

Comment

Consultee Mr David Phillips (1250464)
Email Address [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by Mr David Phillips (1250464)
Comment ID DBLPMod368
Response Date 22/11/21 23:00
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.

MM14

- . The proposed Skerningham Garden Village development will be very remote to the town centre, rail station and major employment areas. By its very nature this makes it inevitably a car dependent development. This does therefore not contribute towards achieving the national commitment of net zero carbon and greenhouse gas emissions by 2050.
-

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.

N/A

Comment

Consultee	Mr David Phillips (1250464)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Mr David Phillips (1250464)
Comment ID	DBLPMod369
Response Date	22/11/21 23:00
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 MM61 & 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.

MM61 & MM62

- . The Council's own transport studies clearly show that the impact on the local transport network, particularly Barmpton Lane, Whinbush Way and Whinfield Road may result in up to 5,437 extra vehicles a day using the local transport network.
- . Whilst the plan looks to mitigate the impact of this development on these roads it does not provide the detail on how this will be done. Instead, there is reference to it forming part of a masterplan, but again there are no published details. It is therefore impossible to comment upon soundness and sustainability when no details on how the impact will be mitigated are available?
- . Para 104 NPPF July 2021 – transport issues need to be considered at the earliest stages of the plan making process so that they can be addressed.
- . This plan does not go far enough in addressing these issues.
- . The Northern Link Road was promoted as necessary to help mitigate the pressures on the A1150 which is now operating close or often at capacity at peak times. The Northern Link Road is not necessary for the Plan, but the proposed Skerningham development plus other local developments will considerably increase traffic on the A1150 and the surrounding local roads. The Council, in its bid to obtain funding for the Darlington Northern Link Road even acknowledged the A1150 is nearly full to capacity. How then is the additional traffic from the proposed Skerningham development sustainable?

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.

- . Improved detail regarding the mitigating measures / infrastructure interventions for Barmpton Lane/Whinbush Way and the A1150 to provide consistency with the NPPF so that impacts are shown to be addressed.

Comment

Consultee	Mr David Phillips (1250464)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Mr David Phillips (1250464)
Comment ID	DBLPMod371
Response Date	22/11/21 23:00
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Letter
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 & 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.

MM65 & MM66

- . A community woodland and wildlife friendly spaces, public footpaths and recreational facilities already exist in Whinfield and Skertingham. Why can these not be incorporated into the development rather than being destroyed to make way for it?
- . The proposed Skertingham development and the infrastructure needed to support it is likely to have a damaging effect on the biodiversity in this area, particularly farmland birds. There is a considerable danger that these species will be lost, not just displaced (or moved) if the Skertingham development proceeds as planned. A full assessment should be detailed together with any mitigation proposals so that the development impact can be considered.
- . Indeed, there are no mitigating measures in the plan for farmland birds, many of which are on the Red and Amber lists of conservation concern. Many have declined or disappeared already from areas where development has taken place within the borough. There needs to be an assessment to show the potential impact that major housing proposals will have on biodiversity and their consistency with Policy ENV 7.
- . It is not clear how the housing proposals at Skertingham will impact on the River Skerne Strategic Corridor and the Durham Wildlife Trust Brightwater Programme.

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.

- . An assessment to show the potential impact the major housing proposals at Skertingham will have on biodiversity and their consistency with Policy ENV 7.

Comment

Consultee	Mr David Phillips (1250464)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Mr David Phillips (1250464)
Comment ID	DBLPMod372
Response Date	22/11/21 23:00
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 & 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.

MM74 & MM75

- . Should the Golf Club remain in situ then it is obvious that Skerningham will instead become isolated pockets of development either side of the Golf Club.
- . How then can a neighbourhood centre be firmly established as neighbourhoods would be split?
- . The lack of a clear neighbourhood centre and potentially split developments will lead to more car dependency, which quite clearly does nothing to meet the NPPF's requirements of sustainable development and improving the environment.
- . A Masterplan lacking in any infrastructure intervention details merely compounds the above problems.

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.

- . A review of the plan to ensure that should the golf club not be relocated then the development will still meet the needs of the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to the impact on the environment from a fragmented development which is car based and the sustainability of the development with a neighbourhood centre not really centre to the development.