

## Comment

Consultee	John Spereall (1250817)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Darlington Local Plan 2016-2036 (Regulation 19)
Comment by	John Spereall (1250817)
Comment ID	DBLPPS130
Response Date	14/09/20 19:29
Consultation Point	Policy H 10 Skerningham - Strategic Site Allocation (Strategic Policy) ( <a href="#">View</a> )
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
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 am writing to protest about the above development:

- . **It is not needed** since the housing projection appears to be based on the creation of 7,000 jobs. *In view of the current pandemic and uncertainty over Brexit this projection appears fundamentally flawed* and these houses are not needed. whilst it may be argued that the Amazon warehouse has brought some jobs, increasing automation is likely to limit the number while at the same time this warehouse has increased congestion on the A1150.
- . **Traffic congestion.** The A1150 / Whinfield Road area is already severely congested at peak times. Such a large development will further add to the congestion there and on Thompson Street East and North Road where bottle-necks are already apparent at Bonomi Way and John Street.
- . **There remain plenty of brownfield sites that could be built upon in the borough.** The current plan involves building on green field sites and destroying habitat and recreational areas that, as has been demonstrated in recent months, are essential for physical and mental health.
- . **Springfield Park.** The area of Springfield park will be destroyed to provide an access road. This park is an important recreational facility for residents (particularly children) and the plan to put a

park elsewhere is of no use to local residents. As highlighted above, an access road will only further increase congestion and even grid-lock in the area.

**Flood Risk.** Drainage water from such a large development must go somewhere. Instead of naturally soaking away into the water course and dissipating over time, a large amount of run-off water will be rapidly discharged either into the existing drainage system, or into the Skerne, or both. The Skerne is already well known for regularly flooding and bursting its banks at Great Burden, and the junction of Whinfield Road and Whinbush Way similarly floods at times of peak rainfall. If the run-off is discharged into the Skerne, Great Burden will flood. If it is discharged into the existing drainage system the properties along Whinfield Road and the lower end of Muirkirk Grove, Balmoral Road, Glamis Road etc. WILL flood. *Since the risk of flooding is increasing with global warming, from a flood risk point of view this development is foolhardy in the extreme.*