

Comment

Consultee Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier (1164335)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier (1164335)

Comment ID DBLPMod573

Response Date 29/11/21 23:30

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** MM 14

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 Development, given its lack of proximity to services such as supermarkets etc, is bound by its nature to be a car dependent development. I therefore cannot see how it will contribute towards national commitments of net zero carbon and greenhouse gasses. If anything this development will only add to the carbon and greenhouse gases pollution problem!
- . Skerningham also involves the cutting down and destruction of mature trees to facilitate development, trees which provide a natural defence in combating greenhouse gas emissions. The idea that mature trees, that have stood in situ for many many years, possibly hundreds can just be uprooted and planted elsewhere on the development (as was suggested by the representative from Skerningham Estates in one of the hearing sessions) is absolutely ludicrous and I would say fairly impossible.
- . The Skerningham development is contrary to MM14.

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.

On the basis of my comments above it is my belief that the Skerningham Development be removed from the Local Plan in its entirety.

Comment

Consultee	Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier (1164335)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier (1164335)
Comment ID	DBLPMod575
Response Date	29/11/21 23:30
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	MM 55
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.

- . I am very concerned about the co-ordinated provision of infrastructure for the Skerningham development.
- . Banks have said, in a recent consultation event with the public, that their development does not require the same access requirements as Skerningham and that their development is an urban extension which can come forward without the rest of Skerningham being approved. This, to me suggests that there could be issues with a co-ordinated provision of infrastructure for Skerningham.
- . If no co-ordinated provision for infrastructure is forthcoming – how will the Banks part of the Skerningham development access the neighbourhood and schools?
- . The Local Plan needs to make it clear who is responsible for providing the appropriate infrastructure and the infrastructure phasing plan – it cannot be piecemeal otherwise it will not work.

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.

Recommendations and changes to the modified Local Plan are listed above. Sustainability still remains uncorroborated in this Plan.

On the basis of my comments above it is my belief that the Skerningham Development be removed from the Local Plan in its entirety.

Comment

Consultee Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier (1164335)
Email Address [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier (1164335)
Comment ID DBLPMod576
Response Date 29/11/21 23:30
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** MM 61 & 62

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.

- . According to the 2021 NPPF, para 104, transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals so that, amongst other things, the potential impact on transport networks can be addressed.
- . This does not seem to be addressed in the modifications – traffic studies have already highlighted the significant issues on the local transport network, in particular Barmpton Lane, Whinbush Way and the A1150 yet the modifications go now way in addressing these, particularly the issues on Barmpton Lane.
- . If Barmpton Lane is to be the principal vehicular access point for the eastern side of the development then mitigation measures should be clearly addressed at this point in the Plan – not when the Plan has been approved and we await the planning application to see exactly how the potential impact will be addressed. That is too late.
- . I would also like to add – how can we comment on whether or not the Plan is legally compliant or sound in this respect if we don't know how the potential impact on the transport network is to be addressed?
- . I consider it ironical that the Council used the 'over capacity' on the A1150 as a reason to obtain funding for the Darlington Northern Link Road – yet here they supporting the development of an extra 4,500 new homes which will undoubtedly increase traffic on the already over capacity A1150. The environmental impact from pollution on this already congested road is a serious concern.
- . To me, it is questionable whether this Local Plan and its modifications are actually within the ethos of the NPPF, the principles of sustainable development and improving the environment.

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.

Recommendations and changes to the modified Local Plan are listed above. Sustainability still remains uncorroborated in this Plan.

On the basis of my comments above it is my belief that the Skerningham Development be removed from the Local Plan in its entirety.

Comment

Consultee Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier (1164335)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier (1164335)

Comment ID DBLPMod577

Response Date 29/11/21 23:30

Status Processed

Submission Type Email

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** MM 74 & 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.

- . With no clear plans regarding the Golf Club, which in itself is quite unbelievable (in so far as one would have thought that at this stage it would be clear whether or not the Golf Club were relocating & not to have any recent dialogue with one another is baffling!) then this Plan is based upon assumptions which may have no legal grounding.
- . Should the Golf Club remain in situ then Skerningham will become divided with pockets of development either side of the Golf Club. There would then be no clearly defined neighbourhood centre and neighbourhoods would in effect be split – even more so if the Banks development becomes stand alone as was suggested by Banks.
- . I fail to see how the Skerningham can be adequately served by division – it is not sustainable, it does not improve the environment and it does not align growth and more importantly infrastructure.

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.

Recommendations and changes to the modified Local Plan are listed above. Sustainability still remains uncorroborated in this Plan.

On the basis of my comments above it is my belief that the Skerningham Development be removed from the Local Plan in its entirety.

Comment

Consultee	Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier (1164335)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier (1164335)
Comment ID	DBLPMod578
Response Date	29/11/21 23:30
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
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	MM 171
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.

- . Access to a wide range of good quality community facilities is identified as a key contributor to the health and well-being of people who live and work in the Borough and is one of the 'key objectives of the Draft Local Plan vision'.
- . Why is it then that the Skerningham development, despite not yet being approved, has had fibre optic broadband installed ready for the development which runs in front of properties on Barmpton Lane, yet those properties on Barmpton Lane will not be able to access this fibre optic broadband and have to make do with old copper lines with download speeds of around 2mb and upload speeds of even less.
- . This has been confirmed by BT Openreach in a letter to Peter Gibson MP in late 2021.
- . BT Openreach have stated that they do not intend to allow residents on Barmpton Lane to connect to the fibre optic broadband cables running in front of their properties as these are for the Skerningham development (which has not yet been approved) only.
- . Good quality community facilities includes broadband connectivity and if it is one of the key objectives in the Draft Local Plan then this modification has failed and does not meet National Policy.
- . To make this Policy and modification sound then a change needs to be made to ensure that when fibre broadband cables run in front of existing developments which currently do not have fibre broadband capability, connectivity must be made available also to those existing developments, in this case Barmpton Lane.

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.

Recommendations and changes to the modified Local Plan are listed above. Sustainability still remains uncorroborated in this Plan.

On the basis of my comments above it is my belief that the Skerningham Development be removed from the Local Plan in its entirety.

Comment

Consultee Robert Fitzpatrick (1301280)

Address [REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Robert Fitzpatrick (1301280)

Comment ID DBLPMod851

Response Date 30/11/21 10:31

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.

I 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	Robert Fitzpatrick (1301280)
Address	[REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Robert Fitzpatrick (1301280)
Comment ID	DBLPMod852
Response Date	30/11/21 10:33
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Letter
Version	0.9

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.

I 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 [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by Robert Fitzpatrick (1301280)
Comment ID DBLPMod854
Response Date 30/11/21 10:35
Status Processed
Submission Type Letter
Version 0.8

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.

I 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.