

Richard Cowen for  
Bishop Auckland  
Cycling Club

Representor number  
1250729

**STATEMENT OF RICHARD COWEN TO THE EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC  
INTO THE  
DARLINGTON LOCAL PLAN**

**RELATING TO MATTER 9**

I made a number of representations to the council in respect of Policy IN2. Whilst generally supporting it from a cycling point of view, I represented that improvements could be made.

Question 9.7 asks about cycle parking. While I will address that, I did raise issues about general cycle safety and specifically made representations for improving point e) of this Policy. Point e) covers cycle storage that is also covered in Policy IN4 but it also covers certain other provisions at employment sites, including changing facilities.

I note with extreme concern that, following representations from Gladman Developments, the Council has determined to delete point e) in its entirety. I represent in the strongest terms that that proposal needs to be revisited in relation to changing and shower facilities.

*Q9.7 Subject to the Council's proposed modification, are the requirements of policy IN4 relating to car and cycle parking, including reference to having regard to local circumstances and the standards set out in the Tees Valley Highway Design Guide, sound?*

The Council appears to have weakened the original wording, substituting the word "provided" with the word "encouraged". It will therefore be impossible to enforce this provision and I represent that, if cycling is to be encouraged in accordance with national policy, this proposed rewording is not sound.

As far as I can see, there is no document called the "Tees Valley Highway Design Guide". The document is the Design Guide and Specification – Residential and

Industrial Estates Development. There is a chapter entitled “Design Guide for Cycle Facilities”. The Guide covers more than just cycle parking and addresses the design of other cycling facilities.

In my representations, I commented that there was no provision detailing how cycling facilities should be provided. While the Teesside document may not be as full as some (for example, giving cyclists priority at traffic lights), it does address this issue and it is difficult to understand why the Council has only referenced it for cycle parking and not for other aspects of cycling infrastructure.

If the proposed developments on the outskirts of Darlington are adopted, I represent that there should be clarity as to how cycling facilities on the various developments will be linked to the existing network. This will be necessary to enable residents to take safe routes to hubs such as shops, leisure facilities and workplaces. As I mentioned in my representations, if Coniscliffe proceeds, something far safer than the A67 needs to be provided to take cyclists from this development into the town centre.

The Policies Map should show existing cycling provision and how new developments will be expected to link to them. A separate map solely on cycling provision, existing and proposed, would be most helpful.

To make the Plan sound, I represent

- 1) Point e) of Policy IN2 should be reinstated in relation to changing etc facilities at work and should be strengthened in line with the representations I made to this Policy
- 2) The original word “provided” should be restored in Policy IN4
- 3) Policy IN2 should refer to the Design Guide for Cycle Facilities mentioned above or a similar document to ensure they are satisfactorily designed in all respects, not just parking. This should include giving cyclists priority at traffic light controlled junctions.
- 4) A Policies Map should be provided to show where existing and proposed cycle facilities are