

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod381
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
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	MM7
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 constantly hear that there is an ambition to create 7,000 new jobs and if that ambition was true, then surely one would hope that most of these jobs would go to local people who already live in the Darlington area. There is also no real evidence to substantiate this figure, plus we have heard that there is only likely to be about 700 jobs (not 7000) jobs when the Treasury reallocates to this area. So, one can only surmise that the majority will be in the Teesside area. If this is then the case, surely it is better to build closer to where the actual employment is for a host of reasons.

When the draft Local Plan was written, our economy was fairly stable, but it does not take into effect what would happen post Brexit when we left the EU and now, we have also been hit by Covid-19 which understandably was unprecedented, but both these factors will have a detrimental and long last lasting effect both on the local and national economy. Therefore, large developments such as the Skerningham Site Allocation can neither be justified and is simply not needed.

The figures for the number of houses required is not consistent and is constantly changing. It is pleasing to see that the figure has dropped for this modification, but what is not clear is what is the figure actually representing? DBC rejected the Government's standard methodology for calculating 'housing need' and have come up with their own questionable statistics to produce figures for 'housing requirement', which is greatly excessive to the need. So even if these exaggerated figures were accepted, there would still be no need for a development such as the Skerningham Site Allocation.

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skerningham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod382
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
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	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.

Skerningham countryside is without doubt a major contribution to the local population's health and well-being. So, building a huge sprawling development, and the destruction of mature woodland & hedges that supports wildlife habitats would be detrimental to a balanced eco system. Skerningham is a community woodland, so whilst there is a promise to replace trees, it takes years not months for them to grow and mature. So why destroy in the first place? Due to the lack of infrastructure to support a development the size of the Skerningham Site Allocation, would see a huge increase of pollution due to the increased number of cars because of car dependency and also the clogging up of an already inadequate infrastructure system, therefore pumping out more CO2 into the air. So how will this help achieve the Government's commitment to reach Net Zero by 2050?

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skerningham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)

Comment ID DBLPMod383

Response Date 24/11/21 20:20

Status Processed

Submission Type Email

Version 0.5

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

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.

Where are the access and egress points from the Skerningham Site Allocation onto the A1150 and A167 roads? The local community keep asking this point and can only see that these points would have to go through housing estates already in the Whinfield area, plus onto Barmpton Lane, which as the name suggests is just a lane, which is very narrow. Therefore, bottle necks and congestion will be the result as traffic try to get onto either the A1150 or A167 roads. This will result in a huge increase of traffic pollution, when the current Government and other leaders throughout the world are trying to combat climate change, we are currently holding the COP26 now. The area around Barmpton and Skerningham are prone to flooding, so taking away the mature woodland etc and the protection of biodiversity, would only heighten the risk.

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skerningham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod384
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
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.

So far, the consultation process with the community has been farcical to say the least. Where was the consultation when an application was made for Skerningham to the Ministry for it to have Garden Village status (or whatever the terminology is now)? As per the Prospectus for Garden Communities, there has to be full participation and involvement by the local communities - but this just did not happen.

Apparently, there will be consultation with the community prior to the submission of any planning application. If this is the case, then it needs to be when the timing is convenient for the majority of the community are available to attend. This will enable the community to help shape the area in which they live, by expressing what they would like to see and what is required and not what the developers & planners believe is what is required. Listen and work alongside the local community will be more beneficial to 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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skerningham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod385
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Letter
Version	0.5
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	MM56
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.

Can DBC confirm how they will ensure that the 20% allocation for affordable housing and self-building will be enforced.

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skerningham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod386
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
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	MM58
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 Skertingham Site Allocation remain in the local plan, then facilities such as walking, cycling and horseriding routes throughout this beautiful countryside should be incorporated into any plans to develop this area.

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skertingham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod387
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
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	MM59
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.

Nobody can predict what educational facilities are required should a development the size of Skertingham take place, but if it does then there will be a great need for the right educational facilities along with GP and Dental surgeries that need to be incorporated into the Skertingham Site Allocation.

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skertingham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod388
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
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	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.

As part of the NPPF July 2021, it clearly states that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making. So that the potential impact on the transport networks can be addressed.

North Darlington residents are aware of an impact study conducted by DBC on the Barmpton Lane, Whimbush Way and the A1150 as part of the Skerningham Site Allocation development. The modifications are not adequate in addressing the concerns raised.

As a resident of Barmpton, the top of the lane which is a narrow country road that joins a 'S' bend that leads onto Whimbush Way, there is nothing that can be done to improve that part of the lane, which is already a bottleneck getting off the lane onto the main road. Therefore, with a significant increase in traffic there will be huge congestion and pollution trying to get off Skerningham via this point.

Every time the question is asked, how will this junction be improved, the answer is always the same 'we will look more closely at it at the planning application stage' – this is just not good enough.

Given the scale of the Skerningham development and the impact it will have on transport issues and the road system in in the Whinfield area the plan must include more detail on how these issues will be addressed. It is not good enough to state that it will be left to a planning application.

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skerningham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod389
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
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	MM65
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.

Common-sense would say, why create a new woodland when an easily accessible, mature and thriving woodland already exists in Skertingham. If the development is to happen, then incorporate what already exists into any future development. That would also save the habitat and wildlife that already exists in the woodland. A new one, would take years to mature.

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skertingham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod390
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
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 66
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.

No need to create what already exists, Skerningham already has beautiful and tranquil Green spaces already, so just incorporates the existing green area into any possible future 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.

There is no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skerningham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)

Email Address [REDACTED]

Address [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)

Comment ID DBLPMod391

Response Date 24/11/21 20:20

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 67

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 relocation of Darlington Golf Club would be an absolute disaster, as it would mean the destruction of a large piece of the Skerningham Community Woodland. Not only is the Woodland a peaceful and tranquil area, but it also provides natural habitat to a huge variety of wildlife. It would also be total insensitive to those that are buried in that woodland. A new golf course also would take many years to mature, which is going against the grain, when we already have a mature woodland that is helping to combat climate change.

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skerningham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod392
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
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	MM69
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 pleasing to read this statement in which it says there will be respect, preservation and protection of heritage assets which exists in Skertingham.

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skertingham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID DBLPMod393
Response Date 24/11/21 20:20
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 73

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.

So far, the consultation process with the community has been farcical to say the least. Where was the consultation when an application was made for Skerningham to the Ministry for it to have Garden Village status (or whatever the terminology is now)? As per the Prospectus for Garden Communities, there has to be full participation and involvement by the local communities - but this just did not happen.

Apparently, there will be consultation with the community prior to the submission of any planning application. If this is the case, then it needs to be when the timing is convenient for the majority of the community are available to attend. This will enable the community to help shape the area in which they live, by expressing what they would like to see and what is required and not what the developers & planners believe is what is required. Listen and work alongside the local community will be more beneficial to 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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skerningham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID DBLPMod394
Response Date 24/11/21 20:20
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 74

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.

No need to create what already exists, Skerningham already has beautiful and tranquil Green spaces already, so just incorporates the existing green area into any possible future 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.

There is no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skerningham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod395
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
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 75
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.

As part of the initial plan for this development, the developers had a high presumption that Darlington Golf Club (DGC) would relocate. Now that members of DGC and residents have a better understanding of the impact it would cause in particular, traffic, noise, and pollution, plus the fact it would take years for a new Golf Course mature and develop, it is now likely that DGC will not want to be relocated. above. This will advocate that the Skertingham development cannot possibly be delivered.

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skertingham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod396
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
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 76
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.

Considering completions since 2016, commitments and windfalls in between 2020 and 2021, coupled with the reduction in the number of properties in Skertingham from 1,850 to 1,650 suggests that the Skertingham development is not required. Even if the inflated housing need figures in the Plan were accepted, the Skertingham Allocation Site would still be surplus to requirements.

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skertingham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?

Comment

Consultee	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE (1164361)
Comment ID	DBLPMod397
Response Date	24/11/21 20:20
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
Version	0.5
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 - 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.

With the possible erosion of the countryside to the north of Darlington will without doubt put increasing pressure on an already overstretched infrastructure. Especially as the conjecture will be that additional housing will be provided beyond the maximum number of homes in the plan period. This is hugely alarming and can only be described as 'urban sprawl' and once again totally ignores measures to combat climate change.

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 no guarantee whatsoever that there will be an additional employment target of 7000. This figure has been 'banded' about by DBC since I became the Barmpton Spokesperson in 2017 and no evidence to back it up. Since then, we have had Brexit and sadly had to deal with Covid-19. Therefore, like myself, more people are indeed working from home, and I can see this being a long-term arrangement for a considerable number of people. Therefore, the Local Plan needs to be totally reviewed to take these factors, which could be long-term into consideration.

From the onset of my involvement as Barmpton Spokesperson, DBC have only ever tried to justify housing requirements and not actual need by using their own figures and not the Government ONS guidelines. The figures used by DBC are greatly exaggerated. We will always need new houses, no one is denying that, but they need to be the right type, affordable and in the right area. The supply of houses should meet the demand for them. The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington three areas, in northwest (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and northeast Darlington (Skerningham), but where is the evidence apart from the figures commissioned by DBC that we do need to expand into the countryside. Plus, as mentioned above, the housing targets need to be revisited to include the impact of Brexit & Covid-19.

Why is Local Plan focussing on green field sites, there seems to lack brownfield sites within the plan. The NPPF is quite clear in stating brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. So what exceptional circumstances do DBC have?