

Comment

Consultee Graham Knight (1300421)
Email Address [REDACTED]
Address [REDACTED]
Event Name Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by Graham Knight (1300421)
Comment ID DBLPMod481
Response Date 28/11/21 20:30
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 proposed Skerningham Garden Village development will be very remote to the town centre. This is not as per the policy modifications as the site placement will render it a car dependent development. Therefore, this is not contributing to achieving the national commitment of net zero carbon and greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. Destroying existing open green spaces and cutting down countless trees to provide a community wholly reliant on car and public transport will certainly not have a net zero effect- quite the opposite- this will increase 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 the Skerningham Development is removed entirely from the local plan in order to make it sound and legally compliant.

Comment

Consultee	Graham Knight (1300421)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Graham Knight (1300421)
Comment ID	DBLPMod482
Response Date	28/11/21 20:30
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
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.

The existing local transport network in the Whinfield area would have to potentially accommodate an extra 5,437 vehicles per day, according to council studies. Although the plan does mention mitigation on Barmpton Lane, Whinfield Road and Whinbush Way, no detail is provided as to how this may be done. In addition, this would only cause congestion further along the route, as all traffic would lead onto existing roads at some point. Transport and congestion issues would need to be discussed in further detail and made clearer. Currently, Barmpton Lane is mentioned as the priority route. In its present state, this is clearly an unsuitable route for the volume of proposed traffic. Furthermore, according to the National Planning Policy Framework July 2021, paragraph 104 states, 'Transport issues should be considered at the earliest stages of the plan process so that they may be addressed.'. Therefore, the modified plan does not address fully how the creation of transport issues due to the Skertingham Garden Village Development would be rectified.

The Northern Link Road, which was planned to alleviate any existing congestion on the A1150, has not been agreed upon. If a further 5,437 cars are added to this route, this will create gridlock. This is certainly 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 the Skertingham Development is removed entirely from the local plan in order to make it sound and legally compliant.

Comment

Consultee	Graham Knight (1300421)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Graham Knight (1300421)
Comment ID	DBLPMod483
Response Date	28/11/21 20:30
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 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.

Whinfield and Skertingham already have a community woodland which is accessible to the public. This is used by many people daily, especially in the current pandemic. Biodiversity is abundant, rare wildlife have been spotted in this area, some already on the red or amber lists. It seems nonsensical to destroy this. Boris Johnson has pledged not to build houses on 'green spaces.' These existing green spaces allow people to enjoy the outdoors, beneficial for both physical and emotional health. The proposed plans will destroy this oasis of nature and become a huge housing estate with little or no access to 'green spaces.'

It is still unclear how these proposals will affect the River Skerne Strategic Corridor, Durham Wildlife Trust Brightwater Programme, or Skertingham Ancient Woodland.

The principles or objectives of the Healthy New Towns or Garden Communities are not consistent with this proposed 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 the Skertingham Development is removed entirely from the local plan in order to make it sound and legally compliant.