





Unimplemented permissions

SQ7. Paragraph 6.9.9 in the Plan refers to a significant number of unimplemented planning permissions on private land providing for small family units. Please provide a list of sites with extant planning permission indicating how many pitches on each. Exclude any that would involve double counting with the 18 vacant and 37 potential pitches identified in the GTAA.

Excluding any pitches that would involve double counting within the 18 vacant and potential pitches in the GTAA 2017 there are the following remaining permissions on private land.

Unimplemented private permissions:

			Owner Status	Pitches	
23	Oakwood Extension	Hurworth	Private	2	2019
24	Walworth Lane North	Heighinton	Private	3	2018
26	Stables Blackwell Extension	Hurworth	Private	2	2020

Potential future permissions:

			Owner Status	Pitches
22	Potential Rowan Extension for 2021	Eastbourne	Public	25
25	Honey Pot Extension	Faverdale	Public	8

Site No. 22 is in the planning process and Site No.25 remains a potential extension.

M7. Economic Development

Greater Faverdale strategic site allocation

SQ8. Policy H11 proposes the development of approximately 200,000 sqm of employment space on the Greater Faverdale site. Policy E1 table 7.3 refers to 70ha gross and 49ha net for employment uses on the site. Are those references in policies H11 and E1 consistent with each other, and are they intended to represent the same proposal?

References in H11 and Policy table 7.3 E2 Site185 are consistent with each other and represent the same proposal.

SQ9. Neither policy H11 nor policy E2 table 7.3 specify the uses proposed in the 200,000 sqm of employment floorspace or on the 70ha (gross) / 49ha (net) of employment land at Greater Faverdale. Is the proposal for B2, B8 and/or E(g) uses as suggested for other employment allocations? If so, to be clear and unambiguous, should that be specified in policies H11 and E2 table 7.3?

The Table in E2 7.3. does not show under Mixed use any suggested uses and they can be added for clarity.

Policy H11 shows in b) suggested uses which will be amended to show the new use class system and will be amended in line with the above,

SQ10. Is “mixed use” in the first sentence of policy H11 intended to refer to the 2,000 homes, 200,000 sqm of employment space, and a neighbourhood centre (as proposed in part c)? Or is it also intended to allow for other types and quantities of development not specified in the policy?

Yes the “Mix use” refers to residential 2000 homes and 200k sqm of employment uses plus uses which could be allocated to the neighbourhood centre. However to ensure further flexibility for Garden Community amenities in Greater Faverdale the masterplan process could define further mixed use classes which add value.

M8. Town centres and retail development

Hierarchy of town centres

SQ11. What evidence is there to justify the hierarchy of town centres proposed in the Plan: Darlington sub-regional centre; Cockerton district centre; and Mowden local centre? Why is each of the other town centres identified in the Core Strategy not included in the Plan’s hierarchy?

In reference to district centres, North Road is now considered more of a retail park that serves a wider area and therefore its designation was not required under Policy TC 4 as the areas did not need protection. Cockerton can be described as a true district centre supplying the needs of the local residents.

In relation to local centres, Neasham Road similar to North Road is a mini retail park serving a wider area. Whinfield Road constitutes an Asda supermarket which whilst it may serve local residents it serves a wider area and has no benefit in a designation. Yarm Road is again a mini retail park, with Aldi, Iceland and Lidl with a small parade of shops mainly constituting takeaways and there would not benefit from designation. West Park has now got an M&S Food and Aldi which serves a much wider area and would not benefit from a designation. Middleton St George services are sporadic and it would be difficult to define an actual centre.

Policy TC 4 is designed to protect the loss of essential services in local areas which lack an alternative without having to use motorised transport. The spread of retail provision in Darlington is such that many areas are well served within walking distance.

There are numerous ‘retail parks’ in Darlington and the danger of designated them as district centres would mean that the sequential test potentially could be assessed against those rather than the priority of the town centre, that could result in further expansion of these centres to the detriment of the town centre. The priority for the Council is to protect the vitality and viability of the town centre which is evidenced by the money being invested. There is over £25 million committed to be spent on the town centre.

Proposed neighbourhood centres

SQ12. Policies H10 and H11, relating to the Skerningham and Greater Faverdale strategic allocations, both propose neighbourhood centres providing community facilities to meet the day to day needs of residents including a health hub, primary school and local shops. Approximately how many square metres of floorspace for each of the retail and other uses proposed does the Council consider likely to be appropriate in those proposed neighbourhood centres?

At this stage this is undetermined and will form part of the masterplans for the areas. The final determination will be also affected by the location of existing services and facilities, for example there is a large Asda at Whinfield so the amount of convenience shopping at Skerningham will be limited at least at the onset.

M9. Transport

Orbital route

SQ13. What new or improved public transport services are expected to be provided around, or along parts of, the proposed orbital route?

The new link roads that form part of the orbital route and will enable greater choice for the public transport operators to serve the sites in the most efficient way possible. Cul-de-sac type development is inherently inefficient in terms of the provision of bus services as it tends to lead to 'double running' (busses turning around and coming past the same properties). Policy IN2d states that all new major development should provide easy and safe access to public transport, accessibility is based on 80% or more of the site being within 400m walking distance of a bus stop served by a regular service. A regular service is defined as being a 30-minute daytime frequency. Policy IN2f states that contributions will be sought from developments that are not served by a regular bus service.

Public transport operators determine which route they will serve commercially. Funding will be sought for those development sites that do not meet the policy requirements in IN2d. This funding will support the introduction of bus services into development sites in the early phases of development to enable the sites to be served commercially by the later phases. The new link roads will be the main public transport conduit into and through major development sites. The specific routing will however, be determined at the post planning application stage when the services are tendered.

The new links will be required to be constructed to a specification wide enough for bus operation and will also have both footpath and cycleway provision alongside.

SQ15. If I were to conclude that the proposal to create an orbital road and public transport route around the urban area as indicated on the key diagram is justified, 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 and how the those schemes are to be connected via the existing road network?

Yes, if you were to conclude this approach is acceptable the policy could be worded to provide greater clarity on how this would be achieved. A suggested rewording is provided below which also factors in some of the modifications already proposed in the Council's Proposed Main Modifications Table (DBC2).

vii. Provision of key routes as part of some development proposals within the plan, in conjunction with existing infrastructure, provide additional for new road and public transport links to support specific developments included in the Local Plan create an orbital route of the northern urban area of Darlington. These include routes are:

- *West Park Garden Village - link road connecting Edward Pease Way to Newton Lane;*
- *Stag House Farm - link road connecting Newton Lane to Staindrop Road;*
- *Coniscliffe Park - link road connecting A67 to Staindrop Road;*
- *Link 66 / Symmetry Park - link road connecting the B6279 Tornado Way to B6280 Yarm Road;*
- *Burdon Hill - link road connecting A1150 to B6279 Tornado Way and new link road to Red Hall;*
- *Skerningham access roads – including local distributor road between the A167 and A1150 close to the Little Burdon roundabout in the broad location identified in the Skerningham Masterplan Framework;*
- *Faverdale link road – connecting Rotary Way to Burtree Lane.*

For further clarity we could also include the plan provided in or response to Matters Question 9.2 in the reasoned justification for paragraphs 10.5.11 and 10.5.12.

M10. Other strategic and development management policies

Rural gaps

SQ16. The Council's response to Q10.2 acknowledges that there would be benefits in identifying the rural gaps on the policies map and advises that This document was classified as: OFFICIAL should this be considered necessary it would endeavour to undertake this. Please prepare maps showing the rural gaps between:

- Middleton St George and Middleton One Row
- Middleton St George and Oak Tree
- Hurworth on Tees and Hurworth Place
- Darlington and the village of Great Burdon
- Darlington and the village of Barmpton

Maps showing the rural gaps in the locations set out above are provided as appendices to this response document.

The following is a summary of the approach undertaken and methodology applied to identify the specific gap areas mapped in each of the locations identified in Policy ENV3 of the proposed Local Plan (2016-2036). There is no specific approach to identifying Rural Gaps set out in NPPF or NPPG, however the approach adopted is considered to be robust and consistent with those undertaken successfully by others elsewhere.

Landscape Context

The landscape context for each gap was identified by review of the Darlington Landscape Character Assessment (SD35) and the Landscape Sensitivity of Potential Housing Sites (SD31) where relevant.

Landscape Analysis and Assessment of Landscape Function

Informed by the landscape context identified an analysis of the landscape within each identified gap area and its immediate environs was undertaken to assess the function or role that the openness and nature of the landscape forming the gap plays in contributing to the setting and separate distinctive identity of the settlements. This took into account the following criteria:

- Landscape context
- Topography
- Vegetation
- Land uses
- Access and movement
- Visual characteristics (including inter-visibility and intra-visibility)
- Sense of leaving from/arrival to a settlement

Conclusions & Identification of Rural Gap areas

In order to specifically identify the rural gaps in the five locations set out in Policy ENV3 an overall assessment was made as to the function or role that the landscape had in retaining the existing settlement pattern by maintaining the openness of the land, the green infrastructure functions and the landscape setting and separate distinctive identity of the settlements, by avoiding coalescence.

Open space provision

SQ17. The Council's response to Q10.11 suggests that a further main modification may be required to include a formula for calculating the green infrastructure requirement in policy ENV5 or reasoned justification, based on the existing Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document 2013 [SD56]. Please draft a potential main modification to policy ENV5 setting out an appropriate formula.

As requested set out below is the Councils proposed modifications to policy ENV5 and the supporting text to incorporate the formulas currently set out in the Planning Obligations SPD. These have been incorporated alongside the existing proposed modifications to ENV5 already published.

Policy ENV5 Paragraph 1

Developments including 20 dwellings (or 0.2 hectares) or more, or non-residential developments of 1,000m gross floorspace or more, will, subject to the quantity, quality and accessibility of existing provision, be expected to deliver new green infrastructure, to meet the additional need generated in the calculated using the formula set out in paragraph 9.4.15 and with consideration of the standards and costs contained in the adopted Planning Obligations SPD, or its replacement. Proposals should also ensure arrangements are in place for the maintenance of new green infrastructure provided in the longer term.

Policy ENV5 Paragraph 4

In areas of open space deficiency (identified in the Planning Obligations SPD or replacement), schemes of 11 dwellings (or 0.1 ha) or more, or non-residential development of 500m gross floorspace or more, will be required to make ~~provision for~~ a financial contribution towards the improvement of off-site green infrastructure in the local area, calculated using the formula set out in paragraph 9.4.15, and which is equivalent to the additional need generated by the development and where this would deliver greater benefits to the wider community than on-site provision.

Insert new paragraph below 9.4.14 which would be number 9.4.15

Proposals where it has been identified green infrastructure provision is required should use the following formula to establish the amount of green infrastructure type to be provided by each new home and the financial contribution required in circumstances where an off-site financial contribution is required. Where proposals are providing a contribution towards quality improvement costs only this will be 50% less of the standard charge for quantitative provision. The same formula below will be applied to proposals for non-residential development where green infrastructure provision is required by replacing the dwelling occupancy with the employee occupancy of the proposal and applying a lower green infrastructure type standard per employee reflecting the lower level of usage. Further information on the inputs to the formula is available in the Planning Obligations SPD or its replacement.

Step 1 – Establish quantity required

Dwelling Occupancy multiplied by (x) green infrastructure type standard per resident equals (=) amount of green infrastructure type required per proposed dwelling

Step 2 – Determine financial contribution required for off-site provision

Amount of green infrastructure required per proposed dwelling multiplied by (x) cost of provision equals (=) standard charge per proposed dwelling

Step 3 – Determine financial contribution required for off-site quality improvement costs

Standard charge per proposed dwelling divided (/) by 2 equals (=) quality improvement costs per proposed dwelling

Paragraph 9.4.16

Provision should also be made for the maintenance of green spaces to ensure quality remains in the long term. For new large greenspaces, particularly those in the strategic locations, a maintenance levy(44) will typically be applied to each household and/or business, to ensure long term maintenance by a management company. Elsewhere, a one off maintenance contribution may be sought so that maintenance can be undertaken by the Council and in these circumstances the formula below should be used to calculate a contribution equivalent to 10 years maintenance. Where the maintenance sum is for off-site quality improvements costs the amount will be reduced by 50%. The same formula below will be applied to proposals for non-residential development where green infrastructure provision is required by replacing the dwelling occupancy with the employee occupancy of the proposal. Further details on the approach to implementation can be found in the Planning Obligations SPD or its replacement.

Step 1 – Establishing maintenance sum required

Dwelling occupancy multiplied by (x) average maintenance cost equals (=) maintenance cost per dwelling multiplied by (x) 10 = one off maintenance sum

Step 2 – Determining maintenance sum for off-site quality improvement costs

One off maintenance sum divided by (/) 2 equals (=) quality improvement maintenance sum