

## Comment

**Consultee** Mr Terry Binks (1250935)  
**Email Address** [REDACTED]  
**Address** [REDACTED]  
**Event Name** Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications  
**Comment by** Mr Terry Binks (1250935)  
**Comment ID** DBLPMod555  
**Response Date** 30/11/21 00:58  
**Status** Processed  
**Submission Type** Web  
**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** 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 states that the A167, A1150 and Barmpton lane are to be the principle vehicle access points. These roads are already heavily congested at peak times. With the addition of 4500 homes proposed for the area the roads even with improved infrastructure wouldn't be able to cope. The increased pollution from queuing traffic will only add to the zero net carbon effect

MM62 states that the improved infrastructure will only take place in a phased manner. This would only increase pollution and traffic

### **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.**

To make the plan legally compliant or sound I feel the Skerningham Development be removed from the local plan.

## Comment

**Consultee** Mr Terry Binks (1250935)

**Email Address** [REDACTED]

**Address** [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Event Name** Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

**Comment by** Mr Terry Binks (1250935)

**Comment ID** DBLPMod556

**Response Date** 30/11/21 01:31

**Status** Processed

**Submission Type** Web

**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** MM64, 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.**

MM64 states it will protect and enhance the River Skerne, it's valley setting and the green corridors. How is this possible with the proposed 4500 dwellings.

MM65 states it will deliver a net gain in the area of public accessible community woodland on the site. There is already a community woodland on the site that provides a safe haven for wildlife and the general public. A place for people to relax and enjoy for their mental wellbeing.

MM66 states that included in the site would be green spaces which would include wildlife friendly natural spaces. Would these natural spaces accommodate all the wildlife that call Skertingham home. How much wildlife would be lost if this development goes ahead.

Has there been a study of the wildlife in the area and the effects this development would have not 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.**

To make the a plan legally compliant and sound Skertingham should be removed from the local plan. Only by doing so would the wildlife of the area be safe and the public be free to enjoy the community woodland to the full.

## Comment

Consultee	Mr Terry Binks (1250935)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Mr Terry Binks (1250935)
Comment ID	DBLPMod557
Response Date	30/11/21 02:20
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
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	MM77, MM81, MM82
--	------------------

### 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.

MM81 states that 45% of the site area is expected to be retained as an accessible green infrastructure if the golf course is relocated or 55% if the golf course remains in situ.

MM77 states that the proposed number of homes is not regarded as the maximum number of homes that the site could deliver. If this was the case and the number of homes increased what would the new percentage of the accessible green infrastructure be?

As Skerningham stands the accessible green infrastructure is about 100%.

MM82 states that the site is expected to deliver an increase in the area of woodland adjacent to the river, to offset any loss resulting from the potential relocation of Darlington golf course, and to help meet the sites wider green infrastructure needs.

Would the new woodland be part of the accessible woodland or part of the golf course. And Would the new woodland be developed before any of the well established trees were felled. At a time when we know how important trees are we should be protecting them. Well established trees are more important to help reduce global warming than newly planted saplings.

## 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.**

To make the Plan legally compliant or sound the Skerningham development should be removed from the local plan.