

Comment

Consultee Miss Leanne Carroll (1250218)
Email Address [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by Miss Leanne Carroll (1250218)
Comment ID DBLPMod193
Response Date 24/11/21 06:21
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** MM54

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.

Firstly, just a query on the wording:

..of which 600 dwellings are to be delivered on land adjacent to the A167 and west of the East Coast Mainline on the eastern part of the allocation...

Should that not read:

*..of which 600 dwellings are to be delivered on land adjacent to the A167 and west of the East Coast Mainline on the **WESTERN** part of the allocation...*

Secondly, the Garden Communities prospectus clearly states that the local community will be engaged and involved at an early stage and that we must have a meaningful say in developing the proposal from design to delivery. Banks' 600 homes (Beaumont Hill) form part of this allocation it says here. Or do they?

In July 2019, they only introduced plans for 350 homes on a circa 17-hectare site to residents and their website is still showing this. Residents back then were told that their site had nothing to do with the Garden Village.

If I had not been following the hearing sessions, I would not have known that this figure of 350 had jumped to 600 (on a site about double in size, 35 hectares) and yet Banks did not feel it necessary to engage with the local community about this change before jumping a step it would seem to me and holding two design workshops at the start of November 2021 for a 600-home site. Any residents not aware of this size increase would have heard it first when it came out of the blue when they were greeted in the entrance of the hall where the workshops were being held and told, "There has been a big change." What meaningful say has the local community had about this increase?

Also, why were Banks asking me now during their design workshop where I would put the retail unit, green spaces, most of the houses, what kind of houses do I want to see etc on this part of the allocation? I thought mixes of use, layout, scale, design etc would be consulted on with the community for the entire 487 hectares prior to any planning application going in as part of the comprehensive masterplan, including infrastructure phasing plan, as stated in MM55. My thoughts on the things I was being asked about might change once I see how the site will work as a whole and the masterplan is meant to come before any planning application and any planning application must adhere with the comprehensive masterplan.

MM77 tells me that the Skerningham site has been allocated as a whole so that it's planned as a single cohesive sustainable development. However, after hearing that local residents were still being told that Banks' site has NO relationship to the Garden Village at this design workshop and me getting the impression during the hearings that James Seabury, who was representing Banks, was kind of implying or requesting that their 600-home site be treated as more of a stand-alone development, I fear this is still the case and they're going to try and do this anyway so they don't incur any costs for the large embankment up to the East Coast Mainline and bridge over it that will complete the distributor road.

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.

My question about the wording, EASTERN needs changing to WESTERN if I'm correct.

Assurances need to be written into the plan to ensure that all parts of the allocation, especially the 600 dwellings that are to be delivered on land adjacent to the A167 and west of the East Coast Mainline which is concerning me here, must be part of the master-planning and infrastructure phasing plan stage to prevent a planning application for these 600 homes being fast-tracked through before this has started.

Comment

Consultee	Miss Leanne Carroll (1250218)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Miss Leanne Carroll (1250218)
Comment ID	DBLPMod378
Response Date	26/11/21 05:57
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	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.

Despite this modification saying that prior to the completion of the development on the western part of the allocation (between the A167 and East Coast Mainline), so Banks' 600 homes (Beaumont Hill), the remaining section of the local distributor road to the East Coast Mainline shall be delivered, this is not what residents were shown during two recent design workshops for this site (mentioned in my comments for MM54).

I was put in front of a map. The site was showing as a big blank white area with a road coming in off the A167 and a roundabout on site. There was the faint outline of a road over the other side of the A167 showing on the map but no faint outline, AT LEAST, of this remaining section of the local distributor road to the East Coast Mainline that would require a large embankment which would dominate the landscape. Why not?

How could I have a meaningful say on design (at a design workshop being held BEFORE any masterplan/infrastructure phasing plan has been decided upon, I might add), as per the Garden Communities prospectus, if this road/embankment wasn't clearly showing on the map? I could have been telling them I would put most of the houses up that end of the site (these are the types of questions being asked of me) if I wasn't aware that this distributor road would eventually be coming over the railway line and was there to serve a 4,500-home development, plus be part of an orbital route around town and have no weight limit on it, according to the representatives from Banks at the design workshop. No, I would want to keep as many homes as possible down the other end of the site I think, away from so much noise and pollution. I felt like I was just ticking boxes for them at that design workshop. I had a say but it wasn't meaningful because I wasn't fully informed.

There was merely a small box with wording inside it something along the lines of "land set aside for future work" but these 600 homes make up the 1,650 expected to be delivered during the plan period to 2036 and this modification is telling me that the distributor road will be completed in its entirety prior to the occupation of between the 900th and 1500th dwelling.

During the hearings, Mr Casey from the Council stated the embankment would need to be put in as the Beaumont Hill site was being developed and not afterwards because of the major earthworks involved with the construction of the bridge. However, in an email to a local resident after the design workshop, Banks said that it is yet to be established exactly when a bridge will be delivered and it will not form part of their planning application. It sounds to me as if they are looking to put in a planning application as a stand-alone development in advance of the masterplan and infrastructure phasing plan.

Again, all of this is ringing alarm bells especially after also hearing that another local resident was told by Banks that they have NO cost involvement for the bridge and have NO idea when it will be built.

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.

The wording needs to be tightened up to prevent any wiggle room and to stop what should be a cohesive development becoming a free-for-all piecemeal one. This land on the western part of the allocation is part of the Skertingham Site Allocation and should not be able to proceed without first being part of and subsequently having to adhere to the comprehensive masterplan and infrastructure phasing plan. The rail bridge cannot be an afterthought or something left to squabble over because the existing infrastructure on the eastern part of the allocation won't cope without it.

Comment

Consultee	Miss Leanne Carroll (1250218)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Miss Leanne Carroll (1250218)
Comment ID	DBLPMod438
Response Date	27/11/21 06:31
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.4
Files	Darlington Environmental Forum_December 12 2005_Item 8(a) Annual Report Appendix.pdf
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	MM148
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.

It is reassuring to see the plan is looking to retain existing woodlands, I support this, especially because I am very concerned about the community woodland at Skerningham. The wording ties in nicely with the Council's policy for the protection of privately owned trees in their Tree and Woodland Strategy 2021-2031 (the woods at Skerningham are privately owned), which states that development will be resisted which it is considered makes inadequate provision for the retention of trees and other woody plants and natural features, particularly wildlife habitats such as woodlands.

Old Hutton Plantation and Skunny Woods are Priority Habitats and the 2004-opened plantation is a large nature reserve/Site of Nature Conservation Interest (according to our Council website and the 2015 SHLAA respectively).

Putting the distributor road through the middle of Skunny Woods when it is a Priority Habitat is not consistent with the NPPF July 2021 para 179b which says that plans should *promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats*.

Also, the preferred approach for the development of the Skerningham site is for the golf club to be relocated into the community woodland (MM75). This I object to. Moving a business of approximately 300 members into a woodland that has more than 100,000 people within three miles of it would benefit only a few whilst taking away from many, many more something which is well-used and has become part of the cultural landscape of Darlington, according to our Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

Our Rights of Way Improvement Plan also recognises that community forests are a long-term project and residents expected this for Skerningham. We read in our Open Space Strategy 2007-2017 that the Skerningham/Barmpton Lane area was identified as a location where a strategic countryside site could be developed, due in part to the area's existing high landscape value (the Jewel in the Crown of Darlington's countryside provision) which attracts visitors from throughout the Borough and beyond. A snippet from a local councillor's blog in 2007 also read:

A new Interpretation Site and Countryside Events Outdoor Theatre are to be built here - this new feature is being built to help new groups to enjoy the community woodland at Low Skerningham. Set in a really lovely location, this new facility will give people a focus for community walks as well as allow a whole series of Countryside events to take place. It will also be the site of a community arts project which will be aimed at exploring the historical significance of the Ketton Ox, important for our area in particular and for Darlington as a whole.

This sense of longevity for the woodland, although the above sadly never materialised, probably gave people confidence to put memorial stones down for deceased relatives and pets and to choose this spot for a natural burial site and somewhere to place ashes. David Green was the first to be laid to rest in the woods in February 2004 in a full-body burial, followed by two further such burials in September and November of that year. I found this Darlington person days worked 2004/5 document online (see attachment) which shows grave-digging activities in the area, an example below:

17-Nov	10	896 Skerningham - digging grave
18-Nov	7	903 Skerningham - filling in grave after burial

The exact number and specific locations of most of the graves are unknown to the general public which is how it should be really, they are absorbed back into nature. We do know that David's grave is only marked by the positioning of seven black poplar trees. Somehow incorporating these graves into the golf course I feel would draw attention to their location. They would no longer be set within a woodland nature reserve but instead be amongst groups of trees left to furnish the course. Putting new trees elsewhere to compensate for any trees lost in the woodland cannot be described as suitable replacement planting when there are human remains involved.

The Northern Naturalists' Union's Volume 89. No.1 edition of The Vasculum paid this tribute to David:

OBITUARY

David Green

21st May 1950 - 15th January 2004

The tragic news that naturalist and wildlife artist David Green of Darlington had been shot dead in India has instilled a feeling of tremendous sadness in his many friends that someone who had such an interest in, and affinity with, all aspects of natural history and a respect for all living organisms should have had his own life taken away so cruelly.

Living his life by Buddhist principles it was no exaggeration to say that Dave would not hurt a fly or, indeed, any organism that might inflict pain on human beings through their bite or sting.

We know from his own job applications and from tales that his mother told that, even at a very young age, Dave had always had a fascination with natural history and used the coalbunker at home to house his pet midwife toad and jars of minibeasts. Years later he worked at Whipsnade Zoo where he particularly enjoyed looking after the bears and later he went on to art college at Middlesborough.

In 1977 he started work on a Job Creation scheme with Durham County Conservation Trust as Publications Officer; it was at this time that many naturalists and conservationists first came to know him as someone who, whilst immensely modest, had terrific abilities in the fields of natural history and illustration.

Over the next three decades he was widely used as an illustrator of books, perhaps most famously on several occasions by David Bellamy, together with other publications and became involved in a variety of conservation projects.

With John Durkin and Brian Banks he set up the Durham Reptile and Amphibian Group and in 1983 he was re-engaged by the Trust, this time on a Community Programme scheme, to undertake a survey of great crested newt sites in the vice-county of Durham. His report, plus the re-surveys that he undertook in 2001 and 2002, has always been considered the authoritative work on this subject. Amongst the ponds which he surveyed on four different occasions were Coxhoe Ponds where the northern cutting pond was threatened by an opencast planning application which went to appeal last year. Dave's records became a key component of the County Council's evidence at the planning inquiry last summer and it was a cause of some personal sadness that, as he was in India at the time that it was learnt that the Appeal had been dismissed, Dave had never known that his work had contributed to this conservation success.

For the last three years of his life he was actively engaged in a great crested newt translocation scheme for Northumbrian Water at Broken Scar in Darlington. This took up much of his time in the early summer but, when the work was completed, this would free up his time to go camping at Ravenscar in North Yorkshire where, as in India, he was most happy and in tune with his surroundings.

As Dave did not drive, feeling that to do so would pose a threat to smaller forms of life, I regularly provided transport for pond survey work which he carried out for the County Council. Although we often had a busy itinerary, imposed by my own time pressures, these visits were both informative and inspirational for me in recording plant and animal life together.

As well as surveying freshwater sites Dave had an excellent knowledge of organisms of other habitats and carried out many most detailed and meticulous surveys of a wide variety of sites. His recent study of the track bed of the old Stockton and Darlington Railway was something of a personal crusade to try and see the site conserved.

*Other projects carried out equally thoroughly included surveys of Cleveland Street in Darlington, an area of rich grassland at the Snipe in Newton Aycliffe and the Cleveland Coast. He also produced a number of botanical identification keys with the very neatest of presentation and became interested in some perhaps surprising genera including bindweeds and cedars. On several occasions he had articles, illustrated by himself, published in the magazine *British Wildlife*.*

At Dave's funeral on February 2nd seven black poplars which had been grown from cuttings by Cliff Evans were planted at a wonderfully inclusive green burial service at Skertingham Manor Farm to the north of Darlington. The reception afterwards provided the opportunity to look at some of his incredible pictures and written reports which both display that hallmark of meticulous attention to detail. It was perhaps only then that some of us fully realised the vast amount he had achieved in his life but without ever appearing rushed.

Living simply, and without many of the trappings of modern life, Dave was both immensely well-liked and respected and also demonstrated how it is still possible to be in tune with natural surroundings on even the smallest scale. His article on tree rot-holes written for the Trust Bulletin in September 1989

was typical of his interest in a micro-environment that many of us might easily overlook. In terms of real connections with nature and treading softly upon the earth he was an inspiration to us all.

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.

There is an opportunity here to designate Skerningham Community Woodland as a Local Green Space even though it falls within a site allocated for development. The plan is five years old and this community woodland could now be reconsidered as a Local Green Space. There is an either/or option with the Skerningham allocation if it goes ahead - either the golf course moves into the woodland (if members still want that) or it doesn't. It shouldn't. It meets all of the designation criteria and on top of that is a green burial site which I believe makes it worthy of special consideration.

The Ministry of Justice's Natural burial grounds, Guidance for operators document says that for many people natural burial grounds will be an emotional as well as a physical landscape and:

Natural burial is a term used to describe the burial of human remains where the burial area creates habitat for wildlife or preserves existing habitats (woodland, species rich meadows, orchards, etc), sustainably managed farmland, in-situ or adjacent aquatic habitats or improves and creates new habitats which are rich in wildlife (flora and fauna). Where a funeral precedes such burial, it would typically seek to minimise environmental impact.

The terms 'green burial', 'green funeral' and 'woodland burial' are also sometimes used.

The woodland should be preserved. It would be extremely insensitive not to conserve it when a local conservationist and others rest there.

Add document

If you wish to attach supporting files please do so here. [Darlington Environmental Forum_December 12 2005_Item 8\(a\) Annual Report Appendix.pdf](#)

Comment

Consultee Miss Leanne Carroll (1250218)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Miss Leanne Carroll (1250218)

Comment ID DBLPMod537

Response Date 29/11/21 19:25

Status Processed

Submission Type Web

Version 0.2

Files [ROAD THROUGH COUNCIL-OWNED FIELD.PNG](#)

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** MM63, 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.

MM63 and the network of green and blue infrastructure. The Darlington Local Plan (2016-2036) Proposed Modifications Consultation Draft shows the Skerningham Masterplan Framework with Darlington Golf Club Remaining Insitu (page 64) as mentioned in MM75. The course is showing in white however this map does NOT reflect the current boundary which extends all the way up behind the houses on Caithness Way, past the Council-owned field, which is between the last two estates on this side of Whinbush Way before Barmpton Lane, and stops at the edge of some of the bungalow gardens on Galloway.

Instead, the map shows that the section of golf-course land mentioned above is part of the Skerningham site and that from the Council-owned field, used by residents of nearby homes for walking with dogs around or playing out on, you enter the Skerningham site via Indicative Strategic Green Infrastructure. Similarly on the original Masterplan Framework, the only difference being this one shows Indicative Strategic Green Infrastructure in this area but then a Proposed Pedestrian/Cycle Route leaving the site here and going through the Council-owned field onto Whinbush Way.

Can a road go through this type of green infrastructure because since 2017 I have seen several maps (see attachment) showing a road leading off the Skerningham site through this field onto Whinbush Way. During the hearings, Mr Casey said that the modelling shows that the majority of the traffic goes down Whinbush Way to reach the A1150 through the traffic lights at Asda which makes me think this Council-owned field is still earmarked for a road just like Council-owned Springfield Park was.

I have heard that the golf club is looking to sell that land behind Caithness Way up to Galloway and has some spare land within its boundary it can use to compensate for any playable course lost.

In order for me to have a meaningful say as a resident in developing the Skerningham proposal from design to delivery, as per the Garden Communities prospectus, is what is showing as Indicative Strategic Green Infrastructure genuinely what it's going to be? I am wary because there was a strip of land set aside for biodiversity at Elm Tree Farm that it transpires was to possibly have a road going through it instead at some stage and I'm concerned what I'm seeing here isn't what we're going to get.

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.

Assurances that green infrastructure will remain such and can't be taken away from the community at a later date for a road. A bungalow has recently sold in Galloway and the property details say:

It is set back with a generous front garden enjoying pleasant views whilst, to the rear it overlooks the golf course giving a sense of both peace and privacy.

If both Masterplan Frameworks are showing this as green infrastructure, there should still be some level of peace and privacy but not if an access road is put in here.

Add document

If you wish to attach supporting files please do so [ROAD THROUGH COUNCIL-OWNED FIELD.PNG](#) here.

Comment

Consultee Miss Leanne Carroll (1250218)
Email Address [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by Miss Leanne Carroll (1250218)
Comment ID DBLPMod543
Response Date 29/11/21 20:01
Status Processed
Submission Type Web
Version 0.2
Files [MAP & PHOTOS FOR MM82.PNG](#)
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** 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.

Should the golf course relocate into the community woodland, which is the preferred approach, it says the site will deliver an increase in the area of woodland adjacent to the river to offset any loss.

Where exactly? There is no space within the community woodland for any more, it is already planted up right up to the water's edge. Heading further west from the current woodland river path, so up the River Skerne, is showing as agricultural land (see attachment), so has permission been obtained from the landowner to put trees along the edge of this field by the river? It also floods badly. It is after all a flood plain. If this extra woodland is going to be accessible to the public, it is likely to be impassable during wet periods and would not compensate for the woodland set to be lost because the paths through this part of the woods do not flood so much because they are up the hillside off the flood plain.

Going east downstream to Barmpton Village, these two fields are also showing as being left as agricultural land. There is already a thin line of trees and bushes next to the Skerne down to the bridge but to create woodland, again, this would require the landowner's permission I would think.

This modification says that it will be woodland adjacent to the river, so does this mean it will be a continuation of the river path in the community woodland and so of a similar depth? If so, how can such planting be accommodated on the land remaining?

The map shows that the remainder of land on the former quarry, a field up from the river that is not already planted up and is currently used as grazing land, will be infilled with trees. However this is not adjacent to the river. It is also full of gas pipes to let the eggy fumes out of this contaminated land (see attachment).

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.

It needs to be made clear where this woodland adjacent to the river is proposed to go. Is it guaranteed to happen? How far in from the river is it going to extend? Is it meant to be accessible to the public even though it's on the flood plain so might not always be? This modification is too vague on detail and I'm not sure it is even possible.

Add document

If you wish to attach supporting files please do so [here](#). [MAP & PHOTOS FOR MM82.PNG](#)

Comment

Consultee Miss Leanne Carroll (1250218)
Email Address [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by Miss Leanne Carroll (1250218)
Comment ID DBLPMod558
Response Date 30/11/21 06:42
Status Processed
Submission Type Web
Version 0.3
Files Muskar House survey page 6 001.bmp

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** MM81

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.

We already have an attractive green edge to the town here.

The preferred approach for the development of the Skertingham site is for the golf club to be relocated so the plan is literally looking to BUILD UPON the local green infrastructure assets already here! The community woodland is a large nature reserve/SNCI but could have a big chunk of it taken away to put in a golf course even though the NPPF 179(a) says that wildlife-rich habitats should be safeguarded.

You can't enhance a "significantly tranquil" (CPRE's words) landscape if you put roads and thousands of houses onto it. There will be a deterioration in this landscape. Skertingham is an area of town where quality countryside can be found and our Rights of Way Improvement Plan says that you have quality when you have *freedom from urban noise*.

There is so much wildlife here that benefits from and needs the variety of landscape available to them, ie farmland, woodland, hedgerows, important temporary ponds etc.

I walk around Skertingham (and Barmpton and Ketton Country) all the time, like many residents do, and have seen and photographed:

Cuckoo (red, UK BAP) Redwing (red, SCHEDULE 1) Fieldfare (red, SCHEDULE 1) Skylark (red, UK BAP) Grey partridge (red, UK BAP) Linnets (red, UK BAP) Mistle thrush (red) Yellowhammer (red, UK BAP) Yellow wagtail (red, UK BAP) Grey wagtail (red) House sparrow (red, UK BAP) Starling (red, UK BAP) Tree sparrow (red, UK BAP) Song thrush (red, UK BAP) Herring gull (red, UK BAP) Red kite (SCHEDULE 1, Annex I) Kingfisher (amber, SCHEDULE 1, Annex I) Reed bunting (amber, UK BAP) Bullfinch (amber, UK BAP) Meadow pipit (amber) Teal (amber) Kestrel (amber) Dipper (amber) Willow warbler (amber) Swift (amber) House martin (amber) Tawny owl (amber) Little egret (Annex I) Common toad (*UK BAP Priority Herpetile Species*) Brown hares (*UK BAP Priority Terrestrial Mammal Species*) Great crested newts Bats Badgers (protected under the *Protection of Badgers Act 1992*) Wall butterfly (*UK BAP Priority Terrestrial Invertebrate Species*) Peregrine (SCHEDULE 1, Annex I) Marsh harrier (amber, SCHEDULE 1, Annex I) Ring ouzel (red, UK BAP) Barn owl (SCHEDULE 1) Roe deer Muntjac deer... The list is extensive and I could go on, for example I was really lucky to finally get some footage recently of a very wary bird - the amber-listed snipe. In April 2000, David Green, who is buried in the community woodland, carried out a Natural History Survey (see attachment) at Muskar House Farm, Barmpton (land to the east of Barmpton Lane). In his conclusions, David was worried about the Council leaflet for the site stating that *development can be linked to enhance the open land to the east, adjacent to the River Skerne and to (allow) public access to this land and the adjacent countryside*" because he recognised that wildlife needs a sanctuary from us humans. He also believed that *disturbance through visitor pressure would prove more damaging than the housing itself*. This was for 14 hectares and he had concerns. The Skertingham site is 487 hectares! Wildlife will not only lose habitat but this modification will see what green space is left becoming more accessible which might be nice for us humans but it's bad news for wildlife and shows little respect for biodiversity!

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.

Take Skertingham, our Jewel in the Crown asset, out of the plan.

Add document

If you wish to attach supporting files please do so here. Muskar House survey page 6 001.bmp