

## Comment

**Consultee** mrs B Emmerson (1250901)

**Email Address** [REDACTED]

**Address** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Event Name** Darlington Local Plan 2016-2036 (Regulation 19)

**Comment by** mrs B Emmerson (1250901)

**Comment ID** DBLPPS295

**Response Date** 17/09/20 09:19

**Consultation Point** Policy H 1 Housing Requirement (Strategic Policy)  
([View](#))

**Status** Processed

**Submission Type** Web

**Version** 0.6

### Question 2

**Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is unsound because it is not: (tick all that apply)**

### Question 3a

#### Your Comments

**Please give details of why you consider that this part of the Local Plan is not legally compliant or unsound or fails to comply with the Duty to Cooperate.**

I believe this plan contravenes the councils sustainability framework notably with reference to points 1.9 10, to 15.

- 1 Minimise levels of noise, vibration, odour and light pollution.
- 2 Avoid and reduce flood risk from all sources including fluvial, surface water and sewer flooding.
- 3 Protect and enhance air and water quality and make efficient use of water.
- 4 Protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity.
- 5 Protect and enhance green infrastructure of all types.
- 6 Protect and enhance the character and quality of Darlington's landscape.

I am extremely concerned by the inevitable loss of wildlife habitat that excessive house building on green field land is causing. Did no one on the council, in a position of decision making, watch the David Attenborough extinction programme recently on the BBC ? My husband and I are acutely aware of the significant impact just one recent nearby development has had on the diversity of wildlife in our area

The plan seems to grossly over estimate the number of houses required, and surely more use should be made of brownfield sites, in and around Darlington.

I would wish to comment further and more specifically with reference to site no.s 335 and 396 These require access on to Roundhill Rd which was surely never designed to carry the additional traffic it is already trying to cope with from the current development sites. Both ends of this road have poor visibility and congestion at junctions. With near access for a primary school, and a Spar shop the junction in the village can be particularly hazardous. I would question again as to whether it is truly necessary to include these particular sites in the plan. No 335 in particular is surely the least sustainable.