

Comment

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Consultee | Mr Alan Macnab (1283965) |
| Email Address | [REDACTED] |
| Address | [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] |
| Event Name | Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications |
| Comment by | Mr Alan Macnab (1283965) |
| Comment ID | DBLPMod21 |
| Response Date | 18/11/21 16:18 |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Web |
| 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 9, 10, 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.

MM9. Whilst the ambition to create 7,000 jobs during the duration of the Local Plan is supported it is unclear how this number will be achieved or how the number has been arrived at. The Local Plan was written when the local and national economy was relatively stable and growing but the effects of the Covid 19 and leaving the EU needs to be taken into consideration in the Local Plan The Darlington Local Plan was written at a time when the local and national economy was relatively stable and growing. This is not the case now with the effects of Covid and Brexit having a long lasting and detrimental effect on the local and national economy. There is no empirical evidence which clearly shows that the Skerningham Site Allocation is needed or can be justified.

MM 10. Planning applications that accord with policies in the development plan will be approved without delay. The wording 'without delay' needs clarifying.

MM14. This will be undermined by the Skerningham Garden Community in the north east of Darlington in open countryside which will result in urban sprawl, increased car dependency, increased pollution on the existing road system and the proposed Northern link road between the A1 and the A66, the destruction of woodland and hedgerows and wildlife habitats which contributes to a balanced eco system and the reduction in the quality of life for residents in North East Darlington. The Skerningham countryside makes a major contribution to people's good health and well-being. Promises to replace these but it will take many years for the replacement trees to grow and 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.

The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington in north west (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and north east Darlington (Skerningham) but there is little evidence which demonstrates clearly that this expansion into the countryside is necessary. Adopting the Government's ONS for Darlington suggests that the large rural sites will not be necessary. The housing targets need to be revisited as a result.

The employment target Of 7,000 net jobs during the duration of the Local Plan was written when the local and national economy was relatively stable and growing but these conditions no longer exist. The effects of leaving the EU and the Covid-19 pandemic will have long term effects for the Local Plan which needs to be taken into consideration.

The Local Plan seems to lack brownfield sites and concentrates on green field sites. The NPPF state brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. Perhaps brown field sites should be given a greater priority for housing over using green field sites.

The Local Plan needs to give a greater priority to developing starter homes to enable young people to obtain affordable housing and smaller properties – bungalows and flats to enable older people to downsize.

Comment

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Consultee | Mr Alan Macnab (1283965) |
| Email Address | [REDACTED] |
| Address | [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] |
| Event Name | Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications |
| Comment by | Mr Alan Macnab (1283965) |
| Comment ID | DBLPMod373 |
| Response Date | 25/11/21 14:47 |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.1 |
| 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 54 and 148 to 153 |
|---|----------------------|

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.

MM 54. The Borough Council's former Draft Local Plan entitled 'Making and Growing Places' 2013 . Preferred Option for Housing Delivery did not propose any development in the Skerningham countryside area and identified options in other parts of the Borough for housing. It is not clear at all nor can it be justified that there is a sudden need for a 4,500 garden community to be developed in a rural area when this area was not identified in the former Local Plan.

MM 148. I support the statement that "new development will be expected to retain existing woodland." However if the Darlington Golf Club is relocated to where the Skerningham Community Woodland currently is located the woodland will be destroyed with the consequent loss of wildlife habitats. The Community Woodland is a burial site and it would be extremely insensitive and cruel. to move the people who are buried in the woodland.

MM 149. This will be impossible to achieve with the development proposed in the Skerningham countryside because woodland and wildlife habitats which currently exist in Skerningham will be destroyed and it will take many years (if ever) for the loss to be replaced.

MM150. No comment.

MM151. The statement about a masterplan for 100 or more dwellings to show how the quality of biodiversity features can be maintained in the long term will be impossible to achieve in Skerningham because the plans for the Skerningham development clearly show that biodiversity, woodland and wildlife habitats which currently exist will be replaced not only by housing but by a village centre, the golf club (if it is relocated) and a road system.

MM152. Significant harm will be done to biodiversity in Skerningham and no amount of mitigating factors will reduce or replace the harm done by the Skerningham development.

MM153. The amendment is welcome.

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.

The Local Plan proposes the expansion of Darlington in north west (Faverdale), north (Burtree) and north east Darlington (Skerningham) but there is little evidence which demonstrates clearly that this expansion into the countryside is necessary. Adopting the Government's ONS for Darlington suggests that the large rural sites will not be necessary. The housing targets need to be revisited as a result.

The employment target Of 7,000 net jobs during the duration of the Local Plan was written when the local and national economy was relatively stable and growing but these conditions no longer exist. The effects of leaving the EU and the Covid-19 pandemic will have long term effects for the Local Plan which needs to be taken into consideration.

The Local Plan seems to lack brownfield sites and concentrates on green field sites. The NPPF state brownfield sites should be included in Local Plans unless there are " exceptional circumstances" not to. Perhaps brown field sites should be given a greater priority for housing over using green field sites.

The Local Plan needs to give a greater priority to developing starter homes to enable young people to obtain affordable housing and smaller properties – bungalows and flats to enable older people to downsize.

Comment

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Consultee | Mr Alan Macnab (1283965) |
| Email Address | [REDACTED] |
| Address | [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] |
| Event Name | Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications |
| Comment by | Mr Alan Macnab (1283965) |
| Comment ID | DBLPMod681 |
| Response Date | 30/11/21 15:50 |
| Status | Processed |
| Submission Type | Web |
| Version | 0.2 |
| 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 and 66 and MM148 to 153 |
|---|------------------------------|

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.

MM65 and 66. 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 proposing to destroy much of these existing to make way for a 4500 unit, housing development which by its very nature will not be able to provide the level of facilities which people from a wide area of Darlington and beyond currently enjoy. This is not consistent with either the Healthy New Towns or Garden Communities principles or objectives. Skerningham will all become part of one huge housing car dependent housing estate.

MM 148. I support the statement that “new development will be expected to retain existing woodland.” However if the Darlington Golf Club is relocated to where the Skerningham Community Woodland currently is located the woodland will be destroyed with the consequent loss of wildlife habitats. The Community Woodland is a burial site and it would be extremely insensitive and cruel to move the people who are buried in the woodland.

MM 149. This will be impossible to achieve with the development proposed in the Skerningham countryside because woodland and wildlife habitats which currently exist in Skerningham will be destroyed and it will take many years (if ever) for the loss to be replaced.

MM150. No comment.

MM151. The statement about a masterplan for 100 or more dwellings to show how the quality of biodiversity features can be maintained in the long term will be impossible to achieve in Skerningham because the plans for the Skerningham development clearly show that biodiversity, woodland and wildlife habitats which currently exist will be replaced not only by housing but by a village centre, the golf club (if it is relocated) and a road system.

MM152. Significant harm will be done to biodiversity in Skerningham and no amount of mitigating factors will reduce or replace the harm done by the Skerningham development.

MM153. The amendment is welcome.

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.