

Comment

Consultee	Mrs Gwen Park (1170978)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Darlington Local Plan 2016-2036 (Regulation 19)
Comment by	Mrs Gwen Park (1170978)
Comment ID	DBLPPS331
Response Date	17/09/20 10:55
Consultation Point	Darlington Borough Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Submission Local Plan August 2020 (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.3
Question 1a	
Do you consider that the Local Plan is Legally compliant?	No
Question 1b	
Do you consider that the Local Plan sound?	No
Question 1c	
Do you consider that the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Question 2	
Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is unsound because it is not: (tick all that apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> Justified
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 disagree that Darlington requires 6700 more houses as it states in the plan with 4500 already allocated. This estimate is several times higher than the government estimate and you have to ask why! The town population of 110000 has remained consistent for decades. With that in mind we should ask why the population will suddenly grow - increase in population will bring in more council tax and that should not justify building 6700 houses. It is therefore not consistent with national planning policy framework.

Darlington roads around North Road and Whinfield are at capacity during peak travel times and independent studies show that an increase in traffic from Skerningham Village would not be possible. More traffic without infrastructure will bring this area to a standstill at peak times. There is also the issue of where roads could be built to accommodate this development- the idea of a road through Springfield Park was eventually turned down. Driving a road through the park, robbing local residents of their green space was an insensitive idea by the council planners. How can you on one hand state that new development have to consider the health and welfare of new residents by removing the green space for existing residents. But where will the roads be built for Skerningham village? Whinfield area and Brampton area are already busy and would be overwhelmed if the village plan went ahead. Planners, developers and the council appear to be putting their profit/ money making causes first and not considering the impact of such a large development on an already congested area. There is no justification for planning 6700 more houses.

The plan does include a link road between the A66 and either A167 or M1. This link road is needed now and has been discussed for 20 years since the west end of Darlington got a bypass. It is needed now to remove the through traffic and hgv traffic away from the north end of Darlington which is heavily congested. Much of the traffic is lorries and other HGV traffic passing through between the A66 and A1. Have the government and Highway Authorities agreed to this? The link road is needed to meet current transport requirements before adding 6700 houses and 13000 more cars to the roads around Darlington.

Health and wellbeing- when we bought a house in Whinfield we were promised open green areas and recreational park on our doorstep. Why are our needs not as important as the health and wellbeing of the village residents? Why remove acres of farmland and woodland enjoyed by many to build Skerningham village? The threat to build over Springfield Park was argued by residents angry at losing our park. Hopefully the council will keep their promise now to NOT BUILD A ROAD ON SPRINGFIELD PARK.

As the economy changes due to Covid and businesses close where are the job opportunities for these new residents? Will Darlington need 6700 new houses? Developments at Hurworth and other areas have slow sales.

PROTECT BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY - building over farmland, woodland and a golf course doesn't make sense when there are many brown sites in Darlington. These natural areas cannot be replaced or developed elsewhere and once gone are gone forever. The plants and animal habitats cannot be redeveloped further afield - it takes 100's of years and decades to build a golf course with mature trees. Use brown areas instead. Might be more expensive to the developer but less harmful to nature. Nature cannot be replaced, think of tomorrow's generation.

I am disgusted to learn that the council maybe in Partnership with the developers. I wonder what the real agenda is. Comments in the local paper discuss the fact that a limited company Darlington Garden Village application show that the council will become a business partner to deliver Skerningham Village if this plan is passed. The council should be neutral and consider what is best for residents. Not consider what they will gain financially.

In summary, I agree that we require a link road now to meet current traffic needs but Darlington does not require 6700 + more houses, many times more than the government recommends.

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate in the examination hearings?

No, I do not wish to participate at the examination hearings

Question 6

Do you request to be notified that the Local Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination under section 22(3) of the regulations and to be notified of the adoption of the Local Plan?

Yes, I request to be notified