

Comment

Consultee	Judith Murray (1164496)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Whinfield Residents Association incorporating Friends of Beechwood
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Whinfield Residents Association incorporating Friends of Beechwood (Judith Murray - 1164496)
Comment ID	DBLPMod515
Response Date	29/11/21 14:56
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Email
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	Overall
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.

- . Firstly we would like to raise the issue of consultation in line with both the Statement of Community Involvement and our responses to Regulation 19. Despite being recognised by the Council as a Residents Association (para 4.3 (a) Statement of Community Involvement (PD05), asking to be informed of the Local Plan progress in our Regulation 19 representation and taking part in the examination hearings, Whinfield Residents Association has not been notified by the Council of this further consultation. We would consider this to be contrary to para 16c of the July 2021 NPPF which states that plans should be shaped early with proportionate and effective engagement between plan makers and

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.

Consultation not valid

Comment

Consultee	Judith Murray (1164496)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Whinfield Residents Association incorporating Friends of Beechwood
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Whinfield Residents Association incorporating Friends of Beechwood (Judith Murray - 1164496)
Comment ID	DBLPMod517
Response Date	29/11/21 14:59
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	MM55
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.

- . Includes an infrastructure phasing plan as part of the masterplan which is to be prepared in consultation with the community. Although this forms part of the masterplan it is unclear whether this will be prepared by the developer or by the Council.
- . The Council have stated that modification MM55 is necessary to ensure the policy is effective in ensuring the coordinated provision of infrastructure with development. At the recent Banks community consultation event which took place on 8/11/21 they stated that their development is not dependent on the same access requirements as they are (the wider Skerningham Garden Development) and can be brought forward as part of an 'urban extension'. This does not suggest to us a coordinated provision of infrastructure for Skerningham.
- . How will the Banks development access the Neighbourhood Centre or the schools without the appropriate infrastructure?

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 suggest that the Plan makes it clear who is responsible for the infrastructure phasing plan, who will be responsible for community engagement in relation to this and who will be responsible for ensuring the coordinated provision of infrastructure with development.
- . Without the developers working together to deliver joined up thinking in relation to the infrastructure plan, Skerningham will not be deliverable or sustainable.

Comment

Consultee	Judith Murray (1164496)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Whinfield Residents Association incorporating Friends of Beechwood
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Whinfield Residents Association incorporating Friends of Beechwood (Judith Murray - 1164496)
Comment ID	DBLPMod518
Response Date	29/11/21 15:01
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	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.

- . Para 104 NPPF July 2021 states that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals so that, amongst other things, the potential impact on the transport networks can be addressed
- . The Council has already undertaken traffic impact studies of the Skerningham development on Barmpton Lane, Whinbush Way and the A1150. We as residents also know the design and layout of these roads.
- . As residents who also know the design and layout of these particular roads, and the impact the Skerningham development will have upon them we do not feel that the modifications go far enough in addressing the concerns that we have previously raised, in particular on Barmpton Lane and its residents.
- . Barmpton Lane is to be the principal vehicular access point for the eastern part of the allocation but without some detail we fail to see how the impact on Barmpton Lane will be mitigated.
- . Whilst we are happy that MM61 now includes upgrade works to Barmpton Lane and it's junction with Whinbush Way, we are still unclear as to how this will actually be delivered. Leaving it until the planning application stage (which has been the consistent rhetoric from the Council) in our opinion is too late.
- . It is not in the spirit of para 104 NPPF as although the impact is recognised, it is not actually being addressed.
- . In the spirit of par 104 NPPF we would recommend that, given the scale of the Skerningham development and the impact it will have on transport issues in and around the Whinfield area, the plan includes more detail on how these issues will be addressed so that the community can make an informed decision on whether or not the plan is sound or legally compliant.

- . We would also note the response from Banks in it's community engagement event in which they have said that the east Coast mainline is a fundamental part of the Skerningham Garden Village and will take a considerable amount of time to identify, agree and deliver. This, in our opinion, casts doubt on whether MM62 (iv) will actually be delivered as per the Plan. Referring back to Para 104 NPPF what Banks has said seems to suggest that these issues have not yet been considered and nothing has been addressed.
- . Another interesting point to note is that the Council are using the 'over capacity' status of the A1150 to try and obtain funding for the Darlington Northern Link Road (nothing to do with the plan we appreciate). However, they are quite happy to support the building of 4,500 new homes with a detrimental impact on the A1150 and the environment prior to the local distributor road being built in 2036.
- . One would question yet again is this actually in the spirit of the NPPF with regards to sustainable development or improving the environment?

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.

As above

Comment

Consultee	Judith Murray (1164496)
Email Address	[REDACTED]
Company / Organisation	Whinfield Residents Association incorporating Friends of Beechwood
Address	[REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Event Name	Local Plan 2016-2036 Proposed Modifications
Comment by	Whinfield Residents Association incorporating Friends of Beechwood (Judith Murray - 1164496)
Comment ID	DBLPMod519
Response Date	29/11/21 15:04
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	MM74 MM75
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 remain disappointed that after much consultation and engagement the Council are still unable to clarify whether or not the Golf Club wish to relocate. The Golf Club is a fundamental part of the Skertingham allocation and to not know whether or not it will be included as part of the Local Plan at this stage is unacceptable.
- . If the Golf Club remains in situ then in our opinion the Skertingham Development as described in the plan cannot be reasonably delivered. The masterplan, instead of being cohesive, would become pockets of development either side of the Golf Club. We would therefore question how it could be adequately served by one neighbourhood centre when in reality neighbourhoods will be split.
- . The NPPF talks about sustainable development to meet the needs of the area, align growth and infrastructure and improve the environment. Given that if pockets of development are formed then, given the lack of a clear infrastructure plan at present, this development is likely to be highly car dependent which will go no way into improving the environment, Given COP26 maybe we should be thinking more about protecting the environment so that we do have one for the future, rather than cutting down trees and trying to build. as many houses as we can on the only green spaces we have left.
- . We would also question the viability of MM74 in relation to the Golf Club remaining in situ.
- . Council viability assessments have shown that should the Golf Club remain in situ then the margin in this development falls to £0.5m.
- . This is, according to the Council's own hierarchy – marginal.
- . If costs should rise (as we are increasingly seeing given the increases in the costs of energy and disruptions to the supply chain network) then the margin of £0.5m may fall quite dramatically and the development become unviable.
- . It is also interesting to note the significant difference between the Council' viability assessment and the developer's viability assessment – which, despite being raised in the hearings, has not been addressed.
- . This is the Council's Local Plan, not the developer's and therefore should not be led by the developer's calculations.
- . If the margin on this development is only £0.5m then viability is called into question and the Skertingham Garden Village Development, without the relocation of the Golf Club becomes unsustainable.

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.

As above