

Comment

Consultee Mr Paul Isted (1251023)

Address [REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Mr Paul Isted (1251023)

Comment ID DBLPMod630

Response Date 29/11/21 13:23

Status Processed

Submission Type Letter

Version 0.4

Question 1

Which document/modification does this representation relate to? Main Modification Schedule *

*** Please provide the reference number (where applicable), for example MM1, PM1, MIN1** 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 open 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 Mr Paul Isted (1251023)

Address [REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Mr Paul Isted (1251023)

Comment ID DBLPMod631

Response Date 29/11/21 13:25

Status Processed

Submission Type Letter

Version 0.4

Question 1

Which document/modification does this representation relate to? Main Modification Schedule *

*** Please provide the reference number (where applicable), for example MM1, PM1, MIN1** MM61 & MM62

Question 2

What best describes the nature of your representation? Object

Question 3 Legally Compliant and Sound

Do you consider the Plan, incorporating the proposed Modification is Legally Compliant? No

Do you consider the Plan, incorporating the proposed Modification is Sound? No

Question 4

Please give details of why you consider the Darlington Local Plan, incorporating the proposed Modifications to which your representation relates, is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the Plan or comment on the Sustainability Appraisal Report Addendum/Habitats Regulations Screening please also use this box to set out your comments.

Council studies have shown that there could be an extra 5437 vehicles per day using the local transport network in Whinfield alone. The plan mentions mitigation on Barmpton Lane, Whinbush Way and

Whinfield Road but does 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 paragraph 104 states that transport issues should be considered at the earliest stages of the plan process so that they may be addressed. The modified plan does not go far enough in addressing the serious 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 significantly added to from the Skerningham Development. This is not a 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 Mr Paul Isted (1251023)

Address [REDACTED]

Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

Comment by Mr Paul Isted (1251023)

Comment ID DBLPMod632

Response Date 29/11/21 13:26

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** 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 the existing attributes to make way for a 4500 housing development which by its very nature will not be able to provide the level of facilities we currently enjoy? Instead it will all become part of one big housing estate !This is not consistent with either the Healthy New Towns 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.