

Darlington Local Plan

Skerningham Estates Limited (ID: 1250841)

Matter 9 Statement - Transport and other infrastructure

Issued May 2021

1.1 Our Client (Skerningham Estates Limited) responds to Questions 9.1; 9.2; 9.3 and 9.9.

Delivering a sustainable transport network (policy IN1)

Q9.1. Is the Council's proposed modification to policy IN1 part C(v) to delete reference to a northern link road necessary to make the Plan sound and, if so, would it be effective in so doing? Do the references in paragraph 10.5.9 to a northern link road need to be modified? Is the designation of a northern relief road on the key diagram (map 1) and the Skerningham masterplan framework (figure 6.1) justified?

1.2 Our Client also responded to Q.4.5 (d) in relation to Matter 4.

1.3 As set out in this response, our Client recognises the aspiration to deliver the northern relief road although the delivery of Skerningham Strategic Allocation is not reliant upon the delivery of this road. This is demonstrated further in the Transport Note, prepared by Fore Consulting (appended to our Client's Matter 4 Statement) and referenced in the Statement of Common Ground between the Council and Highways England (April 2021). The northern relief road has instead been identified as a means of improving east-west links across the Tees Valley towards the A1(M).

1.4 In this context, our Client has no objections to the suggested modifications to Policy IN1, paragraph 10.5.9, the key diagram and Figure 6.1.

1.5 **Q9.2. Is the creation of an orbital road and public transport route as indicated on the key diagram justified? If so, to be effective, does policy IN1 part C(vii) need to be modified to clarify that is one of the objectives that the seven schemes listed are expected to achieve?**

1.6 Our Client agrees that Policy IN 1 could be modified to provide clarification on this subject.

1.7 With regards to the reference to "Skerningham access roads" in part C(vii), the Transport Note (appended to our Client's Matter 4 Statement) considers the access points to the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site in further detail. Notwithstanding this, it is recognised in the Skerningham Statement of Common Ground that this will be considered further again as part of the submission of any future planning application(s).

Q9.3. To ensure that policy IN1 part A(ii) is effective and justified, should all of the "strategic priority corridors" be defined on the policies map?

1.8 Our Client would welcome the addition of the strategic priority corridors on the Policies Map in order to provide clarity on these routes.

Renewable energy (policy IN9)

Q9.9. Subject to the Council's proposed modification, is policy IN9 consistent with national policy relating to renewable energy infrastructure? In particular:

a) the criteria for wind energy development in part (a).

b) the criteria for solar power development in part (b).

c) the requirement for developments of over 300 houses to be enabled for district energy connection unless demonstrated not to be feasible or viable.

1.9 Policy IN9 (d) requires major development over 300 houses to be enabled for district energy connection unless demonstrated not to be feasible or financially viable to do so.

1.10 Our Client recognises the ambitions of this requirement but welcomes the inclusion of the latter part of the sentence which would mean that this is not required in instances where it is not possible to implement. This approach allows for sufficient flexibility.

Word Count: 320