

Comment

Consultee Mr Frank Brown (1251018)

Address [REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Mr Frank Brown (1251018)

Comment ID DBLPMod711

Response Date 30/11/21 09:20

Status Processed

Submission Type Letter

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** 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.

The Skerningham Garden Village development undermines this policy and modification as it is a car dependent development which will therefore not contribute to the achievement of the national

commitment of net zero carbon and greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. Cutting down trees and destroying green spaces to build a car dependent development will not have a net zero effect, in fact it will just add to emissions.

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.

We would therefore recommend that in order to make the Plan sound and legally compliant that the Skerningham Development be removed from the Local Plan altogether.

Comment

Consultee Mr Frank Brown (1251018)

Address [REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Mr Frank Brown (1251018)

Comment ID DBLPMod712

Response Date 30/11/21 09:23

Status Processed

Submission Type Letter

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 & 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.

Council studies have shown that there could be an extra 5,437 vehicles per day using the local transport network in Whinfield alone. The plan mentions mitigation on Barmpton Lane, Whinbrush Way and

Whinfield Road but does not provide any detail on how this will be done. Barmpton Lane is the proposed main vehicular access point for the Skerningham Development, parts of which are unsuitable in providing a main access point and no amount of mitigation will be able to improve the layout of the road to safely reduce the impact of this development. The national Planning Policy Framework July 2021 para 104 says that transport issues should be considered at the earliest stages of the plan process so that they can be addressed. The modified plan does not go far enough in addressing the transport issues which will be created as a result of the Skerningham Garden Village Development. The Darlington Northern Link Road was supposed to alleviate existing pressures on the A1150 – this is now not happening, yet those pressures still exist and will be added to from the Skerningham Development. This is not sustainable 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.

We would therefore recommend that in order to make the Plan sound and legally compliant that the Skerningham Development be removed from the Local Plan altogether.

Comment

Consultee Mr Frank Brown (1251018)

Address [REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Mr Frank Brown (1251018)

Comment ID DBLPMod717

Response Date 30/11/21 09:47

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.

Publicly accessible community woodland, wildlife friendly natural spaces, sport and recreational facilities and allotments already exist in Whinfield and Skerningham – for the community. Why are we destroying

some of these existing attributes to make way for a 4,500-housing development which by its very nature will not be able to provide the level of facilities we currently enjoy? Instead, it will all be part of one big housing estate!

This is not consistent with either the Healthy New Town or garden Communities principles or objectives.

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.

We would therefore recommend that in order to make the Plan sound and legally compliant that the Skerningham Development be removed from the Local Plan altogether.

Comment

Consultee Mr Frank Brown (1251018)

Address [REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Mr Frank Brown (1251018)

Comment ID DBLPMod721

Response Date 30/11/21 10:26

Status Processed

Submission Type Letter

Version 0.6

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** H10

Question 2

What best describes the nature of your representation? Object

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.

One final note is the lack of infrastructure in the ward of Whinfield in particular which will be affected by this proposed development. We have waiting years for proper road signage along Barmpton Lane to the village. The council have advised us that this will be done yet we are still waiting some 2 ½ years later, no community hub whatsoever for young people and the wider community. The main access road to this proposed development will be Barmpton Lane a road which needs completely resurfacing. No connectivity to BY superfast broadband in the Whinfield Ward. In fact, our ward has been bypassed by BT and measures have been put in place to ensure this proposed Garden Village will have access to BT Superfast Broadband yet all those existing residents living in Whinfield will not, how can this be in 2021? I and many others have personally contacted BY who has since confirmed that this is indeed the case and also went on to advise me that there are no plans for superfast

broadband being installed in Whinfield for the foreseeable future. I feel that the needs of the existing residents should be taken into account before embarking on a development of this magnitude. I have very little confidence and even less so after listening to some of the council's officers' responses during the online consultations with the Planning Inspector in the council's ability to facilitate a development of this size. Not only this but I see no measures in place which will alleviate the increase of traffic along Barmpton Lane on a site which will take years to build and even longer to sell. My evidence to support this is the Central Park Development in Darlington, a development consisting of 367 houses which commenced in 2012. This site is still not completed, and we are nearly in 2022. I also have concerns as already mentioned here over the sheer increase in vehicles to a site which will be dependant on cars. The fact that we now know that the bid for the Darlington Northern Link Road was unsuccessful which would without doubt have helped alleviate traffic from a site of this magnitude and the existing road network, points that were used by the council/TVCA in their original bid to government. In fact, both parties argued that the A1150 was pretty much at breaking point and therefore a bypass was desperately needed now, yet all the traffic from this proposed Garden Village development will at some point have to join up on to the A1150. I would therefore suggest that the road infrastructure surrounding this proposed development is not up to the job of taking what would be thousands of additional cars each day and these are the council's own traffic assessments.

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.

I would therefore suggest that the road infrastructure surrounding this proposed development is not up to the job of taking what would be thousands of additional cars each day and these are the council's own traffic assessments.