

Comment

Consultee	Gillan Gibson (1164350)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Darlington Local Plan 2016-2036 (Regulation 19)
Comment by	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)
Comment ID	DBLPPS82
Response Date	14/09/20 10:14
Consultation Point	Policy IN 1 Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network (Strategic Policy) (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
Question 1b	
Do you consider that the Local Plan sound?	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"/> Effective <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.

See: "2 - CPRE - Rep form - IN 1-Sec C-Para vii - Road - Key routes for new roads and public transport links- Extension Document - Word version" for a Word version of the contents of this Representation form. (A PDF version of that Extension Document is also submitted)

CPRE Considers these roads are not justified as they will generate more traffic and CPRE has not identified any exploration or detailed justification for these roads by Darlington Borough Council.

CPRE also notes the lack of detail in the routes of these roads in the Policies Map. So far as CPRE is aware they are only indicated on Map 1 as “New Roads and Transport Links (IN 1)” without any further detail, or reference to where further detail can be found.

- The costs of new roads are not just financial, they include environmental and other wider impacts
- Research has persistently found new roads create more traffic
- The new roads proposed will currently go through unspoilt countryside and significantly change the landscape in a negative way
- Tranquility is an important concept for CPRE who have conducted studies into the topic. New roads will severely damage the tranquility of the countryside along their route.
- No attempt has been made to address if any mitigation is proposed for the damage that will be caused, or indeed if any mitigation is possible

The concerns of other organisations and individuals are noted, with particular reference to Darlington Green Party.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

CPRE requests these roads be removed from the Plan

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

CPRE with many other individuals and organisations has persistently argued for many years additional roads are not required, with particular reference to a Northern Bypass/Link/Relief Road. These other roads will also bring many negative issues.

Our concerns on this are substantial and need consideration that may well go beyond making written comments

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

Comment

Consultee	Gillan Gibson (1164350)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Darlington Local Plan 2016-2036 (Regulation 19)
Comment by	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)
Comment ID	DBLPPS83
Response Date	14/09/20 10:14
Consultation Point	Policy H 1 Housing Requirement (Strategic Policy) (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.6
Files	3 - CPRE - Rep form - H 1 - Housing Requirement - Extension document - PDF version.pdf
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"/> Effective <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.

1. CPRE objects to the figures Darlington Borough Council is using, considering the locally calculated baseline OAN of 422 houses per annum far higher than required. This is compounded if the figure of 492 houses per annum mentioned in this Policy is the “target” figure. CPRE questions the use of two different figures, an OAN and a “target” figure.

As para 6.1.3 says, the standard methodology put forward by the Government identifies an Objectively Assessed (housing) Need (OAN) baseline of 177 hpa 2016-26 (houses per annum). And since March 2018, Government guidance requires any Local Planning Authority (LPA) Plan that has not reached submission stage to adopt the standard methodology OAN (Objectively Assessed Need).

Increased provision above the baseline OAN to support economic growth is actively encouraged by the Government, but the level of increase must be realistic and justified. CPRE considers the Council has not put forward any exceptional circumstances to justify this higher figure and is not convinced there will be the creation of an additional 7,000 full time equivalent jobs over the Plan period.

So the locally calculated baseline OAN of 422 (or 492) hpa needs to be discarded and the Plan redrafted adopting a baseline OAN of 177 hpa.

CPRE notes and supports the analysis of the Darlington Green Party with regard to the OAN.

With regard to the Duty to Cooperate,

CPRE also notes the comments of the Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council on the lack of consideration of their Neighborhood Plan, which has been made, when considering the housing numbers and allocations for their Neighbourhood Plan area. The Neighbourhood Plan was informed by a specifically commissioned analysis which should, therefore, carry great weight. CPRE also represents this demonstrates a failing in the Duty to Cooperate.

CPRE also draws attention to the following analysis of planning applications, commitments, and the figures in the Local Plan:

Darlington Local Plan Submission Draft 2020 Note regarding Housing Allocations.

Local Plan Extract

6.2.2 There is the need to allocate sufficient land to accommodate a minimum of 8,440 dwellings and a target of 9,840 dwellings within the plan period. The allocations which will contribute to achieving this are set out in Policy H 2. In combination with existing commitments and taking into account housing delivery since the start of the plan period (2016) there is sufficient land to surpass the housing target. The allocations and existing commitments have the potential to deliver approximately 10,000 homes up to 2036. The build out of a number of the strategic sites will also extend beyond 2036. Taking this into consideration the plan has sufficient land for approximately 16,000 homes.

Completions The tables in the Housing Trajectory, Appendix A, give completions for the first four years of the plan and these total 1807 dwellings on both large and small sites.

Commitments Table 6.4 lists housing commitments, totalling 2652 on sites of over 10 dwellings to be completed within the plan period. One of these sites, 68 West Park Garden Village, carries 360 completions after 2036.

Small sites The third last line of the tables in the Housing Trajectory, Appendix A, estimates that 25 dwellings will be completed each year on small sites (under 10 dwellings), aggregating to 400 dwellings within the remainder of the plan period.

Windfall sites Unallocated sites of over 10 dwellings will come forward within the plan period and be approved where they conform with the plan policies, e.g. are within development boundaries or bring appropriate brownfield sites into sustainable development. The plan makes no estimate for windfall sites, without explanation. However the following examples already exist;

- Darlington Road Sadberge where outline permission was granted on 07/02/2020 for 46 dwellings on the former reservoir.
- 182 Northgate where 24 apartments are recommended for approval on 2 September
- 213-217 Haughton Road where 12 apartments were permitted on 04/05/2020.

Thus windfalls already total 82 dwellings and on this basis the total for the remainder of the plan period could be significant.

Allocations within existing development boundaries Five sites are allocated for development and lie within the existing (1997 Plan) boundaries and can be considered to be acceptable;

- 11 Cattle Market 76
- 318 North of Allington Way 81
- 355 Lingfield Point 331
- 411 Chesnut St car park 34
- 412 Skinnergate 15

These total 537 dwellings. This means that additional sites for between 2965 and 4365 dwellings are required to be allocated without taking future windfalls into account.

Other Allocated Sites

Policy H2 allocates 18 sites, 5 of which I have identified above as being acceptable within the policies of the 1997 Plan. Of the remaining 13, the following three sites have received planning permission subject to s 106 agreements and should be considered to be commitments;

- 3 South of Burtree lane 380 dwellings permitted 21/08/20 15/01050/OUT
- 8 Berrymead Farm 370 dwellings approved 07/02/20 15/00804/OUT
- 410 Snipe lane 455 dwellings approved 06/08/2020 20/00196/FUL

This adds 1205 dwellings to the commitments and reduce the residual figure to 1760 (minimum) and 3160 (target) dwellings respectively.

The above figures are expressed in the table below; **(See Attached PDF for clear table)**

Residual minimum 8440 Residual target 9840 Completions 1804 6636 8036

Commitments 2652 3984 5384 Small sites 400 3584 4984 Existing Windfalls 82 3502 4902 Acceptable allocations 537 2965 4365 Committed allocations 1205 1760 3160 Total 6680 1760 3160

The remaining 10 sites have a capacity of 4552 dwellings within the period of the plan which is 2792 above the minimum of 8440 and 1392 above the target figure of 9840. The Plan therefore identifies land for a total of 11232 dwellings within the plan period. The sites have a remaining capacity of 5935 dwellings after 2036, resulting in the plan identifying land for 17167 dwellings.

Conclusion

These totals should be compared with those in paragraph 6.2.2. The plan delivers over 11000 (cf 10000) up to 2036 and sufficient land for over 17000 (cf 16000). The differences would increase if a realistic assessment were made to accommodate future windfall sites.

The conclusion is that not all of the allocated sites are required to meet the target in the Plan. If the requirement is set using the Government's preferred method of calculation ($177 \times 20 = 3540$) then no allocations would be necessary.

CPRE considers new houses should be built firstly within the urban area, particularly Town Centre and Inner Area locations

CPRE also considers the contribution from windfall sites, 82 this year, should be included as part of the provision

It is appreciated the Government requires a certain level of provision, but CPRE does not consider any more than the Government's standard OAN figure should be used, namely 177 per year.

2. In addition CPRE also objects in the strongest possible terms to the second last paragraph (beginning "At any point in the Local Plan period...") as it effectively renders useless all the policy in the Plan and the consultation process if there is no longer a demonstrable supply of sites to fully meet the five year land requirement. This is particularly pertinent as CPRE considers the housing figure the Council is proposing to use is vastly overinflated and the Council is effectively "set up to fail".

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

1. The reduction of the locally calculated baseline OAN of 422 hpa or target of 492 hpa and the Plan redrafted adopting a baseline OAN of 177 hpa.
2. The removal of the second last paragraph beginning "At any point in the Local Plan period...).

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

The excessive housing allocation for Darlington has been of major concern to CPRE for many years, and we have submitted comment to various stages in the Local Plan process challenging the figures used. Within this representation we have submitted a Note which we consider makes the Council's proposed figures unjustified. The potential impact of the OAN and allocations are substantial and need consideration that may go well beyond making written comments.

CPRE notes the submissions of individuals and other organisations who are also challenging the figures and we would wish to be part of the challenge to the figures at the Examination in Public. In particular we make reference to the work of Darlington Green Party, Middleton St George Parish Council and Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council.

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

Question 7

Please **upload any supporting documents** here. Please do not include any signatures or other personal data such as home addresses which you would not wish to see published on the Council's website.

3 - CPRE - Rep form - H 1 - Housing Requirement -
Extension document - PDF version.pdf

Comment

Consultee	Gillan Gibson (1164350)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Darlington Local Plan 2016-2036 (Regulation 19)
Comment by	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)
Comment ID	DBLPPS85
Response Date	14/09/20 10:47
Consultation Point	Policy H 2 Housing Allocations (Strategic Policy) (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.7
Files	3 - CPRE - Rep form - H 2 - Housing Allocation - Extension document - PDF version.pdf
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"/> Effective <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.

CPRE considers Darlington Borough Council is using unnecessarily high housing figures and consequently objects to the housing allocations as they stand in this Proposed Submission Local Plan as not being justified, see the “Darlington Local Plan Submission Draft 2020: Note regarding Housing Allocations” below.

In particular we do not consider the following allocations to be justified:

- Site 185 – Greater Faverdale
- Site 251 - Skerningham
- Site 20 - Great Burdon
- Sites 41 and 249 - Coniscliffe Park
- Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm
- Site 403 - Blackwell Grange East
- Site 95 - Beech Crescent
- Site 99 - Maxgate Farm

In addition the Council should also clarify the status of: • Site 3 - Burtree Lane • Site 8 - Berrymead Farm and • Site - 410 - Snipe Lane as these sites have planning permission and should be “commitments”. If they are to remain as “allocations” CPRE does not consider them justified either.

Furthermore, in the interests of future food security CPRE is opposed to the use of productive agricultural land for large scale housing developments. If the Government’s Standard Methodology was used then the Council would have a 5 year housing land supply without utilising productive agricultural land.

The loss of so much agricultural land together with habitats for wildlife in these areas will seriously affect the Council’s stated Vision in this Plan of maintaining its identity as a cohesive historic market town. In addition to leading to the loss of a considerable area of productive agricultural land, it will result in unsustainable development that does not conform to the environmental limb of sustainable development mentioned in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). As soil is itself a store for CO2, it will also mean that, in addition to any emissions from the proposed development of these sites, a considerable facility will be lost, potentially releasing CO2 into the atmosphere and unable to absorb future emissions. As the proposed housing target of 492 hpa is so far in excess of the figure required under the government’s standard method for calculating the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN), we represent that there is no justifiable reason for such a catastrophic loss.

If it is determined that further land needs to be allocated, this should be in the Town Centre fringe. This is brownfield land so its redevelopment would lead to potential rejuvenation of the town centre, lead to a reduced need for travel, redevelop land that has already been developed and save greenfield land from unnecessary development. We represent that this would be consistent with national policy.

With regard to the Duty to Cooperate, CPRE notes the comments of the Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council on the lack of consideration of their Neighborhood Plan, which has been made, when considering the housing numbers and allocations for their Neighbourhood Plan area. The Neighbourhood Plan was informed by a specifically commissioned analysis which should, therefore, carry great weight.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Darlington Local Plan Submission Draft 2020 Note regarding Housing Allocations

Local Plan Extract

6.2.2 There is the need to allocate sufficient land to accommodate a minimum of 8,440 dwellings and a target of 9,840 dwellings within the plan period. The allocations which will contribute to achieving this are set out in Policy H 2. In combination with existing commitments and taking into account housing delivery since the start of the plan period (2016) there is sufficient land to surpass the housing target. The allocations and existing commitments have the potential to deliver approximately 10,000 homes up to 2036. The build out of a number of the strategic sites will also extend beyond 2036. Taking this into consideration the plan has sufficient land for approximately 16,000 homes.

Completions The tables in the Housing Trajectory, Appendix A, give completions for the first four years of the plan and these total 1807 dwellings on both large and small sites.

Commitments Table 6.4 lists housing commitments, totaling 2652 on sites of over 10 dwellings to be completed within the plan period. One of these sites, 68 West Park Garden Village, carries 360 completions after 2036.

Small sites The third last line of the tables in the Housing Trajectory, Appendix A, estimates that 25 dwellings will be completed each year on small sites (under 10 dwellings), aggregating to 400 dwellings within the remainder of the plan period.

Windfall sites Unallocated sites of over 10 dwellings will come forward within the plan period and be approved where they conform with the plan policies, e.g. are within development boundaries or bring appropriate brownfield sites into sustainable development. The plan makes no estimate for windfall sites, without explanation. However the following examples already exist:

- Darlington Road Sadberge where outline permission was granted on 07/02/2020 for 46 dwellings on the former reservoir.
- 182 Northgate where 24 apartments are recommended for approval on 2 September
- 213-217 Haughton Road where 12 apartments were permitted on 04/05/2020.

Thus windfalls already total 82 dwellings and on this basis the total for the remainder of the plan period could be significant.

Allocations within existing development boundaries Five sites are allocated for development and lie within the existing (1997 Plan) boundaries and can be considered to be acceptable:

- 11 Cattle Market 76
- 318 N of Allington Way 81
- 355 Lingfield Point 331
- 411 Chesnut St car park 34
- 412 Skinnergate 15

These total 537 dwellings. This means that additional sites for between 2965 and 4365 dwellings are required to be allocated without taking future windfalls into account.

Other Allocated Sites

Policy H2 allocates 18 sites, 5 of which I have identified above as being acceptable within the policies of the 1997 Plan. Of the remaining 13, the following three sites have received planning permission subject to s 106 agreements and should be considered to be commitments;

- 3 South of Burtree lane 380 dwellings permitted 21/08/20 15/01050/OUT
- 8 Berrymead Farm 370 dwellings approved 07/02/20 15/00804/OUT
- 410 Snipe lane 455 dwellings approved 06/08/2020 20/00196/FUL

This adds 1205 dwellings to the commitments and reduce the residual figure to 1760 (minimum) and 3160 (target) dwellings respectively.

The above figures are expressed in the table below;

Residual minimum	8440	Residual target	9840
Completions	1804	6636	8036
Commitments	2652	3984	5384
Small sites	400	3584	4984
Existing Windfalls	82	3502	4902
Acceptable allocations	537	2965	4365
Committed allocations	1205	1760	3160
Total	6680	1760	3160

The remaining 10 sites have a capacity of 4552 dwellings within the period of the plan which is 2792 above the minimum of 8440 and 1392 above the target figure of 9840. The Plan therefore identifies land for a total of 11232 dwellings within the plan period. The sites have a remaining capacity of 5935 dwellings after 2036, resulting in the plan identifying land for 17167 dwellings.

Conclusion

These totals should be compared with those in paragraph 6.2.2. The plan delivers over 11000 (cf 10000) up to 2036 and sufficient land for over 17000 (cf 16000). The differences would increase if a realistic assessment were made to accommodate future windfall sites.

The conclusion is that not all of the allocated sites are required to meet the target in the Plan. If the requirement is set using the Government's preferred method of calculation ($177 \times 20 = 3540$) then no allocations would be necessary.

CPRE considers new houses should be built firstly within the urban area, particularly Town Centre and Inner Area locations

CPRE also considers the contribution from windfall sites, 82 this year, should be included as part of the provision

It is appreciated the Government requires a certain level of provision, but CPRE does not consider any more than the Government's standard OAN figure should be used, namely 177 per year.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

1. The reduction of the locally calculated baseline OAN of 422 houses per annum (hpa) or target of 492 hpa and the Plan redrafted adopting a baseline OAN of 177 hpa. 2. The removal from the Plan of the following sites:

- Site 185 – Greater Faverdale
- Site 251 - Skerningham
- Site 20 - Great Burdon
- Sites 41 and 249 - Coniscliffe Park, noting these are also not included in the Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Neighbourhood Plan
- Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm
- Site 403 - Blackwell Grange East
- Site 95 - Beech Crescent
- Site 99 - Maxgate Farm

and, if they are considered as “allocations”,

- Site 3 - Burtree Lane
- Site 8 - Berrymead Farm and
- Site - 410 - Snipe Lane

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

The excessive housing allocation, and the sites proposed for Darlington, has been of major concern to CPRE for many years, and we have submitted comment to various stages in the Local Plan process challenging the figures used.

CPRE notes the submissions of individuals and other organisations who are also challenging the figures and we would wish to be part of the challenge to the figures at the Examination in Public. In particular we make reference to the work of Darlington Green Party, Middleton St George Parish Council and the Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council

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 Yes, I request to be notified

**the regulations and to be notified of the adoption
of the Local Plan?**

Comment

Consultee Gillan Gibson (1164350)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Company / Organisation Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group

Address [REDACTED]

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

Comment by Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)

Comment ID DBLPSS87

Response Date 14/09/20 10:53

Consultation Point Policy SH 1 Settlement Hierarchy (Strategic Policy) ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Email

Version 0.6

Files [3 - CPRE - Rep form - SH 1 - Settlement Higherarchy - Extension document - PDF version.pdf](#)

Question 1b

Do you consider that the Local Plan sound? No

Question 2

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

- Positively prepared
- Effective

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.

See: "2 - CPRE - Rep form - SH 1 - Settlement Hierarchy - Extension Document

- Word version" for a Word version of the contents of this Representation form. (A PDF version of that Extension Document is also submitted)

Policy SH 1 lists Rural Villages, but there is no mention of Middleton One Row. Whilst it can be presumed it is either a “Rural Village” or part of Middleton St George, that is a presumption, not a policy. Middleton One Row does have defined Development Limits on the Policies Map.

Clarifying the situation will make the Plan more effective.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

Add Middleton One Row to the list of Rural Villages or clarify it is considered part of Middleton St George.

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

Whilst an administrative matter, the implications for housing allocations could be important and that is an issue we wish to address.

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

Comment

Consultee	Gillan Gibson (1164350)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Darlington Local Plan 2016-2036 (Regulation 19)
Comment by	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)
Comment ID	DBLPPS89
Response Date	14/09/20 10:58
Consultation Point	Policy H 3 Development Limits (Strategic Policy) (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.7
Question 1b	
Do you consider that the Local Plan sound?	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"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Justified <input type="checkbox"/> Consistent with national policy

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.

CPRE supports the concept of this policy. However, CPRE does not consider the extension of those Development Limits into the countryside as shown on the Proposals Map justified as we consider many of the extensions into the countryside are excessive and inconsistent with the environmental limb of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

CPRE has had view of some initial maps showing potential Masterplan's for a number of sites, such as Skerningham, Faverdale and Coniscliffe. They showed there would only be housing on the inner part of the sites adjacent to the town. Why is the Development Limit not drawn to cover only the potential housing areas, instead of all the site including the green infrastructure elements? Developers will look at the Development Boundary in the Local Plan and interpret it that they can build out to the Development Limit without the green infrastructure.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

The Development Limits must be re-drawn taking into account the OAN as calculated under the Standard Method (177 houses per year) and housing commitments made in respect of this and where housing would actually be permitted.

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

The Development Limits are predicated on the housing requirement and allocations.

The excessive housing allocation, and the sites proposed for Darlington, have been of major concern to CPRE for many years, and we have submitted comment to various stages in the Local Plan process challenging the figures used.

CPRE notes the submissions of individuals and other organisations who are also challenging the figures and we would wish to be part of the challenge to the figures at the Examination in Public. In particular we make reference to the work of Darlington Green Party, Middleton St George Parish Council and Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council

CPRE also wishes to express its concerns that the boundaries used leave room for challenge from housing developers who are likely to wish to build up to whatever line is drawn on the Polices Map.

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

Comment

Consultee Gillan Gibson (1164350)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Company / Organisation Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group

Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

Comment by Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)

Comment ID DBLPPS96

Response Date 14/09/20 12:26

Consultation Point Policy IN 9 Renewable Energy Infrastructure (Strategic Policy) ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Email

Version 0.6

Question 1b

Do you consider that the Local Plan sound? No

Question 2

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

- Positively prepared
- Effective

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.

1. CPRE does not consider this policy is as effective as it could be as it makes no mention of solar arrays on roofs, especially on large industrial and business buildings. We consider this is a missed opportunity. Roofs are a far superior location than agricultural land in that productive agricultural land is not lost. In addition, panels can affect the ability of soil under them to act as a sink for CO2 placing solar panels on roofs is an issue that is addressed in the Planning Policy Guidance at paragraph 013 Reference ID: 5-013-20150327 and the speech of Gregory Barker.

2. CPRE also does not consider this policy effective as it could be as in IN9,b,iv, account is not taken that there are non-agricultural uses which may be of significant environmental or amenity value.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

CPRE proposes adding wording to this section to promote the use of roofs for solar energy production, especially on large industrial and commercial buildings. New applications for large buildings should be expected to make provision for solar energy generation.

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

CPRE whilst generally supportive of solar power, considers its scale, location, etc, should be appropriate.

Our concerns on this are substantial and need consideration that may well go beyond making written comments

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

Comment

Consultee	Gillan Gibson (1164350)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Darlington Local Plan 2016-2036 (Regulation 19)
Comment by	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)
Comment ID	DBLPPS102
Response Date	14/09/20 12:51
Consultation Point	Policy H 10 Skertingham - Strategic Site Allocation (Strategic Policy) (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
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"/> Effective <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.

CPRE does not consider this allocation is justified and supports local residents in their objections and their reasons for objecting.

We also refers to CPRE Darlington's submissions on Policies H 1 and H 2

In any case, explicit allocation of a site 60% of which is planned to be developed after the end of the Plan period is not appropriate in planning terms. In the instances of the North East new towns of Peterlee and Cramlington, land was safeguarded for future development beyond the plan period and released in phases as required. In fact, the final phase of Cramlington "New Town" still has not come forward for development more than 50 years after the scheme was initiated.

There seems to be no local employment provision for a development of 4500 houses making it a commuter estate of approaching 10k residents. This is neither socially, environmentally nor economically sustainable that will lead to the loss of productive agricultural land, wildlife habitats and, by removing soil and vegetation, a sink for CO2.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

CPRE considers this allocation, Skerningham – Strategic Site Allocation, should be deleted to make the Plan "sound".

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

The excessive housing allocation, and the sites proposed for Darlington, have been of major concern to CPRE for many years, and we have submitted comment to various stages in the Local Plan process challenging the figures used.

CPRE notes the submissions of individuals and other organisations who are also challenging the figures and allocations and we would wish to be part of the challenge to the sites allocated at the Examination in Public. In particular we make reference to the work of Darlington Green Party and Skerningham residents

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

Comment

Consultee	Gillan Gibson (1164350)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Darlington Local Plan 2016-2036 (Regulation 19)
Comment by	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)
Comment ID	DBLPPS104
Response Date	14/09/20 12:57
Consultation Point	Policy H 11 Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation (Strategic Policy) (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4
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"/> Effective <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.

1. CPRE considers Darlington Borough Council is allocating far more land than necessary for housing. If CPRE's recommendation of using the Government's Standard Methodology for calculating its Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) is used, then there will be no need for the Greater Faverdale Urban Extension.

Delivering 2000 houses on this site at the same time as 1800 houses on the nearby Skertingham site would overwhelm the local housing market and cause it to crash. CPRE is aware of numerous instances where multiple competing developments have mutually failed.

2. In the Borough of Darlington Local Plan a major part of the Greater Faverdale – Strategic Site Allocation is the Faverdale Reserve Employment Site, Policy EP8

"LAND NORTH OF FAVERDALE CLOSE TO THE A1(M)-A68 JUNCTION WILL BE RESERVED FOR DEVELOPMENT BY LARGE INDUSTRIAL USERS."

At the time of the Public Inquiry the Faverdale Reserve site was considered to be one of only four sites in the whole of the North East capable of taking a very large single use, eg a Hitachi or Nissan type use. In view of the scarcity of this type of site CPRE does not consider it should be used for routine developments, such as housing, or even routine employment use. (Note: at the Public Inquiry for the Borough of Darlington Local Plan CPRE presented a case against allocating the site for employment. However, the site was allocated and CPRE reluctantly accepted the result of the consultation process.)

3. In addition the "Greater Faverdale – Strategic Site Allocation" is far larger than EP8, with a major extension on the north east of the site.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

CPRE accepts the "Faverdale Reserve Employment Site", Policy EP8 was allocated in the "Borough of Darlington Local Plan", November 1997, having been subject to a full consultation process. CPRE considers if it is to retain any allocation it should be as a "Reserve Employment Site" and not for housing.

The area of the "Greater Faverdale – Strategic Site Allocation" which is not covered by Site EP8 should be removed from an allocation and marked as outside the Borough's Development Limits

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

The excessive housing allocation, and the sites proposed for Darlington, have been of major concern to CPRE for many years, and we have submitted comment to various stages in the Local Plan process challenging the figures used.

CPRE has challenged the use of this site when it was considered at the inquiry for the Borough of Darlington Local Plan, November 1997, for Employment use. The use for housing and the enlarged area proposed are issues we would wish to challenge.

CPRE notes the submissions of individuals and other organisations who are also challenging the figures and allocations and we would wish to be part of the challenge to the sites allocated at the Examination in Public. In particular we make reference to the work of Darlington Green Party.

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

Comment

Consultee Gillan Gibson (1164350)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Company / Organisation Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group

Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

Comment by Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)

Comment ID DBLPPS108

Response Date 14/09/20 13:18

Consultation Point Policy E 1 Safeguarding Existing Employment Opportunities ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Email

Version 0.4

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"/>	Effective
<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.

CPRE considers the "Suggested Use" for Teesside International Airport is not effective in limiting use of the site to only airport related uses.

Newcastle Airport and Teesside International Airport are the only two major airports in the North East. This results in the land having a particular significance and it should not be used by businesses which do not requiring an airport location, and could be located on other employment areas

Currently because of the way the words are broken up in the box it could be read that:"B1, B2" uses are allocated and "Airport & related uses" are a separate use allocation.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

Amend the wording to read:

“B1 and B2 Airport related uses”

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

Teesside International Airport, as its name implies, is of international significance. The Employment Land is a significant and rare resource. CPRE has consistently commented on the importance of retaining the land for airport related uses only when planning applications are considered. CPRE wishes to express their views to the Inspector as to why this land should retain its limited usage.

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

Comment

Consultee Gillan Gibson (1164350)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Company / Organisation Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group

Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

Comment by Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)

Comment ID DBLPPS109

Response Date 14/09/20 13:24

Consultation Point Site 362 - Teesside International Airport South ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Email

Version 0.7

Question 1b

Do you consider that the Local Plan sound? No

Question 2

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

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.

CPRE considers the "Suggested Use" for Teesside International Airport is not effective in limiting use of the site to only airport related uses only.

Newcastle Airport and Teesside International Airport are the only two major airports in the North East. This results in the land having a particular significance and it should not be used by businesses which do not requiring an airport location, and could be located on other employment areas

Currently because of the way the words are broken up in the box it could be read that:"B2" uses are allocated and"Airport related uses" are a separate use allocated.

This may seem pedantic, but if the policy were ever to go to court the fact of what the wording actually says is the relevant point and not the intention. And it is the wording in the policy which is the policy. Precision in language is essential, especially in view of the number of cases relating to planning applications which have been taken to the courts where words, sentences and punctuation have been forensically analysed for meaning.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

Amend the wording to read:

“B2 Airport related uses”

That is, delete the “&”

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

Teesside International Airport, as its name implies, is of international significance. The Employment Land is a significant and rare resource. CPRE has consistently commented on the importance of retaining the land for airport related uses only when planning applications are considered. CPRE wishes to express their views to the Inspector as to why this land should retain its limited usage

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

Comment

Consultee	Gillan Gibson (1164350)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Darlington Local Plan 2016-2036 (Regulation 19)
Comment by	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)
Comment ID	DBLPPS141
Response Date	13/09/20 11:11
Consultation Point	Policy TC 4 District and Local Centres (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.6
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 2	
Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is unsound because it is not: (tick all that apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> Positively prepared <input type="checkbox"/> Effective <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.	

CPRE does not consider Policy TC4 can be effective as CPRE has not been able to identify a list of the District Centres or a list of the Local Centres.

The Policy names only two centres and several others have been omitted without explanation or justification. Centres at West Park, North Road, Whinfield, Yarm Road, Neasham Road and Middleton St George should be included. A distribution of District and Local Centres has evolved serving most of the Borough. Some, e.g. Whinfield and West Park, were deliberately planned to provide for expanding and new communities; elsewhere food supermarkets were approved near existing shops and services, e.g. Yarm Road and North Road. They deserve to be recognised in the policy, as they were in previous plans (1997 Local Plan, Core Strategy, Making and Growing Places). We draw your attention to your Retail Technical Note of July 2013 which should be revisited and brought up to date with appropriate boundaries.

There is reference to the "Policies Map", but it would be easy to miss a centre if the only way of finding them is by scouring the Map.

The policy should recognise that a wider range of uses can be appropriate and found in or adjacent to District and Local Centres, eg pubs, primary schools, crèches, surgeries, quasi-retail activities, repair workshops, residential and care homes, etc. The wider the range, the stronger the centre and the more likelihood of the services flourishing for the benefit of the residents.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

Policy TC4 should have a list of District Centres and a list of Local Centres

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

Accurately identifying areas with a particular designation is important and we would wish to emphasise this

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

Comment

Consultee Gillan Gibson (1164350)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Company / Organisation Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group

Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

Comment by Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)

Comment ID DBLPPS142

Response Date 13/09/20 11:50

Consultation Point Policy TC 5 Retail Impact Assessment Threshold ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Email

Version 0.5

Question 1b

Do you consider that the Local Plan sound? No

Question 2

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

- Positively prepared
- Effective

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.

CPRE does not consider Policy TC5 can be effective as it only relates to proposals over 500 sqm of ADDITIONAL floor space.

This leaves no policy relating to TOTALLY NEW proposals over 500sqm

Precision in language is essential, especially in view of the number of cases relating to planning applications which have been taken to the courts where words, sentences and punctuation have been

forensically analysed for meaning and where case law upholds it is what a policy says the matters, not its intention.

In addition, CPRE questions what Impact Assessment will be required. The wording here is very loose and it is represented that the Policy should specify the topics that may need to be covered by such a Statement.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

Within Policy TC5 the word “additional” should be deleted.

CPRE proposes Policy TC5 to read: “Proposals for retail (convenience and comparison) and leisure development generating over 500sqm floorspace will be required to undertake an Impact Assessment.”

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

CPRE is concerned at the lack of clarity and precision in the policy and wishes to consider this in the Examination.

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

Comment

Consultee	Gillan Gibson (1164350)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Darlington Local Plan 2016-2036 (Regulation 19)
Comment by	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)
Comment ID	DBLPPS143
Response Date	13/09/20 11:58
Consultation Point	Policy ENV 1 Protecting, Enhancing and Promoting Darlington's Historic Environment (Strategic Policy) (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
Question 1b	
Do you consider that the Local Plan sound?	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"/> Positively prepared <input type="checkbox"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Consistent with national policy

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.

CPRE does not consider Policy ENV 1 can be effective as when considering Designated Heritage Assets the use of the word "an" indicates a single site. This leaves no room for Darlington to have more than one archaeological site which is a Designated Heritage Asset. As listed in APPENDIX C DARLINGTON'S HERITAGE ASSETS, Darlington already has multiple archaeological sites listed as Scheduled Monuments.

In addition, it cannot be known what will be discovered in the future. For example, when test pits were excavated in the Market Place outside St Cuthbert's Church an unknown section of burial ground was discovered.

CPRE notes footnote 33 refers to the Council's duties under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990. However, it does not appear that the Council has considered the duties under Sections 66 and 72 of the Act to seek to preserve heritage assets and, as with the County Durham Plan, it is questioned whether this Policy is consistent with that duty.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

Within Policy ENV 1, A) Designated Heritage Assets, the word "an" should be deleted in lines 2 and 5.

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

CPRE considers Darlington's heritage assets are unique in many ways and we would wish to participate in any discussion.

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

Comment

Consultee Gillan Gibson (1164350)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Company / Organisation Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group

Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

Comment by Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)

Comment ID DBLPPS144

Response Date 13/09/20 12:02

Consultation Point Policy ENV 3 Local Landscape Character (Strategic Policy) ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Email

Version 0.4

Question 1b

Do you consider that the Local Plan sound? No

Question 2

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

- Positively prepared
- Effective

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.

CPRE does not consider Policy ENV 3 can be effective as it could be

In Policy ENV3, Para A),1., there is a list of rural gaps. CPRE proposes the gap between Low Coniscliffe and the urban area is added to the list.

CPRE draws attention to the submissions of the Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council who have made a more detailed submission on this issue.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

In Policy ENV3, Para A),1., add the gap between Low Coniscliffe and the urban area to the list of rural gaps

“Policy ENV3, Para A),.1. The rural gaps, between, Middleton St George and Middleton One Row, Middleton St George and Oak Tree, Hurworth on Tees and Hurworth Place, and between Darlington and the villages of Great Burdon, Barmpton and Low Coniscliffe.”

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

CPRE the countryside charity, has always promoted and defended the landscape and its value. With over 90 years of research and campaigning our concerns on landscape are substantial and need consideration that may well go beyond making written comments.

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

Comment

Consultee Gillan Gibson (1164350)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Company / Organisation Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group

Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

Comment by Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)

Comment ID DBLPPS146

Response Date 13/09/20 12:13

Consultation Point Policy ENV 7 Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development (Strategic Policy) ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Email

Version 0.4

Question 1b

Do you consider that the Local Plan sound? No

Question 2

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

- Positively prepared
- Effective

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.

Whilst Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife sites and Local Geological Sites are marked on the Policies Map, the Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are not.

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

Add the SSSI's to the Policies Map and its Key.

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

Whilst primarily an administrative matter, this issue draws attention to the lack of detail and clarity in the Local Plan and the mapping and our concerns on this are substantial and need consideration that may well go well beyond making written comments

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

Comment

Consultee Gillan Gibson (1164350)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Company / Organisation Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group

Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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

Comment by Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group (Gillan Gibson - 1164350)

Comment ID DBLPPS147

Response Date 13/09/20 12:20

Consultation Point Policy IN 1 Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network (Strategic Policy) ([View](#))

Status Processed

Submission Type Email

Version 0.4

Question 1b

Do you consider that the Local Plan sound? No

Question 2

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

CPRE considers the Northern Relief Road is not justified.

CPRE, with many other individuals and organisations, has persistently argued for many years a Northern Relief Road/Link Road/Bypass is not justified. We note in particular the submissions of the Darlington Green Party

Aspects of concern include:• The costs of the Northern Relief Road are not just financial, they include environmental and other wider impacts• Research has persistently found new roads create more traffic•

CPRE is concerned that, if the Northern Relief Road is constructed, it will increase pressure to use it as the development boundary. While the proposals for Green Infrastructure at Skertingham are noted, CPRE is also concerned about a proposed link road from the Northern Relief Road to Skertingham which, if constructed, may increase this pressure. • The Northern Relief Road will go through unspoilt countryside and significantly change the landscape in a negative way • Tranquility is an important concept for CPRE who have conducted studies into the topic. The Northern Relief Road will severely damage the tranquility of the countryside along its whole route. • No attempt has been made to address if any mitigation is proposed for the damage that will be caused, or indeed if any mitigation is possible

Question 4

Changes Sought

Please Note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. There is the opportunity to attach Word or PDF files before submitting your comment.

After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues identified for examination.

Please set out what change(s) to the Local Plan you consider necessary to make it legally compliant or sound. You will need to say why this change will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording for any policy or text.

CPRE requests provision and references to the Northern Relief Road are removed.

Question 5

Attendance at Examination Hearings

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

Question 5a

Participation at Examination Hearings

Please note the inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearings.

If you wish to participate at the examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

CPRE with many other individuals and organisations has persistently argued for many years a Northern Relief Road is not required.

Our concerns on this are substantial and need consideration that may well go beyond making written comments

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

Darlington Proposed Submission Local Plan 2016-2036
CPRE Darlington comment in Word

Page 36ff	CHAPTER 6. HOUSING			
Policy	Paragraph	Figure/Table	Policies Map	
<i>H1 – Housing requirement (Strategic Policy)</i>				

Darlington Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19 consultation)
Consultation 6th August to 17th September 2020

Part A: Your Details				
Your Contact details				
Title	<i>Secretary of CPRE Darlington</i>			
Name	<i>Gillan Gibson</i>			
Organisation/Group	<i>CPRE Darlington (Campaign to Protect Rural England)</i>			
Address	<i>13 Fenwicks Street Boldon Colliery Tyne and Wear</i>			
Postcode	<i>NE35 9HU</i>			
Tel no	<i>07703 597 211</i>			
Email address	<i>gillan_gibson@yahoo.co.uk</i>			
If you have supplied an email address, are you happy for it to be the main way that the Council contacts you about future consultations on planning policy documents?				
Yes, I am happy for email to be the main way the Council contacts me	<i>Tick</i>		No, I am not happy for email to be the main way the Council contacts me	
If you are replying on behalf of a group how many people does it represent?				
<i>CPRE Darlington does not maintain a list of local members or supporters as it is an integral part of national CPRE which has approximately 40,000 members.</i>				

Part B: Your Representation				
1. To which part of the Local Plan does your representation relate				
<i>Page 36ff</i>	CHAPTER 6. HOUSING			
Policy	Paragraph	Figure/Table	Policies Map	
<i>H1 – Housing requirement (Strategic Policy)</i>				
2. Do you consider the Local Plan is				
		Yes	No	
	Legally compliant		<i>no</i>	
	Sound		<i>no</i>	
	Complies with duty to cooperate		<i>no</i>	
3. Do you consider this part of the Local Plan is not sound because it is not (tick all that apply)				
Positively prepared			Justified	<i>Tick</i>
Effective	<i>Tick</i>		Consistent with national policy	<i>Tick</i>
4. Your Comments				
<p><i>See: "2 - CPRE - Rep form - H 1 – Housing Requirement - Extension Document - Word version" for a Word version of the contents of this Representation form. (A PDF version of that Extension Document is also submitted)</i></p> <p><i>1. CPRE objects to the figures Darlington Borough Council is using, considering the locally calculated baseline OAN of 422 houses per annum far higher than required. This is compounded if the figure of 492 houses per annum mentioned in this Policy is the "target" figure. CPRE questions the use of two different figures, an OAN and a "target" figure.</i></p> <p><i>As para 6.1.3 says, the standard methodology put forward by the Government identifies an Objectively Assessed (housing) Need (OAN) baseline of 177 hpa 2016-26 (houses per annum). And since March 2018, Government guidance requires any Local Planning Authority (LPA) Plan that has not reached submission stage to adopt the standard methodology OAN (Objectively Assessed Need).</i></p> <p><i>Increased provision above the baseline OAN to support economic growth is actively encouraged by the Government, but the level of increase must be realistic and justified. CPRE considers the Council has not put forward any exceptional circumstances to justify this higher figure and is not convinced there will be the creation of an additional 7,000 full time equivalent jobs over the Plan period.</i></p> <p><i>So the locally calculated baseline OAN of 422 (or 492) hpa needs to be discarded and the Plan redrafted adopting a baseline OAN of 177 hpa.</i></p>				

CPRE notes and supports the analysis of the Darlington Green Party with regard to the OAN.

With regard to the Duty to Cooperate,

CPRE also notes the comments of the Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council on the lack of consideration of their Neighborhood Plan, which has been made, when considering the housing numbers and allocations for their Neighbourhood Plan area. The Neighbourhood Plan was informed by a specifically commissioned analysis which should, therefore, carry great weight. CPRE also represents this demonstrates a failing in the Duty to Cooperate.

CPRE also draws attention to the following analysis of planning applications, commitments, and the figures in the Local Plan:

**Darlington Local Plan Submission Draft 2020
Note regarding Housing Allocations.**

Local Plan Extract

*6.2.2 There is the need to allocate sufficient land to accommodate a minimum of **8,440** dwellings and a target of **9,840** dwellings within the plan period. The allocations which will contribute to achieving this are set out in Policy H 2. In combination with existing commitments and taking into account housing delivery since the start of the plan period (2016) there is sufficient land to surpass the housing target. The allocations and existing commitments have the potential to deliver approximately 10,000 homes up to 2036. The build out of a number of the strategic sites will also extend beyond 2036. Taking this into consideration the plan has sufficient land for approximately 16,000 homes.*

Completions

The tables in the Housing Trajectory, Appendix A, give completions for the first four years of the plan and these total **1807** dwellings on both large and small sites.

Commitments

Table 6.4 lists housing commitments, totalling **2652** on sites of over 10 dwellings to be completed within the plan period. One of these sites, 68 West Park Garden Village, carries 360 completions after 2036.

Small sites

The third last line of the tables in the Housing Trajectory, Appendix A, estimates that 25 dwellings will be completed each year on small sites (under 10 dwellings), aggregating to **400** dwellings within the remainder of the plan period.

Windfall sites

Unallocated sites of over 10 dwellings will come forward within the plan period and be approved where they conform with the plan policies, e.g. are within development boundaries or bring appropriate brownfield sites into sustainable development. The plan makes no estimate for windfall sites, without explanation. However the following examples already exist;

- Darlington Road Sadberge where outline permission was granted on 07/02/2020 for 46 dwellings on the former reservoir.
- 182 Northgate where 24 apartments are recommended for approval on 2 September
- 213-217 Houghton Road where 12 apartments were permitted on 04/05/2020.

Thus windfalls already total 82 dwellings and on this basis the total for the remainder of the plan period could be significant.

Allocations within existing development boundaries

Five sites are allocated for development and lie within the existing (1997 Plan) boundaries and can be considered to be acceptable;

- 11 Cattle Market 76
- 318 North of Allington Way 81
- 355 Lingfield Point 331
- 411 Chesnut St car park 34
- 412 Skinnergate 15

These total **537** dwellings. This means that additional sites for between 2965 and 4365 dwellings are required to be allocated without taking future windfalls into account.

Other Allocated Sites

Policy H2 allocates 18 sites, 5 of which I have identified above as being acceptable within the policies of the 1997 Plan. Of the remaining 13, the following three sites have received planning permission subject to s 106 agreements and should be considered to be commitments;

- 3 South of Burtree lane 380 dwellings permitted 21/08/20 15/01050/OUT
- 8 Berrymead Farm 370 dwellings approved 07/02/20 15/00804/OUT
- 410 Snipe lane 455 dwellings approved 06/08/2020 20/00196/FUL

This adds **1205** dwellings to the commitments and reduce the residual figure to **1760** (minimum) and 3160 (target) dwellings respectively.

The above figures are expressed in the table below;

		Residual minimum	Residual target
		8440	9840
Completions	1804	6636	8036
Commitments	2652	3984	5384
Small sites	400	3584	4984
Existing Windfalls	82	3502	4902
Acceptable allocations	537	2965	4365
Committed allocations	1205	1760	3160
Total	6680	1760	3160

The remaining 10 sites have a capacity of **4552** dwellings within the period of the plan which is **2792** above the minimum of 8440 and **1392** above the target figure of 9840. The Plan therefore identifies

land for a total of **11232** dwellings within the plan period. The sites have a remaining capacity of **5935** dwellings after 2036, resulting in the plan identifying land for **17167** dwellings.

Conclusion

These totals should be compared with those in paragraph 6.2.2. The plan delivers over 11000 (cf 10000) up to 2036 and sufficient land for over 17000 (cf 16000). The differences would increase if a realistic assessment were made to accommodate future windfall sites.

The conclusion is that not all of the allocated sites are required to meet the target in the Plan. If the requirement is set using the Government’s preferred method of calculation (177 x 20 = 3540) then no allocations would be necessary.

CPRE considers new houses should be built firstly within the urban area, particularly Town Centre and Inner Area locations

CPRE also considers the contribution from windfall sites, 82 this year, should be included as part of the provision

It is appreciated the Government requires a certain level of provision, but CPRE does not consider any more than the Government’s standard OAN figure should be used, namely 177 per year.

2. In addition CPRE also objects in the strongest possible terms to the second last paragraph (beginning “At any point in the Local Plan period...”) as it effectively renders useless all the policy in the Plan and the consultation process if there is no longer a demonstrable supply of sites to fully meet the five year land requirement. This is particularly pertinent as CPRE considers the housing figure the Council is proposing to use is vastly overinflated and the Council is effectively “set up to fail”.

5. Changes Sought.

- 1. The reduction of the locally calculated baseline OAN of 422 hpa or target of 492 hpa and the Plan redrafted adopting a baseline OAN of 177 hpa.*
- 2. The removal of the second last paragraph beginning “At any point in the Local Plan period...”).*

6. Attendance at Examination Hearings.

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

Yes, I wish to participate	<i>Tick</i>		No	
----------------------------	-------------	--	----	--

7. If you wish to participate at the Examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

The excessive housing allocation for Darlington has been of major concern to CPRE for many years, and we have submitted comment to various stages in the Local Plan process challenging the figures used. Within this representation we have submitted a Note which we consider makes the Council’s

proposed figures unjustified. The potential impact of the OAN and allocations are substantial and need consideration that may go well beyond making written comments.

CPRE notes the submissions of individuals and other organisations who are also challenging the figures and we would wish to be part of the challenge to the figures at the Examination in Public. In particular we make reference to the work of Darlington Green Party, Middleton St George Parish Council and Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council.

Do you request to be notified that the Local Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination...

No, I do not request to be notified			Yes, I do request to be notified	<i>Tick</i>
-------------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------------	-------------

Part C: Declaration

Signature			Date	
-----------	--	--	------	--

We would also like to retain your contact details on our database to keep you informed of future Local Plan consultations and updates

Yes, please add me to your database	<i>Tick</i>		No, I do not wish to be added to your database	
-------------------------------------	-------------	--	--	--

Darlington Proposed Submission Local Plan 2016-2036
CPRE Darlington comment in Word

Policy	Paragraph	Figure/Table	Policies Map	
<i>H2 – Housing Allocations (Strategic Policy)</i>				

Darlington Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19 consultation)
Consultation 6th August to 17th September 2020

Part A: Your Details				
Your Contact details				
Title	<i>Secretary of CPRE Darlington</i>			
Name	<i>Gillan Gibson</i>			
Organisation/Group	<i>CPRE Darlington (Campaign to Protect Rural England)</i>			
Address	<i>13 Fenwicks Street Baldon Colliery Tyne and Wear</i>			
Postcode	<i>NE35 9HU</i>			
Tel no	<i>07703 597 211</i>			
Email address	<i>gillan_gibson@yahoo.co.uk</i>			
If you have supplied an email address, are you happy for it to be the main way that the Council contacts you about future consultations on planning policy documents?				
Yes, I am happy for email to the be main way the Council contacts me	<i>Tick</i>		No, I am not happy for email to the be main way the Council contacts me	
If you are replying on behalf of a group how many people does it represent?				
<i>CPRE Darlington does not maintain a list of local members or supporters as it is an integral part of national CPRE which has approximately 40,000 members.</i>				

Part B: Your Representation				
1. To which part of the Local Plan does your representation relate				
<i>Page 40ff</i>	CHAPTER 6. HOUSING			
Policy	Paragraph	Figure/Table	Policies Map	
<i>H2 – Housing Allocations (Strategic Policy)</i>				
2. Do you consider the Local Plan is				
		Yes	No	
	Legally compliant		<i>no</i>	
	Sound		<i>no</i>	
	Complies with duty to cooperate		<i>no</i>	
3. Do you consider this part of the Local Plan is not sound because it is not (tick all that apply)				
Positively prepared			Justified	<i>Tick</i>
Effective	<i>Tick</i>		Consistent with national policy	<i>Tick</i>
4. Your Comments				
<p><i>See: "2 - CPRE - Rep form – H 2 – Housing Allocations - Extension Document - Word version" for a Word version of the contents of this Representation form. (A PDF version of that Extension Document is also submitted)</i></p> <p><i>CPRE considers Darlington Borough Council is using unnecessarily high housing figures and consequently objects to the housing allocations as they stand in this Proposed Submission Local Plan as not being justified, see the "Darlington Local Plan Submission Draft 2020: Note regarding Housing Allocations" below.</i></p> <p><i>In particular we do not consider the following allocations to be justified:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Site 185 – Greater Faverdale</i> <i>• Site 251 - Skerningham</i> <i>• Site 20 - Great Burdon</i> <i>• Sites 41 and 249 - Coniscliffe Park</i> <i>• Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm</i> <i>• Site 403 - Blackwell Grange East</i> <i>• Site 95 - Beech Crescent</i> <i>• Site 99 - Maxgate Farm</i> <p><i>In addition the Council should also clarify the status of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Site 3 - Burtree Lane</i> 				

- Site 8 - Berrymead Farm and
- Site - 410 - Snipe Lane

as these sites have planning permission and should be “commitments”. If they are to remain as “allocations” CPRE does not consider them justified either.

Furthermore, in the interests of future food security CPRE is opposed to the use of productive agricultural land for large scale housing developments. If the Government’s Standard Methodology was used then the Council would have a 5 year housing land supply without utilising productive agricultural land.

The loss of so much agricultural land together with habitats for wildlife in these areas will seriously affect the Council’s stated Vision in this Plan of maintaining its identity as a cohesive historic market town. In addition to leading to the loss of a considerable area of productive agricultural land, it will result in unsustainable development that does not conform to the environmental limb of sustainable development mentioned in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). As soil is itself a store for CO₂, it will also mean that, in addition to any emissions from the proposed development of these sites, a considerable facility will be lost, potentially releasing CO₂ into the atmosphere and unable to absorb future emissions. As the proposed housing target of 492 hpa is so far in excess of the figure required under the government’s standard method for calculating the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN), we represent that there is no justifiable reason for such a catastrophic loss.

If it is determined that further land needs to be allocated, this should be in the Town Centre fringe. This is brownfield land so its redevelopment would lead to potential rejuvenation of the town centre, lead to a reduced need for travel, redevelop land that has already been developed and save greenfield land from unnecessary development. We represent that this would be consistent with national policy.

With regard to the Duty to Cooperate, CPRE notes the comments of the Low Coniscliff and Merrybent Parish Council on the lack of consideration of their Neighbourhood Plan, which has been made, when considering the housing numbers and allocations for their Neighbourhood Plan area. The Neighbourhood Plan was informed by a specifically commissioned analysis which should, therefore, carry great weight.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Darlington Local Plan Submission Draft 2020
Note regarding Housing Allocations

Local Plan Extract

6.2.2 There is the need to allocate sufficient land to accommodate a minimum of **8,440** dwellings and a target of **9,840** dwellings within the plan period. The allocations which will contribute to achieving this are set out in Policy H 2. In combination with existing commitments and taking into account housing delivery since the start of the plan period (2016) there is sufficient land to surpass the housing target. The allocations and existing commitments have the potential to deliver approximately 10,000 homes up to 2036. The build out of a number of the strategic sites will also extend beyond 2036. Taking this into consideration the plan has sufficient land for approximately 16,000 homes.

Completions

The tables in the Housing Trajectory, Appendix A, give completions for the first four years of the plan and these total **1807** dwellings on both large and small sites.

Commitments

Table 6.4 lists housing commitments, totaling **2652** on sites of over 10 dwellings to be completed within the plan period. One of these sites, 68 West Park Garden Village, carries 360 completions after 2036.

Small sites

The third last line of the tables in the Housing Trajectory, Appendix A, estimates that 25 dwellings will be completed each year on small sites (under 10 dwellings), aggregating to **400** dwellings within the remainder of the plan period.

Windfall sites

Unallocated sites of over 10 dwellings will come forward within the plan period and be approved where they conform with the plan policies, e.g. are within development boundaries or bring appropriate brownfield sites into sustainable development. The plan makes no estimate for windfall sites, without explanation. However the following examples already exist;

- Darlington Road Sadberge where outline permission was granted on 07/02/2020 for 46 dwellings on the former reservoir.
- 182 Northgate where 24 apartments are recommended for approval on 2 September
- 213-217 Houghton Road where 12 apartments were permitted on 04/05/2020.

Thus windfalls already total 82 dwellings and on this basis the total for the remainder of the plan period could be significant.

Allocations within existing development boundaries

Five sites are allocated for development and lie within the existing (1997 Plan) boundaries and can be considered to be acceptable;

- 11 Cattle Market 76
- 318 N of Allington Way 81
- 355 Lingfield Point 331
- 411 Chesnut St car park 34
- 412 Skinnergate 15

These total **537** dwellings. This means that additional sites for between 2965 and 4365 dwellings are required to be allocated without taking future windfalls into account.

Other Allocated Sites

Policy H2 allocates 18 sites, 5 of which I have identified above as being acceptable within the policies of the 1997 Plan. Of the remaining 13, the following three sites have received planning permission subject to s 106 agreements and should be considered to be commitments;

- 3 South of Burtree lane 380 dwellings permitted 21/08/20 15/01050/OUT
- 8 Berrymead Farm 370 dwellings approved 07/02/20 15/00804/OUT
- 410 Snipe lane 455 dwellings approved 06/08/2020 20/00196/FUL

This adds **1205** dwellings to the commitments and reduce the residual figure to **1760** (minimum) and 3160 (target) dwellings respectively.

The above figures are expressed in the table below;

		Residual minimum	Residual target
		8440	9840
Completions	1804	6636	8036
Commitments	2652	3984	5384
Small sites	400	3584	4984
Existing Windfalls	82	3502	4902
Acceptable allocations	537	2965	4365
Committed allocations	1205	1760	3160
Total	6680	1760	3160

The remaining 10 sites have a capacity of **4552** dwellings within the period of the plan which is **2792** above the minimum of 8440 and **1392** above the target figure of 9840. The Plan therefore identifies land for a total of **11232** dwellings within the plan period. The sites have a remaining capacity of **5935** dwellings after 2036, resulting in the plan identifying land for **17167** dwellings.

Conclusion

These totals should be compared with those in paragraph 6.2.2. The plan delivers over 11000 (cf 10000) up to 2036 and sufficient land for over 17000 (cf 16000). The differences would increase if a realistic assessment were made to accommodate future windfall sites.

The conclusion is that not all of the allocated sites are required to meet the target in the Plan. If the requirement is set using the Government's preferred method of calculation ($177 \times 20 = 3540$) then no allocations would be necessary.

CPRE considers new houses should be built firstly within the urban area, particularly Town Centre and Inner Area locations

CPRE also considers the contribution from windfall sites, 82 this year, should be included as part of the provision

It is appreciated the Government requires a certain level of provision, but CPRE does not consider any more than the Government's standard OAN figure should be used, namely 177 per year.

5. Changes Sought.

1. The reduction of the locally calculated baseline OAN of 422 houses per annum (hpa) or target of 492 hpa and the Plan redrafted adopting a baseline OAN of 177 hpa.
2. The removal from the Plan of the following sites:

- Site 185 – Greater Faverdale
- Site 251 - Skerningham
- Site 20 - Great Burdon
- Sites 41 and 249 - Coniscliffe Park, noting these are also not included in the Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Neighbourhood Plan
- Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm
- Site 403 - Blackwell Grange East
- Site 95 - Beech Crescent
- Site 99 - Maxgate Farm

and, if they are considered as “allocations”,

- Site 3 - Burtree Lane
- Site 8 - Berrymead Farm and
- Site - 410 - Snipe Lane

6. Attendance at Examination Hearings.

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

Yes, I wish to participate	<i>Tick</i>		No	
----------------------------	-------------	--	----	--

7. If you wish to participate at the Examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?

The excessive housing allocation, and the sites proposed for Darlington, has been of major concern to CPRE for many years, and we have submitted comment to various stages in the Local Plan process challenging the figures used.

CPRE notes the submissions of individuals and other organisations who are also challenging the figures and we would wish to be part of the challenge to the figures at the Examination in Public. In particular we make reference to the work of Darlington Green Party, Middleton St George Parish Council and the Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council.

Do you request to be notified that the Local Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination...

No, I do not request to be notified			Yes, I do request to be notified	<i>Tick</i>
-------------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------------	-------------

Part C: Declaration

Signature			Date	
-----------	--	--	------	--

We would also like to retain your contact details on our database to keep you informed of future Local Plan consultations and updates

Yes, please add me to your database	<i>Tick</i>		No, I do not wish to be added to your database	

Darlington Proposed Submission Local Plan 2016-2036 CPRE Darlington comment in Word

Darlington Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19 consultation)
Consultation 6th August to 17th September 2020

Page 20	CHAPTER 4. THE SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY			
Policy	Paragraph	Figure/Table	Policies Map	
<i>SH1 – Settlement Hierarchy (Strategic Policy)</i>				

Part A: Your Details				
Your Contact details				
Title	<i>Secretary of CPRE Darlington</i>			
Name	<i>Gillan Gibson</i>			
Organisation/Group	<i>CPRE Darlington (Campaign to Protect Rural England)</i>			
Address	<i>13 Fenwicks Street Baldon Colliery Tyne and Wear</i>			
Postcode	<i>NE35 9HU</i>			
Tel no	<i>07703 597 211</i>			
Email address	<i>gillan_gibson@yahoo.co.uk</i>			
If you have supplied an email address, are you happy for it to be the main way that the Council contacts you about future consultations on planning policy documents?				
Yes, I am happy for email to the be main way the Council contacts me	<i>Tick</i>		No, I am not happy for email to the be main way the Council contacts me	
If you are replying on behalf of a group how many people does it represent?				
<i>CPRE Darlington does not maintain a list of local members or supporters as it is an integral part of national CPRE which has approximately 40,000 members.</i>				

Part B: Your Representation				
1. To which part of the Local Plan does your representation relate				
<i>Page 20</i>	<i>CHAPTER 4. THE SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY</i>			
Policy	Paragraph	Figure/Table	Policies Map	
<i>SH1 – Settlement Hierarchy (Strategic Policy)</i>				
2. Do you consider the Local Plan is				
		Yes	No	
	Legally compliant			
	Sound		<i>no</i>	
	Complies with duty to cooperate			
3. Do you consider this part of the Local Plan is not sound because it is not (tick all that apply)				
Positively prepared	<i>Tick</i>		Justified	
Effective	<i>Tick</i>		Consistent with national policy	
4. Your Comments				
<p><i>See: "2 - CPRE - Rep form - SH 1 - Settlement Hierarchy - Extension Document - Word version" for a Word version of the contents of this Representation form. (A PDF version of that Extension Document is also submitted)</i></p> <p><i>Policy SH 1 lists Rural Villages, but there is no mention of Middleton One Row. Whilst it can be presumed it is either a "Rural Village" or part of Middleton St George, that is a presumption, not a policy. Middleton One Row does have defined Development Limits on the Policies Map.</i></p> <p><i>Clarifying the situation will make the Plan more effective.</i></p>				
5. Changes Sought.				
<i>Add Middleton One Row to the list of Rural Villages or clarify it is considered part of Middleton St George.</i>				
6. Attendance at Examination Hearings.				
If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate in the examination hearings				
Yes, I wish to participate	<i>Tick</i>		No	

7. If you wish to participate at the Examination hearings, please outline why you consider it to be necessary?				
<i>Whilst an administrative matter, the implications for housing allocations could be important and that is an issue we wish to address.</i>				
Do you request to be notified that the Local Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination...				
No, I do not request to be notified			Yes, I do request to be notified	<i>Tick</i>
Part C: Declaration				
Signature			Date	
We would also like to retain your contact details on our database to keep you informed of future Local Plan consultations and updates				
Yes, please add me to your database	<i>Tick</i>		No, I do not wish to be added to your database	