

## Comment

**Consultee** Judith Murray (1164497)  
**Email Address** [REDACTED]  
**Address** [REDACTED]  
**Event Name** Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications  
**Comment by** Judith Murray (1164497)  
**Comment ID** DBLPMod623  
**Response Date** 28/11/21 13:18  
**Status** Processed  
**Submission Type** Email  
**Version** 0.5

### Question 1

**Which document/modification does this representation relate to?** Main Modification Schedule \*

**\* Please provide the reference number (where applicable), for example MM1, PM1, MIN1** MM14

### Question 2

**What best describes the nature of your representation?** Object

### Question 3 Legally Compliant and Sound

**Do you consider the Plan, incorporating the proposed Modification is Legally Compliant?** No

**Do you consider the Plan, incorporating the proposed Modification is Sound?** No

### Question 4

**Please give details of why you consider the Darlington Local Plan, incorporating the proposed Modifications to which your representation relates, is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Plan or comment on the Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum/Habitats Regulations Screening please also use this box to set out your comments.**

- I fail to see how the Skerningham development will minimise the impact of and increase resilience to the effects of climate change.
- Services such as supermarkets for eg will not be in close proximity and therefore reliance on cars will be essential. This is a car dependent development as to go anywhere or do anything you will need a car.
- This therefore will not minimise or help the impact of climate change and will most certainly not contribute anything towards the national commitments of zero carbon and greenhouse gases, in fact it will only add to them.

#### **Question 5**

**Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound and why, thinking about what you identified in Question 4. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording or any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

Recommendations and changes to the modified Local Plan are listed above. Sustainability still remains uncorroborated in this modified Plan.

## Comment

Consultee	Judith Murray (1164497)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Judith Murray (1164497)
Comment ID	DBLPMod625
Response Date	28/11/21 13:18
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4

### Question 1

Which document/modification does this representation relate to?	Main Modification Schedule *
---	------------------------------

* Please provide the reference number (where applicable), for example MM1, PM1, MIN1	MM55
--	------

### Question 2

What best describes the nature of your representation?	Object
--	--------

### Question 3 Legally Compliant and Sound

Do you consider the Plan, incorporating the proposed Modification is Legally Compliant?	No
---	----

Do you consider the Plan, incorporating the proposed Modification is Sound?	No
---	----

### Question 4

Please give details of why you consider the Darlington Local Plan, incorporating the proposed Modifications to which your representation relates, is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Plan or comment on the Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum/Habitats Regulations Screening please also use this box to set out your comments.

- A recent community consultation event held by Banks has called into question this proposed modification, in particular the coordinated provision of infrastructure with development, in particular the road infrastructure.
- Banks, both at the consultation event and further correspondence, has made it clear that their development, although technically part of Skerningham is an urban extension and not reliant upon the same access requirements as the rest of Skerningham.
- Part of the local distributor road to serve Skerningham will pass through the Banks development, in fact the Banks development plays a crucial part in accessing the bridge over the east coast mainline. Given that Banks are now, it would seem, trying to adopt a stand alone approach to the garden village development, this may call into question the idea of 'coordinated provision' – clearly in Banks view it doesn't need to be for their development.
- The Local Plan needs to be more specific about 'coordinated provision' – who will be responsible for ensuring this and safeguarding it so that it actually does go ahead and developers work together with the Council to deliver the appropriate infrastructure.

## Question 5

**Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound and why, thinking about what you identified in Question 4. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording or any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

Recommendations and changes to the modified Local Plan are listed above. Sustainability still remains uncorroborated in this modified Plan.

## Comment

**Consultee** Judith Murray (1164497)  
**Email Address** [REDACTED]  
**Address** [REDACTED]  
**Event Name** Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications  
**Comment by** Judith Murray (1164497)  
**Comment ID** DBLPMod626  
**Response Date** 28/11/21 13:18  
**Status** Processed  
**Submission Type** Email  
**Version** 0.4

### Question 1

**Which document/modification does this representation relate to?** Main Modification Schedule \*

**\* Please provide the reference number (where applicable), for example MM1, PM1, MIN1** MM61 and MM62

### Question 2

**What best describes the nature of your representation?** Object

### Question 3 Legally Compliant and Sound

**Do you consider the Plan, incorporating the proposed Modification is Legally Compliant?** No

**Do you consider the Plan, incorporating the proposed Modification is Sound?** No

### Question 4

**Please give details of why you consider the Darlington Local Plan, incorporating the proposed Modifications to which your representation relates, is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Plan or comment on the Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum/Habitats Regulations Screening please also use this box to set out your comments.**

- . Para 104 of the NPPF 2021 states that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan making and development proposals so that, amongst other things, the potential impact on transport networks can be addressed.
- . The Council have gone part way in meeting this in so far as they have identified the potential impact on transport networks, particularly Barmpton Lane, Whinbush Way and Whinfield Road.
- . The Local Plan, including the modifications proposed in MM61 & MM62, however, do not actually address this impact.
- . Stating that modifications will need to be made is recognising an issue or a problem, it is not addressing it, and given the scale of the impact on local transport networks, this needs to be addressed in this Local Plan – not waiting to see a planning application.
- . The issues raised could have the potential to make the plan unsound and therefore further detail within the Local Plan is required to ensure that issues are addressed at the earliest stages.
- . As an aside I would also like to comment on the fact that the Council already recognises that the A1150 is close to operating at full capacity – one of its arguments for a Darlington Northern Link Road. Yet here we are, the Council pushing forward with a plan which will increase car capacity on the A1150 to breaking point with congestion and delays – doesn't really help in minimising our carbon footprint.

### Question 5

**Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound and why, thinking about what you identified in Question 4. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording or any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

Recommendations and changes to the modified Local Plan are listed above. Sustainability still remains uncorroborated in this modified Plan.

## Comment

**Consultee** Judith Murray (1164497)  
**Email Address** [REDACTED]  
**Address** [REDACTED]  
**Event Name** Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications  
**Comment by** Judith Murray (1164497)  
**Comment ID** DBLPMod627  
**Response Date** 28/11/21 13:18  
**Status** Processed  
**Submission Type** Email  
**Version** 0.3

### Question 1

**Which document/modification does this representation relate to?** Main Modification Schedule \*

**\* Please provide the reference number (where applicable), for example MM1, PM1, MIN1** MM65 and MM66

### Question 2

**What best describes the nature of your representation?** Object

### Question 3 Legally Compliant and Sound

**Do you consider the Plan, incorporating the proposed Modification is Legally Compliant?** No

**Do you consider the Plan, incorporating the proposed Modification is Sound?** No

### Question 4

**Please give details of why you consider the Darlington Local Plan, incorporating the proposed Modifications to which your representation relates, is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Plan or comment on the Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum/Habitats Regulations Screening please also use this box to set out your comments.**

- All of the assets and attributes mentioned in this policy already naturally exist - why are we destroying them to make way for a housing estate and planned open green spaces which will certainly not have the character of the ones that they are replacing.
- The Healthy New Towns initiative can already be achieved with existing attributes, there is no need to destroy it for an environmentally unfriendly development.

#### **Question 5**

**Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound and why, thinking about what you identified in Question 4. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording or any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

Recommendations and changes to the modified Local Plan are listed above. Sustainability still remains uncorroborated in this modified Plan.



## Comment

Consultee	Judith Murray (1164497)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Judith Murray (1164497)
Comment ID	DBLPMod628
Response Date	28/11/21 13:18
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.4

### Question 1

Which document/modification does this representation relate to? Main Modification Schedule \*

\* Please provide the reference number (where applicable), for example MM1, PM1, MIN1 MM74 and MM75

### Question 2

What best describes the nature of your representation? Object

### Question 3 Legally Compliant and Sound

Do you consider the Plan, incorporating the proposed Modification is Legally Compliant? No

Do you consider the Plan, incorporating the proposed Modification is Sound? No

### Question 4

Please give details of why you consider the Darlington Local Plan, incorporating the proposed Modifications to which your representation relates, is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Plan or comment on the Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum/Habitats Regulations Screening please also use this box to set out your comments.

• At this stage in the Local Plan one would've thought that the Council had actually approached the Golf Club to see if their land was to be included in the Local Plan and hence the Skertingham Garden Village development – this does not seem to have happened – why not? • It is interesting to note that para 16 NPPF 2021 states that early, proportionate and effective engagement should take place – if this is the case why do the Council or the interested developers not know whether or not the Golf Club land will be included as part of the Skertingham Development? • If the Golf Club land were to be excluded from the Skertingham development then the modified plans show a development which is not cohesive and is split either side of the Golf Club. • There can, therefore, be no clearly defined neighbourhood centre and should Banks continue with their assertions that their development is not dependant on the Skertingham development, division will most surely become apparent. • If Skertingham is divided then it will not serve the economic, social, and more importantly environmental objectives of the NPPF. • I also disagree with the statement of MM74 and the assertion that Skertingham is not reliant upon the golf club relocation. The Council's own viability calculations have shown a margin of just £0.5m should the golf club not re-locate. • Having attended the hearings I fail to see how the Council's own viability assessment which would push it into 'marginal' can be so different from the developer's viability assessments which still show it to be within the profitability scope. The cynic in me would say that of course the developer's would show this because they want the development to go ahead – but whose assessment is more credible. This is the Council's Local Plan after all! • If the crossing over the east coast main line proves to be more costly than anticipated then this will mean this development is not viable. • Not only that but, it has been demonstrated in past that should developer's profitability fall below their 20% ( as most certainly could happen in this instance) then it is the amount of much needed affordable housing that will be reduced.

#### Question 5

**Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound and why, thinking about what you identified in Question 4. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording or any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

Recommendations and changes to the modified Local Plan are listed above. Sustainability still remains uncorroborated in this modified Plan.