments, site large enough for leisure centre provision.	<p>Parking in Seaham would be badly affected by the loss of current informal parking on the site with no obvious place to displace current demand. Although the site is in a highly sustainable location the development would result in the displacement of a significant volume of car parking with a very high daily demand from users – replacement parking would need to be provided. Parking control would be required as existing users would be likely to continue to use the leisure centre car parking provided. A new access would also be required.</p> <p>Further more detailed investigations are required.</p>	<p>Although in a highly accessible and sustainable location, the development would require displacement of a significant volume of existing parking provision within an existing car park. Replacement of this car parking area would be required as without it there would be a significant detrimental impact on residential amenity. The site could not provide a suitable level of on-site parking to meet the development requirements. Any proposal for the development of this site will need to include parking to replace what is already on St John's Square and the additional spaces required for the leisure centre.</p> <p>Further more detailed investigations are required to include investigation into suitability of alternative sites to provide replacement car parking provision.</p>
	20	8	8
Public Rights of Way (2)	None affected.	None affected.	None affected.
	10	10	10
Utilities (3)	There are no known issues on this site.	There are no known issues on this site.	There is a main sewer running through the

	Existing Site	Seaham Dock Top	St John's Square
	<p>There would be a requirement for sustainable drainage systems which would be considered through design of the scheme.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">9</p>	<p>There would be a requirement for sustainable drainage systems which would be considered through design of the scheme.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">9</p>	<p>site which is shown on NWL utilities plans.</p> <p>There is also an electric cupboard shown on the site. More detailed investigations are required.</p> <p>As with other sites there would be a requirement for sustainable drainage through design of the scheme.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">6</p>
Total for Infrastructure	82	57	74
Proximity			
Visibility (1)	<p>Not a visible location, however moving the building nearer the road will help.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">4</p>	<p>A landmark building could be created in this location. The site offers great visibility and presence.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">5</p>	<p>The site is not easily visible, due to the surrounding properties and no view out.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">1</p>
Proximity to town (4)	<p>Although not in the town centre, there is good access to existing facilities and services. The site is located on an out of centre location, therefore less preferable from a town centre standpoint. However, it should not be rules out for this reason.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">16</p>	<p>Next to the high street and shopping centre beachfront. There are numerous facilities and services within proximity of the site. The site is close to the main town centre.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">20</p>	<p>There are numerous facilities and services within proximity of the site, and it is close to the town centre.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">20</p>
Proximity to residential areas (4)	<p>The existing site is fully accessible, being within proximity to the residential area.</p>	<p>In terms of accessibility, the site is further from the resident population than the existing facility. The site is</p>	<p>In terms of accessibility the site is further from the resident population than the existing facility.</p>

	Existing Site	Seaham Dock Top	St John's Square
	20	detached from the local population. 12	12
Sequential assessment requirements (4)	In terms of the sequential test required in CDP Policy 9 and Part 7 of the NPPF, it is not considered that one would be required. 20	The site lies within the boundary of Seaham town centre and is preferable in terms of the NPPF and CDP Policy 9's town centre first approach for main town centre uses. Locating the new leisure centre within the town centre would also help protect its vitality and viability by helping to diversify its uses to move away from a reliance on retail. 20	The site lies within the boundary of Seaham town centre and would be preferable in terms of the NPPF and CDP Policy 9's town centre first approach for main town centre uses. Locating the new leisure centre within the town centre would also help protect its vitality and viability by helping to diversify its uses to move away from a reliance on retail. 20
Totals for proximity	60	57	53
Design/planning			
Stacking (4)	Building would not need to be stacked. 20	The second and third options for the new build leisure centre would be too large for the site without needing to stack the building and so would result in a mass considerably larger than the surrounding context. A leisure centre with multiple storeys would block views and potentially have negative impacts on the surrounding areas, given the site's prominent position of the coast. 8	Likely to be stacked. Issues around the scale and massing of a multi-storey leisure centre building. Difficult to accommodate a building of the scale envisaged without a loss of scale and quality of the public realm and the setting of adjacent buildings currently adjacent to an open civic square. 8

	Existing Site	Seaham Dock Top	St John's Square
Special façade treatments (2)	Not considered to require any special treatment. 10	Marine environment – higher specification of materials to consider. 6	Residential streets look onto the site – consideration to façade treatments and height of building. 6
Views out (1)	Potential for views across playing fields. 4	Potential industrial outlook, although could be pleasant overlooking frontage. 4	No views out, site is surrounded. 1
Total design/planning	31	18	15
Buildability			
Maintaining service provision (4)	Existing venue can remain in operation when the new build is taking place. 20	Existing venue can remain in operation when the new build is taking place. 20	Existing venue can remain in operation when the new build is taking place. 20
Temporary accommodation required (2)	There is no requirement for any temporary facilities. 10	Relocation of the Sure start will be required. 6	There is no requirement for any temporary facilities. 10
Construction impact (2)	Consideration would need to be given to noise/dust/light/odour and impact upon residential amenity. Appropriate assessments in relation to air quality would be required. 8	Consideration would need to be given to noise/dust/light/odour and impact upon residential amenity. Appropriate assessments in relation to air quality would be required. Closet residential properties to the north at Marques Point. Careful consideration would need to be given to the design of the proposals and the impacts upon its surroundings. 6	Consideration would need to be given to noise/dust/light/odour and impact upon residential amenity. Appropriate assessments in relation to air quality would be required. 8

	Existing Site	Seaham Dock Top	St John's Square
Programme/layers of work (1)	Demolition of existing leisure centre. New access road. New build leisure centre. 4	Demolition of existing leisure centre Demolition of Surestart, Relocation of Surestart, New build leisure centre. New build changing facility on existing site for pitches. 2	Demolition of existing building to be included. New build changing facility on existing site. New build leisure centre. 3
Build location (2)	No issues – new entrance to the building will create separate site access road. 10	Challenging location for major build. 6	Challenging location for major build, plus site would struggle to receive major pool related deliveries (chemicals/gas). 6
Totals for Buildability	52	40	47
Affordability and programme			
Affordability (4)	Provisional allowance made for improved connections to Deneside Park. 20	Pitches will have to remain on existing site at Seaham, where changing facilities will need to be provided. Sure start to relocate. 16	Additional design and build considerations for parking which would require further consideration and assessment. May result in buildability challenges if existing parking required to remain for existing facility. This could result in multi storey car parking or leisure facility on multi levels, 12
Programme (4)	Minimal risk adjustment to base programme for core facility mix.	Moderate risk adjustment to base cost/programme for facility mix.	Additional design and build consideration for parking which would require further consideration and assessment and may result in programme extension.

	Existing Site	Seaham Dock Top	St John's Square
	20	12	12
Totals for Affordability	40	28	24
Leisure			
Co-location opportunities (3)	<p>The library is already near the leisure centre. Obvious co-location with outdoor facilities on a single site is preferable and more operationally viable.</p> <p>12</p>	<p>Good opportunity to interface with water sport provision.</p> <p>15</p>	<p>There are several complimentary buildings surrounding the site.</p> <p>15</p>
Outdoor provision (3)	<p>The site can easily accommodate the required playing pitch provision and makes operational sense to utilise shared infrastructure to deliver services at a single location.</p> <p>15</p>	<p>The site is too small to accommodate a build option that includes playing pitch provision and it is operationally less viable and cost effective to consider operating across two separate locations (i.e. if pitches remain on the existing site at Seaham, where changing facility will need to be provided).</p> <p>6</p>	<p>The site is too small to accommodate a build option that includes playing pitch provision and it is operationally less viable and cost effective to consider operating across two separate locations (i.e. if pitches remain on the existing site at Seaham, where changing facility will need to be provided).</p> <p>6</p>
Totals for Leisure	27	21	21
Social Value			
Inclusion (3)	<p>Proximity to key areas of deprivation and low socio-economic groups makes the potential for health impact and social return on investment much higher.</p>	<p>The placement of the leisure centre in this location may displace already established family based services and provision due to the loss or effect on the one -point centre. Tis site may also have an adverse effect on other community provision suppressing rather than</p>	<p>Site has proximity with other services which offer good opportunities for wider working and inclusion.</p>

	Existing Site	Seaham Dock Top	St John's Square
	15	complimenting the water sports centre. 9	15
Poverty proofing (3)	Good transport and proximity to housing and pedestrian links mean the site will impact less on low income families in terms of poverty proofing access. 15	Good transport and proximity to housing and pedestrian links mean the site will impact less on low income families in terms of poverty proofing access. 15	Good transport and proximity to local services and pedestrian links mean the site will impact less on low income families in terms of poverty proofing access. 15
Totals for Social value	30	24	30
Energy/carbon opportunities			
Low carbon/sustainability (1)	A sustainability assessment has been undertaken and rated as good. 4	A sustainability assessment has been undertaken and rated as poor. 2	A sustainability assessment has been undertaken and rated as poor. 2
Totals for Energy/Carbon opportunities	4	2	2
Overall Totals	471/505	345/505	387/505

19 **Table 6 Chester-Le-Street Assessment Summary**

CHESTER-LE-STREET SITE	Existing	Civic	Riverside
Land	58	69	58
Natural environment	48	60	51
Infrastructure	70	85	77
Proximity	54	64	33
Design/planning	34	33	35
Buildability	26	51	51
Affordability	32	32	28
Leisure	15	24	27
Social value	21	30	21
Energy/Carbon opportunities	3	4	2
TOTAL	361/505	452/505	383/505

20 **Table 7 Chester-le-Street Detailed Technical Assessment**

	Existing	Civic	Riverside
Land			
Ownership (4)	Site is owned by DCC 20	Site is owned by DCC 20	The site is owned by DCC but mine and minerals owned by church 12
Capital receipt/regen opportunities (1)	If the building is located here, the Civic Centre site could be sold for housing or retail. 5	If the existing site is vacated, this land could be sold for housing. If the library site is vacant this could also be sold, or the building could be offered up for an alternative use. 5	Using this site, other DCC sites could be developed or represent significant capital receipts. 5

	Existing	Civic	Riverside
Contamination (3)	The site is considered suitable for the proposed use in terms of land contamination. However, further investigation work is required to determine extent. 9	Contamination - Asbestos and PAH contamination on site, Gas risk is amber and monitoring wells proposed for further investigation, A remediation strategy will be required, and a land contamination condition would be required. 9	There is no requirement for a contaminated land condition. However, further investigation work is required to determine extent. 9
Size and topography (4)	Tight site and the topography of the site is a cause for concern as the current facility sits in a dip but could be used in the design to alleviate some costs. Proposal could include an under-croft parking or pool tank. 12	This is a large site and can accommodate all build options. If the leisure centre is built here, potential development opportunities would remain to the rear of the site. 20	The site is large and can easily accommodate all build options, the site presents a very good opportunity for a Leisure Hub of significant standing. 20
Flooding (3)	Flood plain to the north of the site. 12	No issue. 15	Flooding territory on the east. 12
Totals for land	58	69	58
Effects on natural environment			
HRA (A Habitats Regulations Assessment) (3)	The site would likely be screened out from requiring HRA Appropriate Assessment N/A 15	The site would likely be screened out from requiring HRA Appropriate Assessment N/A 15	The site would likely be screened out from requiring HRA Appropriate Assessment N/A 15
Heritage (3)	Within the setting of high-status designated heritage assets, including scheduled monument (Roman Fort)	There will be limited impact on the setting of designated heritage assets.	Grade II listed registered Park and Garden to eastern boundary – Lumley

	Existing	Civic	Riverside
	to the west and Grade I listed Church of St. Cuthbert. 9	15	Castle. Lumley Castle is also Grade II listed in its own right. 9
Conservation (3)	Site is in a sensitive location being within the setting Chester le Street Conservation Area. There is the potential for enhancement, but this could be a challenge. 9	The site is within the setting of the conservation area however there is extensive development around the site which would limit any potential impact on the setting. Design quality is key to a successful scheme in this location. 12	Conservation Area to the northwest of the site albeit at a distance. Some adverse effect on open AHLV landscape likely from development of large building though seen in visual association with pavilion style buildings to north and residential areas to the west 9
Archaeology (3)	Significant work around Chester-Le-Street has shown archaeological remains outside of the Scheduled area, so this area has very high archaeological potential. Pre-determination evaluation required as potential for nationally significant remains to be encountered. This site would likely require significant archaeological works. 6	Roman remains found to the south of the site. It is likely that they may extend into the site and would be impacted by the proposed development. Archaeology work would be required however the scope of this would be dependent on the scheme of works chosen. 9	Archaeological interest on this site, due to records in the HER relating to roman and medieval finds, and potential cropmarks. However, work at the site may well have affected these remains and depending on the exact proposals there may not be an issue. Desk based assessment required to determine if any archaeological impact. 9
Trees (1)	There are mature trees on or surrounding the site requiring appropriate surveys, assessment, and protection. 3	There are mature trees on or surrounding the site requiring appropriate surveys, assessment, and protection. 3	Any construction near trees would require appropriate surveys, assessment, and protection. 3

	Existing	Civic	Riverside
Ecology (2)	Any impacts on existing buildings will need to be supported by a bat risk assessment alongside any recommended activity surveys.	Any impacts on existing buildings will need to be supported by a bat risk assessment alongside any recommended activity surveys. Biodiversity net gains expected, impacts are likely to be low given the nature of habitats on site.	Any impacts on existing buildings will need to be supported by a bat risk assessment alongside any recommended activity surveys. Bat risk assessments and preliminary ecological survey required. Biodiversity net gains expected, impacts on biodiversity likely to be low.
	6	6	6
Totals for natural environment	48	60	51
Infrastructure			
Footpaths/Cycleways (3)	Not well linked to main pedestrian routes. There is a small footpath which links to the town centre.	Good opportunity for footfall and access on foot. New pedestrian route proposed to link to residential areas	The major roads(A167) represent a significant barrier, as such travel to the site would largely be by car, this presents significant challenges for poverty proofing leisure and the options for inclusion. Significant and costly improvements in infrastructure would be needed to ensure there was an easily accessible route to the site for pedestrians and consideration of engagement with public transport provision.
	9	12	6
Public transport links (3)	This is a good location in terms of facilities, services, and public transport links.	The site is well served by public transport along Newcastle Road	The site is not too badly served by public transport, but the frequency and route options are fewer to

	Existing	Civic	Riverside
	15	15	this site than other sites. 9
Highways (4)	The existing site would be acceptable from a highway's perspective but a signing strategy for the development would be required to improve its connectivity to the town centre and residential areas further afield. 16	A traffic survey may be required. Pick Tree layout (signalised junction) may have limited capacity 16	Good transport links, Next to A688 20
Parking (4)	Limited current parking. Parking review of town centre underway by Highways. Some concerns that would need to be addressed with regard to the parking layout on site due to proximity to attractive POS of Burn Green. However, maybe an opportunity to wrap all existing uses on the site together and improve town parking issue 12	Parking facilities already exist but would need extending. Acceptable existing vehicle access. 20	Parking for the site could be shared with cricket club on schedule basis, issue on match days and other scheduled events. However, there is space on the site to accommodate additional parking. 20
Public Rights of Way (2)	Impact on PROWs would need to be considered. 6	PROW on site but unlikely to be impacted upon 10	Not believed to be any issues 10
Utilities (3)	There would be a requirement for sustainable drainage systems which would be	There would be a requirement for sustainable drainage systems which would be	There would be a requirement for sustainable drainage systems which would be

	Existing	Civic	Riverside
	considered through design of the scheme. 12	considered through design of the scheme. 12	considered through design of the scheme. 12
Totals for infrastructure	70	85	77
Proximity			
Visibility (1)	Not a prominent site 2	Prominent site 4	Prominent site 5
Proximity to town (4)	The existing site is close to the town centre and near the station 20	The site is fully accessible, being centrally located within the town. 20	Site situated outside town centre. 8
Proximity to residential areas (4)	Slightly isolated from residential - rely on public transport or cars 12	It is near residential areas to the north of the town centre. 20	Away from residential properties 8
Sequential assessment requires (4)	The site is outside the designated town centre boundary for Chester-Le-Street, however, as is the site of the existing leisure facility the site is previously developed land and could be viewed as a like for like replacement. The Chester-Le-Street masterplan has a range of projects identified for sustainable transport zones through the town and the proposal could seek to link up with some of those to improve the sustainable access of the	It is not considered that a sequential assessment as referred to in the County Durham Plan Policy 9 and Part 7 of the NPPF would be required.	The site is outside the designated town centre boundary for Chester-Le-Street; however it could be considered as being an existing leisure facility on the outer edge and as highlighted in the masterplan has an existing sustainable access, with projects in the pipeline for further improvements. A sequential assessment as referred to in the County Durham Plan Policy 9 and Part 7 of

	Existing	Civic	Riverside
	site. In terms of the sequential test required by the County Durham Plan Policy 9 and Part 7 of the NPPF, it is not considered that one would be required. 20	20	the NPPF would be required. 12
Totals for proximity	54	64	33
Design/planning			
Stacking (4)	Although a tight site stacking should not be required 20	Stacking will not be required 20	Stacking will not be required 20
Special façade treatments (2)	Not believed that any special treatment would be required. 10	Not believed that any special treatment would be required. 10	Not believed that any special treatment would be required. 10
Views out (1)	There are views out across open space 4	There are views out from the site and it may be possible to see Lumley Castle at a distance 3	There are views out to Lumley Castle and surroundings 5
Total design/planning	34	33	35
Buildability			
Maintaining service provision (4)	Loss of revenue during build of new/ refurbishment – unless a new location was utilised, allowing the existing site to remain in operation.	Existing site can remain open during work	Existing site would not need to close during the build.

	Existing	Civic	Riverside
	8	20	20
Temporary accommodation required (2)	Temporary facilities required for gym as the existing facility would be demolished before new one built. 2	No temporary work is required 10	No temporary work is required 10
Construction impact (2)	Consideration would need to be given to noise/dust/light/odour and impact upon residential amenity. The site is in proximity to the declared Air Quality Management Area Chester le Street and appropriate assessments in relation to air quality would be required. 8	Consideration would need to be given to noise/dust/light/odour and impact upon residential amenity. The site is in proximity to the declared Air Quality Management Area Chester le Street and appropriate assessments in relation to air quality would be required. 8	Consideration would need to be given to noise/dust/light/odour and impact upon residential amenity. The site is in proximity to the declared Air Quality Management Area Chester le Street and appropriate assessments in relation to air quality would be required. 8
Programme/layers of work (1)	Demolition of leisure centre Condition survey work to library Temp gym required. If insufficient space could consider Riverside site. Dovetail scheme with highways project looking at town centre parking generally New build 2	Demolition of existing leisure centre New build footprint of library. New build leisure centre Disposal of Library building and land 3	Demolition of existing leisure centre. Demolition of pavilion is an option Condition survey work should be included to library. New build 3

	Existing	Civic	Riverside
Build location (2)	Other highways work in the town centre to consider 6	Library demolition to be included and contamination issues to address 10	Existing pavilion courts and cricket nets to be considered 10
Totals for Buildability	26	51	51
Affordability			
Affordability (4)	Car parking under review and may need to dovetail with any proposals under this project. Extra allowance on externals affecting 20	library demolition to include 20	Flood risk to consider, consider cost for removal of pavilion 16
Programme (4)	Moderate risk allowance to BASE cost/programme for facility mix 12	Moderate to significant risk adjustment to base cost/programme for facilities mix 12	Moderate risk adjustment to base cost/programme for facility mix. Consideration for removal of pavilion 12
Totals for affordability and programme	32	32	28
Leisure and Wellbeing			
Co-location opportunities (3)	The site would not suit the colocation of the library compared to the current library location. However, proximity to One Point Hub offers some opportunities.	Good opportunity to collocate library service. Proximity to health centre.	This site would offer an excellent regional sporting hub approach as an option and aid with rationalising built assets in Chester-Le-Street. Library colocation would not be

	Existing	Civic	Riverside
	6	5	favourable at this location. 12
Outdoor provision (3)	Site too small to accommodate outdoor provision. This isn't noted as a key strategic priority. 9	The site may be able to accommodate some external provision, but this is limited. 9	Proximity to other services and outdoor activities would be very advantageous. 15
Totals for Leisure	15	24	27
Social values			
Inclusion (3)	Close to key residential areas but few shared services. 9	The option for library colocation improves options around inclusion and proximity to town centre. 15	The site is located adjacent to other leisure and sporting facilities. Also, would offer enhanced pathways from grass roots to elite level participation. It allows consolidation of Leisure facilities and partnership potential. 15
Poverty proofing (3)	With good pedestrian and transport links as well as reasonable proximity to the town, this site is well placed to poverty proof leisure centre access. 12	With good pedestrian and transport links as well as proximity to the town, this site is well placed to poverty proof leisure centre access. 15	Due to the transport infrastructure being less frequent than other sites and main prevalence for travel by car to this location, it is not well place to offer the most inclusive and poverty proof service provision. 6
Totals for Social values	21	30	21
Energy/carbon opportunities			

	Existing	Civic	Riverside
Low carbon/sustainability (1)	A sustainability assessment has been undertaken and rated as satisfactory. 3	A sustainability assessment has been undertaken and rated as good 4	A sustainability assessment has been undertaken and rated as poor. 2
Totals for carbon opportunities	3	4	2
Totals	365/505	455/505	383/505

21 **Table 8 Bishop Auckland Assessment Summary**

BISHOP AUCKLAND SITE	Existing	Tindale Crescent	College
Land	67	69	57
Natural environment	62	61	60
Infrastructure	92	63	85
Proximity	61	37	48
Design/planning	30	33	32
Buildability	31	53	43
Affordability	32	20	32
Leisure	27	24	27
Social value	30	18	24
Energy/Carbon opportunities	5	1	3
TOTAL	437/505	379/505	411/505

22 **Table 9 Bishop Auckland detailed technical assessment**

	Existing	Tindale FC	College
Land			
Ownership (4)	<p>Site owned by DCC</p> <p>20</p>	<p>Owned by DCC but TSOA - temporary stop off area for travellers. This is only a short-term arrangement however an alternative site would be needed.</p> <p>20</p>	<p>Site not in DCC ownership</p> <p>8</p>
Capital receipt/regen opportunities (1)	<p>There are One Public Estate opportunities on this site. Should this approach be taken then the site taken in its totality would still afford a remaining parcel of land for regen/housing development.</p> <p>3</p>	<p>Regeneration and housing masterplan options on the Woodhouse close site should it be vacated</p> <p>Focus for much redevelopment which sits along other uses e.g. football club - Leisure development would provide additional footfall</p> <p>5</p>	<p>Regeneration and housing masterplan options on the Woodhouse close site should it be vacated</p> <p>5</p>
Contamination (3)	<p>The site would be suitable for the proposed use having regard to land contamination issue. An SI would still be required</p>	<p>Potentially contaminated land – colliery. The site has an industrial history however has undergone remedial works. The site was left suitable for the ongoing development, but ground gas protection measures would need to be incorporated as a precautionary measure in any application. Further information obtained regarding mine shaft locations suggest that the location is north of the site to be developed. More detailed</p>	<p>Site would be suitable for the proposed use having regard to land contamination issue. An SI would still be required</p>

	Existing	Tindale FC	College
	9	investigations will be required. 9	9
Size and topography (4)	This site is large enough and is flat. 20	This is a large site with flat topography. 20	This site is large enough and is flat. 20
Flooding (3)	Not on flood plain. 15	Not on flood plain. 15	Not on flood plain. 15
Totals for land	67	69	57
Effects on natural environment			
HRA Habitat Regulations Assessment (3)	Not required 15	Not required 15	Not required 15
Heritage (3)	There are several designated heritage assets in the vicinity of the site. The site has a very tight boundary and a large structure of an inappropriate design could have a detrimental impact on the setting of St Mary's RC Church but there are several options that can be considered, to reduce the impact. The church windows overlook the western part of the site, so this must remain as landscaping 9	The site is not within the setting of any designated or non-designated heritage assets 15	No heritage assets are known within the site. 15

	Existing	Tindale FC	College
Conservation (3)	<p>From a design and conservation perspective, in Bishop Auckland the existing leisure centre site is preferred in terms of connections and accessibility</p> <p>15</p>	<p>From a design and conservation perspective, in Bishop Auckland the existing leisure centre site is preferred in terms of connections and accessibility</p> <p>9</p>	<p>From a design and conservation perspective, in Bishop Auckland the existing leisure centre site is preferred in terms of connections and accessibility</p> <p>9</p>
Trees (1)	<p>In terms of impact upon trees Options 1 and 3 not preferred as trees would be removed. Option 2 would require tree protection.</p> <p>2</p>	<p>In terms of impact upon trees, Option 1 appears feasible with the retention of the existing trees/vegetation. There would be a requirement for some tree removal on the eastern boundary of the site with Options 2 and 3 but could be mitigated through planting. Need for tree protection</p> <p>3</p>	<p>A bat risk assessment of trees likely to be impacted.</p> <p>3</p>
Ecology (2)	<p>A Preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) of the existing site required in advance of any demolition of the buildings, and in support of the application. Possible further surveys may be identified as a result</p>	<p>This site is likely to have priority species and habitats present, and therefore other sites in Bishop Auckland would be preferable in terms of likely ecological impacts/likely required compensation. A Preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) would be required and possible further surveys. Consideration would need to be given to net gain requirement considerations and possible offsite</p>	<p>A Preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) would be required Possible further surveys, net gain requirement considerations, possible offsite compensation for priority/BAP species may be required.</p>

	Existing	Tindale FC	College
	6	compensation for priority/BAP species. 4	6
Archaeology (3)	No archaeological objection 15	No archaeological objection 15	Archaeological work adjacent to the proposed development site did not find any archaeological remains 12
Totals for natural environment	62	61	60
Infrastructure			
Footpaths/Cycleways (3)	Preferred in terms of connections and accessibility. Existing in place 15	There are cycle linkages to town centre. The location is inaccessible for pedestrians and would not be a suitable site. Improvements required to pedestrian route from Maude Terrace Maude Terrace is heavily trafficked route 6	Existing in place 15
Public transport links (3)	This site is preferred in terms of connections and accessibility. All forms of sustainable transport links. There are bus stops within 200M. direct transport links throughout the weekdays and weekends.	The location is inaccessible for public transport users Not near railway and bus stops are between 200-800M depending on bus route. For some, there is no direct service and those who do have access to direct link, have potentially only 2 services per hour. The direct service does not operate before 8am or after 6pm on weekdays and does	Accessible by sustainable transport modes. The site has access to public transport stops on the B6282. However, travel distance from closest stops to the destination are in excess of 400M up a steep bank. Not all services reach close proximity to the site, instead are directed

	Existing	Tindale FC	College
	15	not operate on a Sunday. 6	into the housing estate. Only 1 direct service operates directly past the site per hour. 12
Highways (4)	Suitable vehicular access. From a highways perspective this site would be suitable for a new leisure facility. 20	Consider traffic roundabouts (signalled one in particular) at Tindale, also peak time of use, Sat pm same as football. Will need to be a review of how the network copes with demand. Retail area also busy Sat pm. Maude terrace is a heavily trafficked route 12	As the site operates as an educational facility the highway B6282 is engineered to promote sustainable transport use. 20
Parking (4)	Appropriate level of existing on-site parking. 20	There is plenty of land to accommodate parking 20	Shared access/parking 16
Public Rights of Way (2)	Not considered to be an issue. 10	Not considered to be an issue. 10	Not considered to be an issue. 10
Utilities (3)	There would be a requirement for sustainable drainage systems which would be considered through design of the scheme. 12	No services currently on the site There would be a requirement for sustainable drainage systems which would be considered through design of the scheme. 9	There would be a requirement for sustainable drainage systems which would be considered through design of the scheme. 12
Totals for infrastructure	92	63	85
	Existing	Tindale FC	College
Proximity			

	Existing	Tindale FC	College
Visibility (1)	<p>Current building on site is not particularly visible. New building would be located on corner and more visible.</p> <p>5</p>	<p>Visibility on the main road</p> <p>5</p>	<p>Visibility is reasonable</p> <p>4</p>
Proximity to town (4)	<p>The site is not located in the town centre but is central to the geographic placement of users from across the Bishop Auckland and Shildon area.</p> <p>16</p>	<p>The site is on the edge of town. Note it is closest to Shildon and furthest from Crook.</p> <p>12</p>	<p>Further from connections, facilities and services than the existing leisure centre</p> <p>12</p>
Proximity to residential areas (4)	<p>Site is an established location for the leisure centre, so existing patrons would not be displaced to another site. It is close to Woodhouse Estate</p> <p>20</p>	<p>The site is located some distance from residential areas with poor accessibility.</p> <p>8</p>	<p>The site is in a reasonably sustainable location close to residential developments</p> <p>20</p>
Sequential assessment required (4)	<p>The site is outside of the designated town centre boundary for Bishop Auckland, and as such would be required to follow the approaches set out within the CDP Policy 9 and Part 7 of the NPPF. The existing leisure centre site is located closest to the town centre and would involve the replacement of the existing established facility in this location.</p>	<p>The site is outside of the designated town centre boundary for Bishop Auckland, and as such would be required to follow the approaches set out within the CDP Policy 9 and Part 7 of the NPPF. A sequential assessment would be required. The site is sequentially inferior to the existing leisure centre site on account of being situated further away from the town centre and less accessible by sustainable</p>	<p>The site is outside of the designated town centre boundary for Bishop Auckland, and as such would be required to follow the approaches set out within the CDP Policy 9 and Part 7 of the NPPF. A sequential assessment would be required. The site is sequentially inferior to the existing leisure centre site on account of being situated further away from the</p>

	Existing	Tindale FC	College
Total design/planning	30	33	32
Buildability			
Maintaining service provision (4)	Existing Leisure Centre and Library would be closed for duration of the project. 8	Existing site can remain open during the work 20	Existing site can remain open during the work 20
Temporary accommodation required (2)	Temporary facilities for a library and gym have been included 6	No temporary work required 10	Temporary relocation of nursery is required 6
Construction impact (2)	Consideration would need to be given to noise/dust/light/odour and impact upon residential amenity. Appropriate assessments in relation to air quality would be required. 8	Consideration would need to be given to noise/dust/light/odour and impact upon residential amenity. Appropriate assessments in relation to air quality would be required. 8	Consideration would need to be given to noise/dust/light/odour and impact upon residential amenity. Appropriate assessments in relation to air quality would be required. 8
Programme/layers of work (1)	Demolition of library Demolition of leisure centre New build footprint of library Temporary library Temporary gym New build 3	Demolition of existing leisure centre Condition survey work to library New build. 5	Demolition of nursery Temporary relocation of nursery Demolition of existing leisure centre Relocation of nursery New build footprint of nursery New build 3

	Existing	Tindale FC	College
Build location (2)	Larger build options may require phasing. 6	No issues other than piling recommended and other contamination. 10	Construction of new build on a live site. 6
Totals for Buildability	31	53	43
Affordability and programme			
Affordability (4)	Temporary facilities required for library 12	Potential contamination and mine risks 8	Temporary relocation of nursery and construction of new build on a live site and cost of new build nursery 12
Programme (4)	Minimal risk adjustment to base programme for core facility mix. Demolition of library ahead of new construction 20	Moderate adjustments to base programme/cost for facilities mix 12	Minimal risk adjustment to base programme for core facilities mix. Demo of nursery ahead of new construction 20
Totals for affordability and programme	32	20	32
Leisure and Wellbeing			
Co – location (3)	Key consideration is the obvious colocation of the library which is already on the same site. There is opportunity for interface with the education establishments within this location.	Not appropriate to co-locate the library however, it there is potential for co-location with other sporting sites and facilities. There is obviously some good synergy to be had with the proximity of the football club although current provision and	Key consideration is the colocation of the library which would still be possible albeit less preferable in this location. However, there are obvious benefits to the direct association with the college

	Existing	Tindale FC	College
	One public estate model on existing site with police and other public services could be advantageous. 15	sporting pathways are already in place which would be strengthened slightly at this location. 9	12
Outdoor provision (3)	Playing strategy does not identify outdoor provision as a strategic priority in this area. There maybe the opportunity to include outdoor space, although site is restricted. 12	Playing strategy does not identify outdoor provision as a strategic priority in this area. There is the opportunity to include outdoor space. 15	Playing strategy does not identify outdoor provision as a strategic priority in this area. There is the opportunity to include outdoor space. 15
Leisure totals	27	24	27
Social Values			
Inclusion (3)	The colocation of the library and proximity to education establishments provides the greatest opportunity to promote inclusion. 15	The less favourable location for the library and distance from other related services would also make this location less favourable for inclusion opportunities. 9	The colocation of the library and proximity to education establishments provides the greatest opportunity to promote inclusion. This site is slightly further out from the town and away from key household areas so offers slightly less opportunity for inclusion, but the education link remains very strong. 12
Poverty proofing (3)	Due to better transport infrastructure and proximity to key targets households this site offers the best opportunity to poverty	The out of town location and less accessibility in terms of public transport make the location less favourable for poverty proofing, prevalence for car transportation affect this	Due to better transport infrastructure and proximity to key targets households this site offers the best opportunity to poverty

	Existing	Tindale FC	College
	proof leisure centre access. 15	9	proof leisure centre access 12
Totals for Social values	30	18	24
Energy/carbon opportunities			
Low carbon/sustainability (1)	A sustainability assessment has been undertaken. This site is rated 5	A sustainability assessment has been undertaken. This site is rated very poor. 1	A sustainability assessment has been undertaken. This site is rated ok. 3
Totals of carbon opportunities	5	1	3
Total Score	437/505	379/505	411/505