

## Comment

**Consultee** Mrs Kathy Barley (1298456)  
**Email Address** [REDACTED]  
**Address** [REDACTED]  
**Event Name** Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications  
**Comment by** Mrs Kathy Barley (1298456)  
**Comment ID** DBLPMMod477  
**Response Date** 26/11/21 11:16  
**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 MM9/MM14/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.**

With reference to Skerningham.

"A move towards a low net zero carbon community by encouraging efficient use of resources, good design and well-located development, whilst increasing resilience to impacts from climate change.". Where houses are being built on the edge of town, which will necessitate car use to other parts of the town for schools and shopping and work, does nothing to encourage efficient use of resources or increase resilience to climate change. When vast swathes of woodland and farmland are set to be destroyed (as in the case of Skerningham) the detrimental impact is enormous and removes a substantial source of carbon sequestration in both the trees and the soil.

The net gain referred to in MM65 does not take into account the loss of carbon sequestration of already established and mature trees. Referring to a 'net gain' detracts from ultimately the loss of wildlife corridors and green spaces plus the already valuable trees and soil doing their thing for the climate.

#### **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.**

Skerningham should be removed from the plan completely. Any references to reaching carbon zero by 2050 are meaningless in light of development that seeks to remove effective and natural carbon capture in the form of trees and soil.

## Comment

**Consultee** Mrs Kathy Barley (1298456)  
**Email Address** [REDACTED]  
**Address** [REDACTED]  
  
**Event Name** Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications  
**Comment by** Mrs Kathy Barley (1298456)  
**Comment ID** DBLPMOD485  
**Response Date** 26/11/21 11:52  
**Status** Processed  
**Submission Type** Email  
**Version** 0.2

### 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.**

The net gain referred to in MM65 does not take into account the loss of carbon sequestration of already established and mature trees. Referring to a 'net gain' detracts from ultimately the loss of wildlife corridors and green spaces plus the already valuable trees and soil doing their thing for the climate.

#### **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.**

Skerningham should be removed from the plan completely. Any references to reaching carbon zero by 2050 are meaningless in light of development that seeks to remove effective and natural carbon capture in the form of trees and soil.