

## Comment

**Consultee** Mr Kim Jackson (1251024)

**Address** [REDACTED]

**Event Name** Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

**Comment by** Mr Kim Jackson (1251024)

**Comment ID** DBLPMod645

**Response Date** 30/11/21 13:39

**Status** Processed

**Submission Type** Letter

**Version** 0.3

### Question 1

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

**\* Please provide the reference number (where applicable), for example MM1, PM1, MIN1** 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 Garden Village development undermines this policy and modification as it is a car dependent development which will therefore not contribute to the achievement of the national

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

#### **Question 5**

**Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound and why, thinking about what you identified in Question 4. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording or any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

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

## Comment

**Consultee** Mr Kim Jackson (1251024)

**Address** [REDACTED]

**Event Name** Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

**Comment by** Mr Kim Jackson (1251024)

**Comment ID** DBLPMod649

**Response Date** 30/11/21 13:41

**Status** Processed

**Submission Type** Letter

**Version** 0.3

### Question 1

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

**\* Please provide the reference number (where applicable), for example MM1, PM1, MIN1** 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.**

- . Council studies have shown that there could be an extra 5,437 vehicles per day using the local transport network in Whinfield alone.

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

#### **Question 5**

**Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound and why, thinking about what you identified in Question 4. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording or any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

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

## Comment

**Consultee** Mr Kim Jackson (1251024)

**Address** [REDACTED]

**Event Name** Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

**Comment by** Mr Kim Jackson (1251024)

**Comment ID** DBLPMod651

**Response Date** 30/11/21 13:43

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

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

#### **Question 5**

**Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound and why, thinking about what you identified in Question 4. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording or any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

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

## Comment

**Consultee** Mr Kim Jackson (1251024)

**Address** [REDACTED]

**Event Name** Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications

**Comment by** Mr Kim Jackson (1251024)

**Comment ID** DBLPMod654

**Response Date** 30/11/21 13:44

**Status** Processed

**Submission Type** Letter

**Version** 0.3

### Question 1

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

### 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.**

One final note is the lack of infrastructure in the ward of Whinfield in particular which will be affected by this development. We have waited years for proper road signage along Barmpton Lane to the village. The council have advised that this will be done but we are still waiting some two years later, no community hub whatsoever for young people and the wider community. No connectivity to BT superfast broadband in the Whinfield ward. In fact our ward has been bypassed by BT and measures

have been put in place to ensure this proposed garden village will have access to BT Superfast Broadband yet all those existing residents living in Whinfield will not, how can this be? I have personally contacted BT who have confirmed that this is indeed the case and also went on to advise me that there are no plans for superfast broadband being installed in Whinfield in the foreseeable future. I feel the needs of the existing residents should be taken into account before embarking on a development of this magnitude. I have very little confidence and even less so after listening to some of the council's officers responses during the online consultation with the Planning Inspector.

#### **Question 5**

**Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound and why, thinking about what you identified in Question 4. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording or any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.**

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