

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

Mod Ref	Relevant part of Plan	Comment ID	Consultee Name	Support/ Object	Main Issues Raised Summary	Councils Response
MM6	Para 1.7.2	DBLPMod195	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis)	Object	There is one apparent error: MM30 states that the total number of dwellings in the Plan is 14,836. Figures given elsewhere in the Plan, however, total 14,497 (3119 commitments and 5764 allocations plus 5,614 allocations outside the Plan period).	The figure of 14,836 within MM30 also includes 339 dwellings from site 68 West Park Garden Village which are estimated to be delivered beyond 2036. Therefore, the total is correct (commitments 3119 + allocations 5764 + sites beyond plan period 5953 = 14,836).
MM6	Para 1.7.2	DBLPMod16	David Clark	Object	<p>Concern that the housing figures within the plan are not consistent. Figure of 14,836 provided in MM30 however there are different total figures throughout the plan. Housing delivered since 2016 should also be included. In para 1.7.2 (MM6) the figure of 5,440 is adjusted elsewhere with no explanation.</p> <p>More smaller brownfield sites should be allocated that could provide affordable homes rather than purely greenfield sites which are at lower density, involve more expensive housing and are car dependent.</p>	<p>There may be some confusion over total figures as 14,836 includes estimated delivery of strategic sites beyond the plan period 2036; hence a higher figure. The figure of 5,440 is not adjusted in anyway in other parts of the plan. For clarification it is a combination of supply via commitments and completions since the beginning of the plan period (commitments 3,119 + completions 2,321 = 5,440). Dwellings completed since 2016 are included and contribute to meeting the housing requirement. Modifications proposed at MM33 and MM37 also aim to clarify and make clearer the housing figures for the plan.</p> <p>The other comments submitted do not directly relate to the proposed modifications, rather the broader approach of the plan. However, the Council's evidence on the spatial strategy and site selection can be found in the Spatial Distribution of Development Topic Paper and Matter 4 Statement.</p>
MM6	Para 1.7.2	DBLPMod595	Hallam Land (ID Planning)	Object	For clarity, MM6 should reflect the information set out in MM37.	Paragraph 1.7.2 does reflect the information set out in MM37 and provides an overview. It is not considered necessary to replicate the detail from MM37.
MM6, MM8, MM25, MM30, MM37	Para 1.7.2, Aim 2, Policy H1, Policy H2 - Paragraph 6.2.2, Policy H2 - Paragraph 6.2.11	DBLPMod697	David Taylor	Object	Housing figures amended for consistency; However, they fail to clearly explain the housing figures for the five designated neighbourhood areas in H2 Table 6.1.	MM27 sets out an explanation of how the neighbourhood area housing requirements have been derived.
MM7	Para 1.7.3	DBLPMod16	David Clark	Object	Concerns that ONS data has not been used for household growth yet MM7 outlines that it has been utilised for jobs growth. This indicates to residents that the Council use some ONS data when it suits.	In relation to comments on ONS data for household growth it is considered that this relates to MM25 and the proposed single housing requirement figure. The Council's evidence on this area is set out in the Housing Topic Paper, the Council's Matter 2 Statement and SHMA 2020.
MM7	Para 1.7.3	DBLPMod381, DBLPMod21	Maj. F Greenhow, Alan Macnab	Object	Concern that 7,000 jobs is too ambitious and longer-term effects of covid recovery, Brexit etc. not yet known.	The Council's evidence on the jobs forecast and resulting housing requirement is set out in SD15 Darlington Future Employment Needs Report 2017, SD09 SHMA 2017 and the Housing Topic Paper.
MM8	Aim 2	DBLPMod195, DBLPMod16	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), David Clark	Object	There is one apparent error: MM30 states that the total number of dwellings in the Plan is 14,836. Figures given elsewhere in the Plan, however, total 14,497 (3119 commitments and 5764 allocations plus 5,614 allocations outside the Plan period).	The figure of 14,836 within MM30 also includes 339 dwellings from site 68 West Park Garden Village which are estimated to be delivered beyond 2036. Therefore, the total is correct (commitments 3119 + allocations 5764 + sites beyond plan period 5953 = 14,836).
MM9	Aim 6	DBLPMod196, DBLPMod550, DBLPMod734, DBLPMod477, DBLPMod697	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), Chris Bowey, Christine Fishwick, Kathy Barley, David Taylor	Support	Support modification however, it is inappropriate for it to do so without very significant changes to its strategy, which at present mandate low-density, car-dependent sprawl and a new orbital route around the town and promotes the loss of woodland and agricultural land removing sources of carbon sequestration.	Support noted, the Council set out how the Plans seeks to mitigate and adapt to climate change in the Climate Change Topic Paper.

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

MM10	SD1	DBLPMod513	Josh Plant (Gladman Developments Ltd)	Support	Support modification. Ensures consistency with national policy and provides clarity on the application of development plan policies.	Support noted.
MM10	SD1	DBLPMod21	Alan Macnab	Object	MM10 – ‘Without delay’ needs further clarification	The wording is consistent with national policy. Further clarification is not considered necessary.
MM11	Policy DC1 – Policy wording – paragraph 1	DBLPMod419, DBLPMod514	Hellens & Homes England, Josh Plant (Gladman Developments Ltd)	Support	Support modification to “have regard to” to reflect the flexible approach to such documents and ensures consistency with revisions to national policy.	Support noted.
MM11	Policy DC1 – Policy wording – paragraph 1	DBLPMod197	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis)	Object	Not comfortable with the apparent downgrading of the SPD's significance. The Plan text, and decision-making, should be amended to make it clear that all new development will be expected to follow the highest standards of sustainable design.	The proposed modification is sound and ensures the Local Plan affords the appropriate level of weight to the SPD consistent with national legislation and policy.
MM11	Policy DC1 – Policy wording – paragraph 1	DBLPMod356, DBLPMod29	LC&M Parish Council, MSG Parish Council	Object	Amend policy DC1 and/ or the supporting text to highlight that neighbourhood plan design codes and policies are also a relevant consideration.	The introduction sets out the context of neighbourhood plans and how they form part of the statutory development plan. It is not considered necessary to alter individual policies or supporting text to refer to specific elements of neighbourhood plans.
MM13	Policy DC1 – paragraph 5.1.1	DBLPMod197	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis)	Object	Not comfortable with the apparent downgrading of the SPD's significance. The Plan text, and decision-making, should be amended to make it clear that all new development will be expected to follow the highest standards of sustainable design.	The proposed modification is sound and ensures the Local Plan affords the appropriate level of weight to the SPD consistent with national legislation and policy.
MM13	Policy DC1 – paragraph 5.1.1	DBLPMod420	Hellens & Homes England	Support	Support modification to “have regard to” to reflect the flexible approach to such documents.	Support noted.
MM14	Policy DC1 – Para 5.1.8	DBLPMod196, DBLPMod734	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), Christine Fishwick	Support	Applaud the Plan’s recognition of the fact that, by law, Local Plans must support the national commitment to net zero carbon emissions by 2050. However, it is inappropriate for it to do so without very significant changes to its strategy, which at present mandate low-density, car-dependent sprawl and a new orbital route around the town.	Support noted, the Council set out how the Plans seeks to mitigate and adapt to climate change in the Climate Change Topic Paper.
MM14	Policy DC1 – Para 5.1.8	DBLPMod10, DBLPMod382, DBLPMod21	David Clark, Maj. F Greenhow, Alan Macnab	Object	The proposed modification to the objective will not be achieved whilst the Council support the felling of thousands of trees in Skerningham Community Woodland for the potential relocation of Darlington Golf Club and the allocation of thousands of hectares of surrounding greenfield sites right around Darlington to facilitate the building of an inner ring road, creating car dependent urban sprawl. The proposed greenfield allocations should be removed from the plan and replaced with brownfield sites.	This comment focuses on the broader approach of the plan rather than the proposed modification. Policy H10 requires a net gain in community woodland and the Council has explained its approach to the location of development in its spatial distribution of development topic paper
MM14	Policy DC1 – Para 5.1.8	See Appendix A	See Appendix A	Object	The Skerningham Garden Village Development, because of its remoteness to the town centre will inevitably be a car dependent development. This does therefore not contribute towards the national commitment of net zero carbon and greenhouse gas emissions by 2050.	The council’s approach to the distribution of housing development and selection of site allocations is explained in the Spatial Distribution of Development Topic Paper and the Climate Change Topic Paper sets out how the plan seeks to mitigate and adapt to climate change.
MM17	Policy DC3	DBLPMod31, DBLPMod437	MSG Parish Council, Kim Binks	Object	There is no robust evidence to justify changing the threshold from 100 to 150. The examples provided by the council, within the Public Health England document, referenced in MM18, include 100 house thresholds (Greater Norwich, South Cambridgeshire). The threshold should be left at 100 houses.	It is acknowledged there are examples in government guidance that apply from 100 units upwards including Norwich and Cambridgeshire. Having received representations on the plan the council considers an increase of the threshold to 150 dwellings would strike an appropriate balance for development in Darlington. It should also be noted none of the proposed allocations in Policy H2 would be impacted by this modification as all are either under 100 units or over 150.
MM19	Policy DC4 – policy wording – para 2	DBLPMod33	MSG Parish Council	Object	Request that policy DC4 includes the following text: ‘Proposals which would result in a level of movement of Heavy Goods Vehicles in residential areas which would result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of those living in the area will not be permitted’	Policy DC4 still allows for the consideration of Impacts on amenity associated with all traffic movements (including HGVs). Consideration of traffic impacts during construction are more appropriately dealt

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

					If deletion of this sentence is required here, then reference should be placed elsewhere within the plan. For example, an extra bullet point could be added under paragraph 5.4.3 (The aspects of amenity taken into consideration through the planning process are:) (Extra bullet point): Noise, disturbance, pollution caused by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) on residential roads, (both construction traffic during building of development, and other HGVs once the development has been built	with via construction management plans which can be imposed on permissions where appropriate.
MM19	Policy DC4 – policy wording – para 2	DBLPMo687	Banks Property	Support	support modification which ensures that the policy sets out a sound approach to safeguarding amenity and is positively prepared.	Support noted
MM23	Policy H1 – policy wording	DBLPMo634	Story Homes (Savills)	Support	Support modification.	Support noted
MM23	Policy H1 – policy wording	DBLPMo198	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis)	Object	The Plan should acknowledge that too much development, or development in the wrong place, can be a failure of planning. The phrase stating that the housing figures should not be seen as a "restrictive maximum" should be removed; planning is supposed to be restrictive and has no other weapons in its armoury.	The plan should be read as a whole and there are other restrictive policies within it. For example, Policy H3 Development Limits directs development to sustainable locations. Setting out housing requirement figures as a minimum ensures that sustainable windfall sites not identified within the plan can still come forward for development. This approach is in line with the overarching principles of the NPPF.
MM23	Policy H1 – policy wording	DBLPMo359, DBLPMo35, DBLPMo437	LC&M Parish Council, MSG Parish Council, Kim Binks	Object	Remove reference to the neighbourhood area requirements being minimum as it conflicts with the provisions of the NPPF.	Setting out housing requirement figures as a minimum ensures that sustainable windfall sites not identified within the plan can still come forward for development. This approach is in line with the overarching principles of the NPPF.
MM23	Policy H1 – policy wording	DBLPMo359	LC&M Parish Council	Object	Amend the neighbourhood area requirement for LC&M to 23, reflecting the LC&M Neighbourhood Plan and its housing needs assessment.	The Council does not consider it appropriate to amend the neighbourhood areas housing requirement for Low Coniscliffe & Merrybent to 23 (to reflect the Neighbourhood Plan and housing needs assessment). The evidence behind the housing requirement for the plan, and subsequent neighbourhood area requirements, is set out within SDO9 SHMA 2017 and the Housing Topic Paper.
MM23 / MM24	Policy H1 – policy wording & table 6.1	DBLPMo375	Taylor Wimpey (ELG)	Support	Support modification. However, the effectiveness of the policy could be further improved by adding a further detail to 6.1.10 (MM27) to confirm that sites can deliver at a faster rate than currently anticipated and deliver more than outlined in table 6.1.	There are other sections of the plan that clearly state that the phasing estimates within the housing trajectory do not restrict sites from delivering at a faster rate. It is not considered necessary to duplicate this within the proposed modification.
MM24	Policy H1 – table 6.1	DBLPMo635	Story Homes (Savills)	Support	Support modification.	Support noted.
MM24	Policy H1 – table 6.1	DBLPMo200, DBLPMo690, DBLPMo735	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), Amanda Meeks, Christine Fishwick	Object	Neighbourhood area housing allocation for Middleton St George should be amended to reflect a level compatible with housing need in the village.	Does not directly relate to the modification. However, the evidence behind the housing requirement for the plan, and subsequent neighbourhood area requirements, is set out within SDO9 SHMA 2017, the Council's matter 2 statement and the Housing Topic Paper. The housing allocations proposed are considered to be the most suitable and sustainable locations for new development and are supported by the plans evidence base.
MM24	Policy H1 – table 6.1	DBLPMo561 DBLPMo699	Colin Raine	Object	Table 6.1 has been amended to increase the housing requirement for Hurworth from 625 to 816. This increase goes against assurances that were given at the Draft Local Plan Consultation held at Hurworth Grange, where villages were told by DBC planning that other than existing developments at the two sites on Roundhill road there would not be any further, major housing developments in the parish. Re-instate the original housing requirement of 625 for Hurworth.	The neighbourhood area housing requirements have been altered to include commitments for completeness. The alterations also reflect the update to the housing trajectory set out in the Council's examination document DBC6.2. For Hurworth the figure has risen from 625 to 816 as the remaining yields from 3 housing commitments have been added. These are not additional sites as such, they already

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

						had planning permission and were already identified in the Local Plan, they just were just not accounted for in the neighbourhood area housing requirement figures.
MM25	Policy H1	DBLPMo503, DBLPMo516, DBLPMo636, DBLPMo590, DBLPMo688	Home Builders Federation, Josh Plant (Gladman Developments Ltd), Story Homes (Savills), Hallam Land Management (ID Planning), Banks Property	Support	Support modification. Improves clarity and ensures the policy will be effective in achieving the Council's growth aspirations.	Support noted.
MM25	Policy H1	DBLPMo36, DBLPMo200, DBLPMo437, DBLPMo735	MSG Parish Council, Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), Kim Binks, Christine Fishwick	Object	Whilst the NPPF requires minimum numbers at the local authority level, paragraph 66 does not refer to minimum in the context of neighbourhood plans. Suggest table 6.1 be amended to ensure the neighbourhood area housing requirements have been identified in response to the needs of the area, rather than as a result of development pressure.	It is considered that setting the neighbourhood area housing requirements as minimum figures is in line with the overarching principles of the NPPF, in terms of flexibility and boosting the supply of homes. A minimum figure ensures that windfall sites not identified in the plan which are suitable and sustainable can still come forward for development. The evidence behind the housing requirement for the plan, and subsequent neighbourhood area requirements, is set out within SDO9 SHMA 2017, the Council's matter 2 statement and the Housing and Spatial Distribution of Development Topic Paper.
MM25	Policy H1	DBLPMo195, DBLPMo16	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), David Clark	Object	There is one apparent error: MM30 states that the total number of dwellings in the Plan is 14,836. Figures given elsewhere in the Plan, however, total 14,497 (3119 commitments and 5764 allocations plus 5,614 allocations outside the Plan period).	The figure of 14,836 within MM30 also includes 339 dwellings from site 68 West Park Garden Village which are estimated to be delivered beyond 2036. Therefore, the total is correct (commitments 3119 + allocations 5764 + sites beyond plan period 5953 = 14,836).
MM25	Policy H1	DBLPMo16	David Clark	Object	Concerns that ONS data has not been used for household growth yet MM7 outlines that it has been utilised for jobs growth. This indicates to residents that the Council use some ONS data when it suits.	In relation to comments on ONS data for household growth it is considered that this relates to MM25 and the proposed single housing requirement figure. The Council's evidence on this area is set out in the Housing Topic Paper, the Council's Matter 2 Statement and SHMA 2020.
MM25	Policy H1	DBLPMo16, DBLPMo729, DBLPMo855, DBLPMo194, DBLPMo379	David Clark, Christine Fishwick, CPRE, Tim Ellis, Alex Swainston	Object	The objectively assessed need for housing does not accord with the Government's Standard Method for calculating it and has been calculated using questionable statistics and analytical methods resulting in the amount of land allocated for housing (and, in the case of Policy H11 relating to Great Faverdale, employment) is grossly excessive.	The Council's evidence on housing need is set out in the Housing Topic Paper, the Council's Matter 2 Statement and SHMA 2017 (SD09).
MM25	Policy H1	DBLPMo552	Colin Raine	Object	Re-instate all references to sustainability in MM25.	There were concerns with how the term sustainable would be interpreted within the policy and clarification would be required with regards to its meaning. As sustainability includes many different aspects it was considered a simpler approach to remove the reference as its meaning is comprehensively set out within national policy.
MM26	Policy H1 - paragraph 6.1.9	DBLPMo638	Story Homes (Savills)	Support	Support modification.	Support noted.
MM27	Policy H1 - new paragraphs added after 6.1.9	DBLPMo640	Story Homes (Savills)	Support	Support modification. Provides clarity and ensures justification for the policy is clearly reasoned.	Support noted.
MM27	Policy H1 – New paras	DBLPMo200	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis)	Object	Pleased to see that neighbourhood area housing figures have been amended for consistency but the neighbourhood area housing allocation for Middleton St	The evidence behind the housing requirement for the plan, and subsequent neighbourhood area requirements, is set out within SDO9

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

	added after 6.1.9				George should be amended to reflect a level compatible with housing need in the village.	SHMA 2017, the Council's matter 2 statement and the Housing and Spatial Distribution of Development Topic Paper.
MM27	Policy H1 – New paras added after 6.1.9	DBLPMod354, DBLPMod38, DBLPMod735	LC&M Parish Council (Jo-Anne Garrick), MSG Parish Council, Christine Fishwick	Object	<p>Wording proposed suggests that no consideration was given to the overall strategy/ spatial distribution and that it was merely the result of sites put forward by developers. Also, no consideration was given to the evidence base that has informed neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Neighbourhood area requirements should reflect the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development, informed by local evidence of housing need.</p>	<p>As set out in the modification the Council has followed national policy and guidance in the NPPF and NPPG in terms of setting the neighbourhood area housing requirements. The figures were not simply a result of sites put forward by developers. They reflect the Council's assessment of housing need in the borough, the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy of the plan. The housing sites proposed are supported and justified by detailed evidence in the HELAA (SD10) and SA (CD03). Further explanation is set out in the Council's Topic Paper Spatial Distribution of Development.</p> <p>The NPPG states where a neighbourhood plan has been brought into force, the local planning authority should take its policies and proposals into account when preparing the local plan. This does not mean that the Local Plan is bound to follow the Neighbourhood Plan and supporting evidence but should take into account its policies and proposals.</p> <p>The Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) for MSG and LC & M were published before their housing requirement figures were published in the proposed submission Local Plan. The HNA's identify a proportionate share of quantitative housing need in the neighbourhood plan areas from historic figures and alternative data, however these are now out of date. Neighbourhood planning groups have the right to calculate the housing needs of their areas however this does not take into account the Local Plan's assessment of housing need, the spatial strategy or the distribution of development which is justified by the supporting evidence base. Guidance also states that the housing requirement figure provided by the planning authority will immediately supersede any interim figure produced in the HNA (Locality Toolkit).</p> <p>It is also important to note that the emphasis in the NPPF and NPPG is for the local planning authority to provide a housing requirement figure for neighbourhood areas as part of strategic policies. It is only in exceptional circumstances that the HNA will be used to provide a housing requirement at neighbourhood plan level.</p>
MM29	Policy H2 – Paragraph 6.2.2	DBLPMod591	Hallam Land Management (ID Planning)	Object	For clarity, MM29 should clearly identify the number of new allocations needed taking into account net completions and existing commitments.	It is not considered that this is necessary as MM37 sets out the overall land supply over the plan period 2016-36.
MM30	Policy H2 – Paragraph 6.2.2	DBLPMod195, DBLPMod16	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), David Clark	Object	There is one apparent error: MM30 states that the total number of dwellings in the Plan is 14,836. Figures given elsewhere in the Plan, however, total 14,497 (3119 commitments and 5764 allocations plus 5,614 allocations outside the Plan period).	The figure of 14,836 within MM30 also includes 339 dwellings from site 68 West Park Garden Village which are estimated to be delivered beyond 2036. Therefore, the total is correct (commitments 3119 + allocations 5764 + sites beyond plan period 5953 = 14,836).
MM30	Policy H2 – Paragraph 6.2.2	DBLPMod593	Hallam Land Management (ID Planning)	Object	<p>It should be made clear that the 14,836 dwelling figures includes dwellings that are expected to be delivered beyond the plan period.</p> <p>For clarity, MM6, MM30 and MM37 should reflect the information set out in MM37.</p>	The text does set out that the figure of 14,836 includes the build out of a number of the strategic sites which will extend beyond 2036. No changes are required. It is not considered necessary to duplicate the information set out in MM37 in other sections of the plan.

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

MM31	Policy H2 – Paragraph 6.2.3	DBLPMod22, DBLPMod202, DBLPMod765	David Clark, Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), Christine Fishwick	Object	Based on past delivery the correct figure for windfalls per annum, ought to take into account the pattern of delivery on both categories of site. That is, the Plan should assume delivery of 37 dwellings per annum on windfall sites of less than 10 units and 149 on larger sites – a total of 186 dwgs per annum.	The Council does not consider it appropriate to increase the small sites allowance within the plan. As set out in the Council’s matter 4 statement (Q4.16) and response to preliminary question 27, the supply of 25 dwellings per annum is suitable as it is based on past trends and is not overly optimistic. Also set out in these documents it is highlighted that making an estimation of windfall development for major schemes over recent years would be difficult for Darlington due to the age of existing housing policies and allocations. As such a windfall allowance has not been included for sites of ten units or more as it would be difficult to evidence.
MM33	Policy H2 - Paragraph 6.2.5	DBLPMod596	Hallam Land Management (ID Planning)	Object	Based on the new single requirement figure proposed (MM25) and the information presented in relation to the 5 year housing land supply and components of the total supply (MM33) we maintain the plan will not be effective in delivering the identified housing need for Darlington. We have raised concerns at each stage of the plan preparation process that the plan is too reliant on a small number of large allocations which are all located around the edge of Darlington. It remains our case that the plan will not be effective in delivering the identified housing requirement. The marginal 5 year housing land supply position, the reliance on a large quantum of commitments as part of the Council’s overall supply which the Council do not expect to be delivered in the first five years and the strategy to identify a small number of large allocations presents a high risk that the identified need will not be met and that a 5 year supply will not be maintained throughout the plan period given the time lag that is expected in completions commencing on the large allocation sites.	The Council considers that the plan will be effective in delivering the identified housing need for Darlington. The justification behind this is set out in a number of evidence base documents including the Spatial Distribution of Development Topic Paper and the Council’s Matter 4 statement.
MM35	Policy H2 – table 6.3 housing allocations	DBLPMod360	LC&M Parish Council (Jo-Anne Garrick)	Object	In order to make the plan sound, LC&MPC submit that the Coniscliffe Park sites should be removed from the local plan.	The Council considers that the Coniscliffe Park sites are suitable and sustainable locations for development as justified by the supporting evidence base, including the SA (CD03), HELAA (SD10) and Spatial Distribution of Development topic paper. The sites are required to meet quantitative and qualitative housing needs.
MM35	Policy H2 – table 6.3 housing allocations	DBLPMod39, DBLPMod437	MSG Parish Council, Kim Binks	Object	The inclusion of site 99 is not required in order to make the Plan sound. We therefore ask for it to be removed from the Plan.	The Council considers that site 99 Maxgate Farm, MSG is a suitable and sustainable location for development as justified by the supporting evidence base, including the SA (CD03), HELAA (SD10) and Spatial Distribution of Development topic paper. The site is required to meet quantitative and qualitative housing needs.
MM36	Policy H2	DBLPMod531	Bellway & Story Homes (Barton Willmore)	Support	No issues raised with the modification.	Noted.
MM37	Policy H2 – Paragraph 6.2.11	DBLPMod195, DBLPMod16	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), David Clark	Object	There is one apparent error: MM30 states that the total number of dwellings in the Plan is 14,836. Figures given elsewhere in the Plan, however, total 14,497 (3119 commitments and 5764 allocations plus 5,614 allocations outside the Plan period).	The figure of 14,836 within MM30 also includes 339 dwellings from site 68 West Park Garden Village which are estimated to be delivered beyond 2036. Therefore, the total is correct (commitments 3119 + allocations 5764 + sites beyond plan period 5953 = 14,836).
MM37	Policy H2 – Paragraph 6.2.3	DBLPMod202, DBLPMod765	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), Christine Fishwick	Object	The "small sites allocation" should be amended to read 37 rather than 25, and an allocation for larger windfall sites of 149 dwellings per annum should be made.	The Council does not consider it appropriate to increase the small sites allowance within the plan. As set out in the Council’s matter 4 statement (Q4.16) and response to preliminary question 27, the supply of 25 dwellings per annum is suitable as it is based on past trends and is not overly optimistic.
MM37	Policy H2 – Paragraph 6.2.3	DBLPMod594	Hallam Land (ID Planning)	Object	MM37 identifies the main sources of the Council’s supply. For clarity, MM37 should reflect the information set out in MM37.	It is unclear what changes are requested to MM37.

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

MM40	Policy H4 – para 1	DBLPMod504, DBLPMod642, DBLPMod421	Home Builders Federation, Story Homes (Savills), Hellens & Homes England	Support	Support modification. Provides flexibility and accounts for a wider range of evidence.	Support noted.
MM40	Policy H4 – para 1	DBLPMod6	Darlington Association on Disability (Gordon Pybus)	Object	Proposals for housing development will no longer be ‘expected’ to provide an appropriate mix of housing, only ‘encouraged’. The types, sizes and tenures which ‘meet’ local needs as identified within the most up to date has been replaced by ‘have regard to’ which is weak.	The modification is required to ensure the policy is clear, effective and consistent with national policy in the way it refers to evidence base documents.
MM40	Policy H4 – para 1	DBLPMod809	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM41	Policy H4 - policy wording – part a	DBLPMod506, DBLPMod520, DBLPMod643, DBLPMod422, DBLPMod633,	Home Builders Federation, Josh Plant (Gladman Developments Ltd), Story Homes (Savills), Hellens & Homes England, Kevin Ayrton (ELG) for Barratt Homes	Support	Support modification. Ensures policy is justified and in line with the recommendations of the supporting evidence.	Support noted.
MM41	Policy H4 – policy wording – part a	DBLPMod6	Darlington Association on Disability (Gordon Pybus)	Object	Reducing the number of category 2 by almost half will not replace the original policy of Lifetime Homes. The vast majority of people will not be able to remain in their home should they need to be adapted. This 45% also comes with the caveat of ‘subject to consideration of site suitability and site viability’.	The reduction in the policy requirement for category M4(2) reflects the Council’s latest evidence within the SHMA 2020 (SD08). The need to give consideration to site suitability and viability is set out within national planning policy guidance.
MM42	Policy H4 – additional text following para 6.4.5	DBLPMod644	Story Homes (Savills)	Support	Support modification. Ensures policy is justified and in line with the recommendations of the supporting evidence.	Support noted.
MM43	Policy H5 - policy wording – table 6.5	DBLPMod509, DBLPMod646	Home Builders Federation, Story Homes (Savills)	Support	Support modification. Additional detail on tenure split ensures the policy is justified, will be effective in responding to local circumstances and is in line with the NPPF.	Support noted.
MM44	Policy H5	DBLPMod647	Story Homes (Savills)	Support	Support modification.	Support noted.
MM44	Policy H5	DBLPMod203	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis)	Object	concerned about the apparent discrepancy between the identified need for affordable housing (47.2% of all dwellings) and the policy requirement (10%). The plan should provide for 47.2% of new dwellings to be affordable.	The affordable housing requirement that can be set is subject to economic viability and the requirements set are the maximum which the Local Plan Viability testing (CD08) has demonstrated to be viable.
MM44	Policy H5	DBLPMod423	Hellens & Homes England	Support	Support modification but it would be beneficial to reference self-build developments of over 10 dwellings as an explicit exception to the requirement to provide of affordable housing on-site. Logistically the master developer would obtain an outline planning consent and provide infrastructure and serviced plots for self-builders to develop their homes individually via separate reserved matters applications. As such it would not deliver affordable housing on site in practice with bespoke homes being provided for owner occupiers.	Self-build could be captured under criteria c, any other circumstances where the Council considers off-site provision to be preferable to on-site provision. However, the Council would be willing to add self-build in as an explicit exception if this was considered necessary.
MM45	Policy H5 – para 6.5.2	DBLPMod648	Story Homes (Savills)	Support	Support modification.	Support noted.
MM45	Policy H5 – para 6.5.2	DBLPMod203	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis)	Object	concerned about the apparent discrepancy between the identified need for affordable housing (47.2% of all dwellings) and the policy requirement (10%). The plan should provide for 47.2% of new dwellings to be affordable.	The affordable housing requirement that can be set is subject to economic viability and the requirements set are the maximum which the Local Plan Viability testing (CD08) has demonstrated to be viable. This approach is explained in the reasoned justification to the policy.
MM45	Policy H5 – para 6.5.2	DBLPMod11, DBLPMod414	David Clark, William Wallis	Object	Objection that the Local Plan does not include the Governments new First Homes scheme. No valid reasons have been provided by the Council for this and the scheme should be included within the Local Plan.	The comments do not directly relate to the proposed modification. However, the government’s First Homes programme was introduced via a Ministerial Statement on the 24 th May 2021. The statement set out transitional arrangements in which Local Plan’s submitted for

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

					<p>The issue was raised during the examination hearings and the Council explained that due to a transitional period there is no intention to include First Homes scheme in any of the allocated sites until further notice. Not including the scheme would mean many first time buyers may not get on the property ladder as soon as they may have done. Other negative impacts could include people moving out of the borough to areas where the scheme is available.</p>	<p>examination before 28th June 2021 would not be required to reflect the First Homes policy. The Council's Local Plan was captured under these arrangements with the examination already underway. As such it was considered a very late stage in the plan making process to introduce a new policy without giving it full consideration. A large amount of guidance was also published on the 24th May which also required analysis.</p> <p>It is not the case that the Council does not intend on applying this new national policy in the future. It can be incorporated via a plan review or other methods. It is also national policy therefore can be given weight in decision making. The Council intends to issue a policy position statement on the matter once the inspectors report has been received (which may provide some guidance) and following full consideration of the new policy and guidance.</p> <p>It is important to note that policy H5 Affordable Housing does require proportions of discount market housing which First Homes are similar to (although they are subject to a larger discount). The Council will also be flexible in its approach if developers do propose First Homes on schemes.</p>
MM46	Policy H6 – policy wording	DBLPMod474	Nigel Swinbank (Ward Hadaway)	Object	<p>General support for inclusion of entry level exception sites. Object that there is a need to demonstrate viability and additional criterion broadly reflecting the last paragraph in the Rural Exception Sites part of the policy.</p> <p>Alterations suggested:</p> <p>Demonstrate the policy will deliver schemes which are viable and deliverable.</p> <p>Include an additional criterion, "In exceptional circumstances, a small proportion of market or self /custom build housing may be provided, if it can be demonstrated via a detailed viability assessment that a 100% entry level affordable housing scheme would be unviable and the market homes would support delivery".</p>	<p>The approach taken to entry level exception sites is in line with the criteria set out in the NPPF. Allowing some market housing to assist in facilitating entry level exception sites is not mentioned in the framework; it is only stated for rural exception sites. As such it is not considered appropriate or in accordance with national policy to make the changes suggested.</p>
MM47	Policy H6 - Para 6.6.4	DBLPMod475	Nigel Swinbank (Ward Hadaway)	Object	<p>Object to the words 'it is expected that entry level scheme will consist of <u>more</u> than one type of affordable housing'. This is inconsistent with the new criterion b proposed in MM46 which refers to 'one or more types of affordable housing'.</p> <p>Suggest '<u>one or more</u>'</p>	<p>Agree to amend the modification as suggested to ensure that it is in line with the associated policy (H6 & MM46) and national policy.</p>
MM51	Policy H8 – final para.	DBLPMod197	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis)	Object	<p>Not comfortable with the apparent downgrading of the SPD's significance. The Plan text, and decision-making, should be amended to make it clear that all new development will be expected to follow the highest standards of sustainable design.</p>	<p>The proposed modification is sound and ensures the Local Plan affords the appropriate level of weight to the SPD consistent with national legislation and policy.</p>
MM54	Policy H10 – Para 1	DBLPMod664, DBLPMod694	Skerningham Estates, Banks Property	Support	<p>consider this modification to be justified and helpful in clarifying the delivery and phasing of the development.</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
MM54	Policy H10 – Para 1	DBLPMod21	Alan Macnab	Object	<p>Concern over access points an impact of additional traffic on existing highway infrastructure and climate. Requesting assessments from the withdrawn 'Making and Growing Places' DPD be taken into account.</p>	<p>Detailed assessment of access points will take place in due course. The evidence base used to assess the withdrawn DPD is out of date and has been replaced</p>
MM54	Policy H10 – Para 1	DBLPMod193	Leanne Carroll	Object	<p>Query raised over the reference to '...of which 600 dwellings are to be delivered on land adjacent to the A167 and west of the East Coast Mainline on the <u>eastern</u> part of the allocation...' Considers it should be <u>western</u>.</p>	<p>Agreed this should be western rather than eastern so the proposed modified sentence should read 'of which 600 dwellings are to be delivered on land adjacent to the A167 and west of the East Coast</p>

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

						Mainline on the eastern <u>western</u> part of the allocation; and 1,050 dwellings to be delivered on land to the east of the east coast mainline on the eastern part of the allocation with initial phases located on land adjoining Barmpton Lane.
MM55	Policy H10 – Para 3	DBLPMod23, DBLPMod517, DBLPMod193	David Clark, Judith Murray (Whinfield Residents Association), Leanne Carroll	Support	Support the need for a comprehensive masterplan including a phasing plan for infrastructure but objects to different developers not wanting to fully adhere to this. Needs to be properly and clearly worded to avoid any doubts or misunderstanding as to who needs to deliver what and when and to be adhered to by all developers and new home builders wanting to deliver dwellings anywhere on this site.	The need for a comprehensive masterplan including infrastructure phasing plan and it applying to all phases of the Skerningham site is clearly set out in Policy H10 and any applicant will be required to adhere to this.
MM55/ MM73	Policy H10 – Para 3, Policy H10 – Para 6.10.3	DBLPMod527, DBLPMod384, DBLPMod193, DBLPMod625, DBLPMod21	Deborah Holmes, Maj. F Greenhow, Leanne Carroll, Judith Murray, Alan Macnab	Object	Requirement for consultation does not go far enough. It needs to be meaningful and in a way that is convenient for residents. Lack of consultation on Garden Community bid and by Banks raised.	The councils consider the proposed modification is sound in ensuring that the comprehensive masterplan and infrastructure phasing plan shall be prepared in consultation with the community. As set out in MM73 this is to be agreed with the Council in advance of a planning application. In addition, MM73 also sets out that the design code will be prepared in consultation with the community that will be adopted as an SPD. So, there will be a number of opportunities for the local community to engage and be involved in developing the proposed development for Skerningham.
MM55	Policy H10 – Para 3	DNLPMMod721, DBLPMod578, DBLPMod654	Frank Brown, Roger Fitzpatrick – Odahamier, Kim Jackson.	Object	Lack of infrastructure in Whinfield. No connectivity to superfast BT broadband. Concerns raised with regards to installation of superfast broadband for Skerningham development which existing residents are unable to access.	Comments do not directly relate to the proposed modifications. Policy H10 contains appropriate measures to ensure the Skerningham development provides enhancements to or additional infrastructure that is necessary to accommodate the additional need it generates. Policy IN8 requires new developments to ensure they have broadband connectivity but the upgrading of broadband for existing residents is a separate matter with the service provider out with the scope of the Local Plan.
MM55	Policy H10 – Para 3	DBLPMod539	Chris Bowey	Object	Believe the time for a comprehensive master plan has been and gone and should have been included in the various consultation events which have taken place during the plan review period.	The proposed timing for the production of the comprehensive masterplan is considered appropriate and proportionate once the certainty of allocation has been established. A wide range of evidence has been gathered to support the proposed allocation and the accompanying masterplan frameworks.
MM55	Policy H10 – Para 3	DBLPMod665	Skerningham Estates	Support	Modification MM55 is justified and will be effective in providing clarity relating to the preparation of the Comprehensive Masterplan, Infrastructure Phasing Plan and Design Code.	Noted
MM55	Policy H10 – Para 3	DBLPMod695	Banks Property	Object	At the beginning of the third paragraph we would suggest ‘ Comprehensive masterplans ’ as opposed to ‘ A comprehensive masterplan ’ to reflect the fact that two planning applications are likely to be submitted on different parts of the site. Paragraph 129 of the recently updated NPPF (July 2021) states that landowners and developers may choose to prepare design codes in support of a planning application for sites they wish to develop. Suggest a further amendment to the third paragraph to highlight that the applicant may choose to prepare a design code to be reviewed by the council as part of the consideration of any planning application; <i>The masterplan shall be led by the applicant(s) and should be based on the design approach and principles established in the developers Design Code and/or the Council’s Design Code, a strong understanding of the characteristics of the site,</i>	The Council do not consider it appropriate to amend the reference from a ‘comprehensive masterplan’ to ‘comprehensive masterplans’. It is considered justified and effective to require a single comprehensive masterplan and infrastructure phasing plan to be produced for the site to ensure a cohesive development is delivered along with the coordinated provision of infrastructure and housing development. This requirement does not preclude multiple planning applications being brought forward for different parts of the site. It is important that a coordinated approach is taken on a Design Code for Skerningham hence why the policy is worded as it is. We do not consider the modification suggested necessary.

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

					<i>and its surrounds and adopt the Healthy New Town approach to site design incorporate the key principles for the development as set out in points a to j below. To ensure that a cohesive development is delivered at Skerningham, the Council will only approve planning applications that adhere with the comprehensive masterplan, and a design code the Council's design code and deliver the necessary local and strategic infrastructure at the appropriate phase of the development identified in the infrastructure phasing plan to support the coordinated provision of infrastructure and housing development.</i>	
MM56	Policy H10 – Part a	DBLPMod385, DBLPMod21	Maj. F Greenhow, Alan Macnab	Object	Question how the 20% allocation for affordable housing and self-building will be enforced.	The Council will seek the affordable housing and self-build requirements consistent with the provisions of local and national policy.
MM56	Policy H10 – Part a	DBLPMod666	Skerningham Estates	Support	supports the proposed modifications as they will provide precision on the requirements of the development.	Noted
MM57	Policy H10 – Part b	DBLPMod666	Skerningham Estates	Support	supports the proposed modifications as they will provide precision on the requirements of the development.	Noted
MM58	Policy H10 – part c	DBLPMod386, DBLPMod21	Maj. F Greenhow, Alan Macnab	Object	Existing walking and cycling facilities in Skerningham should be retained rather than providing new ones.	Policy H10 part c and the masterplan frameworks ensure existing rights of way are incorporated in to and enhanced by the proposed development.
MM59	Policy H10 – part d	DBLPMod387, DBLPMod21	Maj. F Greenhow, Alan Macnab	Object	There will be a great need for the right educational facilities along with GP and Dental surgeries that need to be incorporated into the Skerningham Site Allocation. National shortage of GP's not recognised by the plan.	Parts b and d of Policy H10 will ensure sufficient educational, GP and dentist facilities are provided by the development to accommodate the additional need it generates.
MM59	Policy H10 – Part d	DBLPMod667	Skerningham Estates	Support	MM59 includes changes to part d of the policy which sets out the requirements in terms of education provision within the allocation. Additional text has been included with regards to the timing of the delivery within the plan period (and beyond), locations within the site and also the need to keep capacity within existing local schools under review.	Noted
MM60	Policy H10 – part e	DBLPMod21	Alan Macnab	Support	Supported.	Noted
MM61	Policy H10 – part f	See appendix B	See appendix B	Object	Roads are heavily congested, improved detail required regarding the mitigation works for Barmpton Lane/Whinbush Way and the A1150 including access and egress points to provide consistency with the NPPF that impacts are shown to be addressed. Increased pollution/ co2 levels. Concerned over increase levels of traffic on Barmpton Lane and highlighting the top of the lane is a narrow country road that joins a 'S' bend that leads onto Whinbush Way, which is already a bottleneck, and nothing can be done to upgrade.	Additional detail on mitigation will be developed as part of the ongoing master planning work and subsequent supporting information with a planning application which would include a transport assessment.
MM61	Policy H10 – part g	DBLPMod541	Chris Bowey	Object	Concerned regarding the feasibility of upgrading Barmpton Lane when the Council has advised for many years not even possible to add in a footpath.	There are options being examined in more detail to provide a footpath. This could include a footpath not immediately adjacent to the highway. Precise details will be developed and considered in due course.
MM61	Policy H10 – part g	DBLPMod669	Skerningham Estates	Support	The proposed modification will ensure that the policy will be effective in requiring an appropriate assessment of the development (and mitigation) in relation to its impact on the highway network.	Noted
MM61/ MM62	Policy H10 – part f & g	DBLPMod697	David Taylor	Object	The proposed local distributor road between the A167 and A1150 fails to address the projected increase in traffic from Skerningham and from the A1 to Amazon, Teesside Freeport and Teesside International airport. Skerningham should be removed.	Robust traffic modelling has been provided to accompany the submitted local plan demonstrating sufficient mitigation can be provided to 2030 with subsequent reviews of the plan monitoring if further measures are required.
MM62	Policy H10 – Part g	DBLPMod696	Banks Property	Object	From a design and construction perspective, until such time as the bridge crossing is programmed for delivery, we do not believe that the last section of embankment and road should be delivered on the western side of the railway	The policy approach identified in the local plan is considered sound to ensure the bridge crossing can be delivered in a timely fashion linked to supporting evidence undertaken on traffic modelling. It does not

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

					<p>line. The building of the last part of the road and full embankment should be built concurrently with the bridge structure. By building up to the primary development access point, a degree of 'flex' is provided for the last part of the road which can be fixed upon the detailed bridge design being finalised. This would not be the case if it was built in its entirety. As the embankment will also tie in with the bridge structure, through the integrated design of the bridge abutment and vehicle restraint systems on approach to the structure itself, caution should be made as to how far the embankment is progressed at an early stage to ensure no abortive works are undertaken in the construction of the embankment.</p> <p>The proposed amendment to 'safeguarding' provides certainty that the road infrastructure leading to the bridge will be delivered at the correct time to tie in with the detailed design and construction of the bridge structure.</p> <p><i>Prior to the completion of the development to the west of the allocation boundary (between the A167 and East Coast Mainline) the remaining section of the local distributor road to the East Coast Mainline shall be safeguarded delivered.</i></p>	<p>stipulate precisely who delivers the remaining section of road to the East Coast Mainline and this can be agreed at a later stage. Timing of the delivery of the bridge crossing will be monitored and considered in subsequent plan reviews throughout the plan period.</p>
MM62	Policy H10 – Part g	DBLPMod23, DBLPMod542	David Clark, Chris Bowey	Support	<p>The Link road up to the railway and the Western side of the embankment should be agreed to be delivered by the 600 dwellings site at Beaumont Hill before a planning application is approved through an infrastructure phasing plan to ensure key infrastructure elements are put in place.</p>	<p>Delivery of the internal link road is essential to the Skerningham development and it is considered there are sufficient controls in place to ensure this happens. The policy is one mechanism but legal agreements associated with planning applications will also have a role. Whilst early delivery of the link would not be discouraged modelling evidence indicates the crossing becomes necessary between the 900th and 1500th dwelling across the Skerningham site.</p>
MM62	Policy H10 – Part g	DBLPMod378	Miss Leanne Carroll	Object	<p>Wording needs tightening up to stop what should be a cohesive development becoming a free-for-all piecemeal one. The rail bridge cannot be an afterthought, or something left to squabble over because the existing infrastructure on the eastern part of the allocation won't cope without it.</p>	<p>Delivery of the internal link road is essential to the Skerningham development and it is considered there are sufficient controls in place to ensure this happens. The policy is one mechanism but legal agreements associated with planning applications will also have a role.</p>
MM62	Policy H10 – Part g	DBLPMod575	Roger Fitzpatrick - Odahamier	Object	<p>Concerned as to the co-ordination and delivery of the necessary infrastructure for the Skerningham Development. This is particularly related to the section of the development to be delivered by Banks.</p> <p>Comment suggests that Banks have said, in a recent public consultation event with the public, that their development does not require the same access requirements as Skerningham and that their development is an urban extension which can come forward without the rest of Skerningham being approved.</p> <p>Comment questions how, if there is no co-ordinated provision for infrastructure, how the Banks development will access the neighbourhood and schools?</p> <p>Suggests the Local Plan must be clear who is responsible for providing the appropriate infrastructure and the infrastructure phasing plan.</p>	<p>Delivery of the internal link road is essential to the Skerningham development and it is considered there are sufficient controls in place to ensure this happens. The policy is one mechanism but legal agreements associated with planning applications will also have a role in ensuring timely delivery of necessary infrastructure.</p>
MM62	Policy H10 – Part g	DBLPMod457	Bruce McKnight	Object	<p>The construction of a 'local distribution road,' between the Little Burdon roundabout and the A167, which is intimately linked with the Skerningham would represent an entirely unwelcome blot on the landscape in the area of locally valued countryside.</p>	<p>Design and visual impact of the local distributor road will require further consideration as part of the planning application process.</p>
MM62	Policy H10 – part g	DBLPMod533	Bellway & Story Homes (Barton Willmore)	Object	<p>A roundabout between the Great Burdon and Skerningham sites is not justified or effective. There is no evidence to suggest that a roundabout to serve the sites can be delivered. Implications for access and phasing a concern.</p>	<p>The council considers a roundabout would be suitable in this location in principle but as the final paragraph of Policy H10 part g states 'precise details of the road and development access points, together with a timetable for its implementation, shall be agreed with the</p>

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

						Council as part of the comprehensive masterplan, infrastructure phasing plan and any future planning applications for the site.' This acknowledges further consideration of detail is required when available.
MM62	Policy H10 – Part g	DBLPMod671	Skerningham Estates	Support	The added text provides further detail on the development within the early phases of implementation and the associated access points. With regards to our client's element of the site, the policy, as modified, will ensure that the length of distributor road between Barmpton Lane and Bishopton Lane will be delivered prior to the occupation of the 450th dwelling and possibly sooner subject to further assessment. Given the context of the assessments which have been undertaken to date by the Council and the site promoters, the changes would ensure the policy is precise in requiring further information to be detailed in the comprehensive masterplan and infrastructure phasing plan.	Noted
MM63	Policy H10 – part I	DBLPMod353, DBLPMod537	David Clark, Leanne Carroll	Object	Concerns that the strip of road shaped green infrastructure shown on Appendix B Skerningham Masterplan with Golf Club in Situ that is currently part of Darlington Golf Club land will be used as access road on to Whinbush Way.	Noted. Detailed landscaping proposals will be developed as part of the ongoing master planning work and ultimately considered in detail at planning application stage.
MM64	Policy H10 Part I ii	DBLPMod672	Skerningham Estates	Support	This modification is justified and will be effective in securing environmental enhancements as may be required.	Noted
MM65	Policy H10 Part I iii	DBLPMod674	Skerningham Estates	Support	This change is welcomed, and it aligns with our client's intentions to extend the area which has previously been made available for the community to access and enjoy.	Noted
MM65/ MM66	Policy H10 – Part I iii & iv	See Appendix C	See Appendix C	Object	Publicly accessible community woodland, wildlife friendly spaces, sport and recreational facilities already exist in Whinfield and Skerningham. Why can these not be incorporated into the development rather than being destroyed to make way for it such as the relocation of the golf course.	The masterplan frameworks illustrate that consistent with policies ENV3, ENV4 and ENV7 that existing green infrastructure will be incorporated within the layout and enhanced or replaced where this is not possible.
MM65	Policy H10 – Part I iii	DBLPMod353, DBLPMod570, DBLPMod544	Mr David Clark, Alan Hutchinson, Chris Bowey	Object	Told by the developers a new community woodland will be planted to the East of the Hutton plantation, but this is on top of the landfill site that has many above the ground breather pipes to allow the toxic gases to be released from underground. Would this net gain of publicly accessible woodland really offer the public a safe environment bearing in mind there was an underground fire in the landfill site in 2007 also if the Darlington Northern link Road (DNLR) is funded and built the developer has plans to put a link road through this area so it would become even less safe of attractive to wildlife and humans. Simply planting more trees is not the answer. The location of the trees and the accessibility are important to ensure the public can access them.	The location of any additional community woodland will be considered in consultation with the community through the comprehensive masterplanning process.
MM66	Policy H10 – Part I iv	DBLPMod353	David Clark	Object	Concerns regarding green space maintenance charges that will be applied to future residents.	This will be a matter for the planning application stage and the developer.
MM66	Policy H10 – Part I iv	DBLPMod390, DBLPMod451, DBLPMod21, DBLPMod459	Maj. F Greenhow, David Boyd, Alan Macnab, Bruce McKnight	Object	No need to create what already exists and will be destroyed. These should be incorporated into the development.	The creation of green infrastructure will include the retention and enhancement of what already exists.
MM66	Policy H10 – Part I iv	DBLPMod546	Chris Bowey	Object	main issue here is that the current proposal shows that the inner link road will run right through the allocation which has the effect of severing the development and creating a division. From a user perspective i think this goes against the garden community principles in which the setting should be well designed and accessible.	The masterplan frameworks illustrate that existing and proposed pedestrian and cycle routes will be required to have access over the internal distributor road.
MM67	Policy H10 – Part I vii	DBLPMod675	Skerningham Estates	Support	Consistent with the discussions during the relevant examination hearing sessions, the changes in this regard will ensure the Local Plan is flexible in relation to the relocation of the Golf Club.	Noted

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

MM67	Policy H10 – Part I vii	DBLPMod353, DBLPMod391, DBLPMod21, DBLPMod380, DBLPMod418	David Clark, Maj. F Greenhow, Alan Macnab, Alex Swainston, William Wallis	Object	The potential relocation of the golf club contradicts MM148 ENV7 part D iii which states new development will be expected to retain existing woodlands.	Policy ENV7 part D iii applies to the Skerningham and any proposal developed through the comprehensive masterplan incorporating the relocation of the golf course would need to comply with this by retaining existing woodland or providing suitable replacement benefits where the benefits are considered to outweigh the loss.
MM68	Policy H10 – part i x	DBLPMod551	Chris Bowey	Object	more detail is needed on definitions and acknowledgement is required that the openness/separation is broken by the inner road and its location to the rural gap.	This requirement should be read in conjunction with Policy ENV3 where further detailed requirements regarding rural gaps is set out. The proposed distributor road is located outside of and not adjacent to the rural gap but consideration will need to be made through the comprehensive master planning process.
MM68	Policy H10 – part i x	DBLPMod676	Skerningham Estates	Support	This change will provide consistency with the requirements of Policy ENV3 (and the associated modifications to this policy).	Noted
MM68	Policy H10 – part i x	DBLPMod21	Alan Macnab	Object	Rural gaps between Darlington and the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton welcomed. Further gaps needed at the southern end of the proposed Skerningham along Green Lane bridleway and to the north of Sparrow Hall Drive and on Barmpton Lane.	The primary purpose of rural gaps is to maintain the separation and distinctive character of existing settlements and rural gaps in these locations would not fulfil these criteria.
MM69	Policy H10 – Last para within Policy text	DBLPMod810	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM69	Policy H10 – Last para within Policy text	DBLPMod392	Maj. F Greenhow	Support	It is pleasing to read this statement in which it says there will be respect, preservation and protection of heritage assets which exists in Skerningham.	Noted
MM69	Policy H10 – Last para within Policy text	DBLPMod548	Chris Bowey	Object	Concerned how the inner distribution road running <100 meters from assets mentioned in the heritage asset report (SD30) including Elly Hill preserves or enhances these assets. Believes heritage assessment needs to be updated to take account of significant changes to the allocation such as golf course ambiguity.	The HIA is broad and considers the impact of development across the whole site in relation to the significance of heritage assets and therefore does not need updating. The modification is considered sound in ensuring proposals will be required to conserve, and where appropriate enhance designated and non-designated heritage assets within and in the vicinity of the site including their setting in accordance with policy ENV1.
MM75	Policy H10 – paragraph 6.10.5	DBLPMod209, DBLPMod403, DBLPMod367, DBLPMod413, DBLPMod395, DBLPMod490, DBLPMod577, DBLPMod72, DBLPMod372, DBLPMod519, DBLPMod628, DBLPMod743	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), Ken Walton, Kathleen Keogan, Ann Rudkin, Maj. F Greenhow, Tyler Nixon, Roger Fitzpatrick – Odahamier, Simone Hope, David Phillips, Judith Murray (Whinfield Residents), Darlington FOE (Kendra Ulliyart)	Object	The Plan should not make provision for the revised version of the Skerningham scheme, without the relocation of the golf course. This would constitute a series of sprawling and disconnected car-dependent pockets of development without cohesion or functionality and lack of a clear neighbourhood centre.	As this proposed modification sets out it is the Councils preference for the development of the proposed Skerningham allocation to incorporate the relocation of the golf course. However, if this is not possible then this alternative masterplan framework demonstrates that a sustainable, functioning and well-connected development can still take place with a range of sustainable transport connections and centrally located neighbourhood centre and services.
MM75	Policy H10 – paragraph 6.10.5	DBLPMod519	Judith Murray (Whinfield Residents)	Object	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 is marginal.	The Councils Viability Assessment (DBC24) relating to the golf club remaining in situ demonstrates this scenario is viable.
MM75	Policy H10 – paragraph 6.10.5	DBLPMod572, DBLPMod549	Alan Hutchinson, Chris Bowey	Object	The use of the word “potential” in relation to the relocation of Darlington Golf Club introduces into the Plan an element of doubt and uncertainty as to whether this might happen. The use of such imprecise language should have no place in a Local Plan, which should set out exactly what is going to happen without “ifs and buts” and ambiguity of any kind.	This modification is considered effective in ensuring the plan is flexible and adaptable to ensure the allocation can still be brought forward should the golf course not be relocated as envisaged.

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

MM76	Policy H10 – para 6.10.5	DBLPMod396, DBLPMod21	Maj. F Greenhow, Alan Macnab	Object	Reduction in units from 1,850 to 1,650 suggests that the Skerningham development is not needed at all.	This modification has been proposed to reflect a change made to Policy H2 prior to the submission of the plan to take account of the updated delivery trajectory for the site for the plan period.
MM77	Policy H10 para 6.10.5	DBLPMod21, DBLPMod397	Alan Macnab, Maj. F Greenhow	Object	The presumption that additional housing will be provided beyond the maximum number of homes in the plan period is alarming and suggests that urban sprawl will put increasing pressure on an already overstretched infrastructure over and above the current proposals.	This modification ensures that prior to additional homes over above the 1,650 planned for during the plan period being brought forward that a review of all associated infrastructure requirements is undertaken to ensure the delivery and appropriate phasing of required infrastructure.
MM81	Policy H10 para 6.10.11	DBLPMod558	Leanne Carroll	Object	The preferred approach for the development of the Skerningham site is for the golf club to be relocated so the plan is literally looking to BUILD UPON the local green infrastructure assets already here! The community woodland is a large nature reserve/SNCI but could have a big chunk of it taken away to put in a golf course even though the NPPF 179(a) says that wildlife-rich habitats should be safeguarded.	As set out in part I viii of Policy H10 the proposal is required to mitigate impact on biodiversity and achieve net gains to be consistent with Policy ENV7.
MM81	Policy H10 para 6.10.11	DBLPMod547	Chris Bowey	Object	The plans behind this development are insufficiently prepared given it has come to light at this late stage in the process that the golf club might not want to move location. This should have been considered and agreed in advance through a memorandum of understanding or similar.	The approach proposed is considered to be justified and effective in ensuring the plan is flexible and adaptable to ensure the allocation can still be brought forward should the golf course not be relocated as envisaged.
MM82	Policy H10 – para 6.10.12	DBLPMod353, DBLPMod543, DBLPMod557	David Clark, Leanne Carroll, Terry Binks	Object	More clarification as to where adjacent to the river the additional woodland it is referring to is to be provided as most of the community woodland is already adjacent to the River Skerne.	This further detail can be provided through the comprehensive masterplan.
MM82	Policy H10 – para 6.10.12	DBLPMod684	Amanda Meeks	Object	The reference to offsetting losses due to a potential relocation of the golf course is unsound. An established, biodiverse area cannot be offset and requires protection.	As set out in part I viii of Policy H10 the proposal is required to mitigate impact on biodiversity and achieve net gains to be consistent with Policy ENV7. This section refers directly to total area of woodland rather than offsetting biodiversity impact.
MM81/ MM82	Policy H10 - para 6.10.11 & 6.10.12	DBLPMod697, DBLPMod186	David Taylor, Alison Jermy	Object	The proposed “Landscaping” and creation of habitat corridors does not mitigate for the destruction of the existing natural environment which will never be replaced. Skerningham should be removed.	As set out in part I viii of Policy H10 the proposal is required to mitigate impact on biodiversity and achieve net gains to be consistent with Policy ENV7.
MM84	Policy H11 – paragraph 3	DBLPMod212, DBLPMod776	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), Christine Fishwick	Object	Modifications do not go far enough to address concerns regarding the design and layout of the scheme, which seems likely to generate a low-density, car-dependent development. Consider this site to be sequentially preferable to the Skerningham site, because of the latter’s particular importance for landscape and recreation, and because of its lack of connectivity.	The proposed modifications are considered to be adequate in ensuring measures are in place to secure an appropriate and sustainable design and layout can be achieved which prioritises sustainable modes of transport.
MM93	Policy H11 – policy wording – final para.	DBLPMod811	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM102	Policy H11 – 6.11.11	DBLPMod424	Hellens & Homes England	Support	The following appears to have been missed from the proposed wording after 24ha “(net) of employment land”.	Agreed, the modification should read ‘24 <u>net hectares of employment land</u> in the Local Plan to 2036.
MM105	Policy E1 – Table 7.2	DBLPMod856	CPRE	Object	address changes to the Use Classes Order but our representations relating to Teesside Airport have not been addressed.	The Council maintains that the approach to the suggested uses at Teesside Airport is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
MM108	Policy E2 – Table 7.3	DBLPMod856	CPRE	Object	address changes to the Use Classes Order but our representations relating to Teesside Airport have not been addressed.	The Council maintains that the approach to the suggested uses at Teesside Airport is justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
MM108	Policy E2 – Table 7.3	DBLPMod425	Hellens & Homes England	Support	modifications regarding Greater Faverdale to reference E(g), B2 and B8 uses as acceptable for the employment element of the allocation are supported and ensure a sound plan with consistent references between H11 and E2.	Support noted

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

MM110	Policy E4 – policy wording	DBLPMod812	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM115	Policy TC3 – policy wording – Part A	DBLPMod813	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM116	Policy TC4 - policy wording – para 2	DBLPMod857	CPRE	Object	modifications are proposed to reflect the new Use Classes Order but there is nothing to reflect the representations CPRE made about District and Local Centres.	The Council set out its reasoning for the approach proposed regarding District and Local Centres in our written matters and issues statement and verbally at the hearings.
MM117	Policy TC4 - policy wording – last para	DBLPMod858	CPRE	Object	While we accept this modification for its intended purpose, it does not reflect the important point that a number of centres which should qualify as District or Local Centres are not included.	The Council set out its reasoning for the approach proposed regarding District and Local Centres in our written matters and issues statement and verbally at the hearings.
MM118	Policy TC5 – policy wording	DBLPMod426	Hellens & Homes England	Support	support the exemption of retail and leisure development which is identified within Local Plan policies from impacts testing.	Support noted
MM119	Policy TC5 – para 8.2.6	DBLPMod427, DBLPMod689	Hellens & Homes England, Banks Property	Support	The additional text at 8.2.6 is also supported	Support noted
MM122	Policy TC6 – policy wording – Part B	DBLPMod814	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM123	Policy ENV1 – policy wording - paragraph 1	DBLPMod815	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM123	Policy ENV1 – policy wording - paragraph 1 – 1st sentence	DBLPMod859	CPRE	Object	Welcome MM 123 which addresses the point made about the number of heritage sites in Darlington. However, note it still does not reflect the statutory duty imposed by the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The NPPF of course has to be read to accord with this statutory duty.	The Council considers that the policy as proposed enables it to fulfil its statutory duties imposed by the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990) in conjunction with the requirements of NPPF. Policy ENV1 modifications are supported by Historic England (DBLPMod815).
MM124	Policy ENV1 – policy wording – part B	DBLPMod816	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM125	Policy ENV1 – policy wording – part B – para 3	DBLPMod817	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM126	Policy ENV1 – Policy wording – Part D	DBLPMod818	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

MM126	Policy ENV1 – Policy wording – Part D	DBLPMod428	Hellens & Homes England	Support	Supportive of the proposed removal of the text identified within the consultation documents. However, the use of the term “undermines” is additional to simple test set out in national policy and adds some uncertainty as to the definition of what “undermines” the significance and whether that is any different from “harming” the significance. In order to avoid any interpretation that this policy seeks to achieve something in addition to national policy this policy could be further enhanced by removing this reference.	This could generate additional uncertainty so the Council would be agreeable to the removal of the term “undermines” so Part D would read as follows “ Proposals which would remove <u>or</u> harm or undermine the significance of a non-designated heritage asset will only be permitted where the benefits are considered to outweigh the harm”.
MM127	Policy ENV1 – Policy wording – Part F & Para 9.1.28	DBLPMod819	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM128	Policy ENV1 Para 9.1.24 pg 34	DBLPMod820	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM128	Policy ENV1 Para 9.1.24 pg 34	DBLPMod341	Dr David Mason (Durham County Archeology)	Object	The proposed modification would negate the intended purpose of this policy which is to identify previously unknown archaeology. Desk-based assessment by itself would reveal nothing about the archaeological potential of such areas because they are areas which have not previously produced evidence for the presence of archaeology. Suggested approach is that outside of the identified Areas of High Archaeological Potential, Durham County Council take the approach that desk-based assessment and field evaluation (consisting of geophysical survey followed up by trial-trenching) is required for all development proposals affecting an area of 1 hectare or more, unless it is known to have been archaeologically sterilised by previous development.	The Council understands the concerns raised and would be willing to support the amendment to the proposed modification should it be considered necessary to ensure the policy is sound.
MM129	Policy ENV2 – policy wording – para 3	DBLPMod15, DBLPMod829	Friends of Stockton and Darlington Railway (Ross Chisholm), Historic England	Support	Support for proposed modification	Noted.
MM130	Policy ENV3 – Policy wording	DBLPMod41	MSG Parish Council	Object	Support the reference to rural gaps between Middleton St George and Middleton One Row as well as between Middleton St George and Oak tree, we consider there is confusion over the conflict of terminology used within the local plan compared to the neighbourhood plan and also over the boundaries. To ensure clarity, we feel as a minimum, the boundary of the rural gap between Middleton St George and Middleton One Row should reflect that within the neighbourhood plan. It should extend eastwards and that this is reflected clearly in the policy wording and on the policies map.	The Council agrees that the use of differing terminology for designations could cause confusion and responded to the recent regulation 16 consultation on the MSG Neighbourhood Plan to this effect. It is considered that the Local Plans use of the term rural gap rather than the Neighbourhood Plans use of the term green wedge is more appropriate for these designations given their main purpose is to retain the separation between the built areas. As set out previously the Council do not consider extending the rural gap between Middleton St George and Middleton One Row is required to fulfil the rural gap’s purpose.
MM132	Policy ENV3 – Para 9.3.5	DBLPMod751	Darlington FOE (Kendra Ulliyart)	Object	Want the section on Local Green Space proposed for removal retaining.	This section has been removed because it was incorrectly located in Policy ENV3. Policy ENV6 covers Local Green Spaces including the content of this paragraph.
MM133	Policy ENV4– Para 9.4.3-9.4.6	DBLPMod9, DBLPMod214, DBLPMod49, DBLPMod415, DBLPMod559, DBLPMod778, DBLPMod742	David Clark, Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), MSG Parish Council, William Wallis, Colin Raine, Christine Fishwick, Darlington FOE (Kendra Ulliyart)	Object	The Green Corridors should be properly defined on the map as polygons rather than dotted green lines. The precise dimensions of each corridor should be shown, so that there is a definitive answer to the question of whether a feature lies within a corridor or not.	The proposed modification to remove reference to the measurements of the green corridor buffer zones is to ensure the policy is effective by recognising that the corridors are distinct, and the widths will vary along their length depending on its qualities, characteristics and surroundings. Applying a single width measurement to all corridors would potentially result in important characteristics not being protected by the policy. Equally it would be disproportionate to

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

						<p>exactly measure every metre over every corridor as the depth of features could vary significantly from one 10 metre section to another. Policy EN4 a and b are considered to appropriately protect green corridors and clearly set out that green corridors must be maintained and incorporated into any development proposals as well as setting out the characteristics that development proposals should preserve and enhance.</p> <p>The Council considers the corridors are sufficiently defined with the location clearly illustrated on the proposals map. The dotted lines have been used to distinguish the green corridors from other designations in the policies maps and ensure they are clearly visible where they overlay other layers. It is no indication regarding their level of protection which is set out in Policy ENV4.</p>
MM133	Policy ENV4– Para 9.4.3-9.4.6	DBLPMod357	LC&M Parish Council (Jo-Anne Garrick)	Object	Amend policy ENV4 or the relevant supporting text to highlight that green infrastructure assets can also be identified within neighbourhood plans.	It is not considered necessary to modify the policy ENV4 or its supporting text as proposed as paragraph 9.4.3 sets out the broad types of green infrastructure and part g of policy ENV4 how it will be protected. In addition, neighbourhood plans form part of the Local planning framework so any assets formally identified within them will be taken account of in the decision-making process.
MM135	Policy ENV4 - policy wording parts a and b	DBLPMod534	Bellway & Story Homes (Barton Willmore)	Support	Support modification.	Support noted
MM139	Policy ENV5 – policy wording – paragraphs 2 and 3	DBLPMod215	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis)	Support	Pleased to see the change in wording regarding green infrastructure, involving the removal of a typology of GI which did not accord with the GI Strategy, the Planning Obligations SPD or national policy and guidance.	Support noted
MM144	Policy ENV7 – policy wording – para 7	DBLPMod42	MSG Parish Council	Object	<p>The biodiversity of sites must be given the utmost protection, and this should be reflected in the Plan by appropriately robust language.</p> <p>It would therefore be better to say: “Where development proposals come forward within the areas listed below, they must support the achievement of the specific actions identified...” (or similar).</p>	The Council considers the language used is sufficiently robust and consistent with national policy. It also continues the use of encourage as previously proposed in parts a and b.
MM148	Policy ENV7 – Policy Wording - D (iii)	DBLPMod358, DBLPMod681	David Clark, Alan Macnab	Support	<p>Support for the modified policy however objection to the felling of Skertingham Community Woodland trees to relocate the golf course.</p> <p>A range of further objections are made in relation to the Skertingham allocation and its impact on woodland.</p>	Support noted. Any proposal for the Skertingham site would have to comply with this policy and Policy H10 requires a net gain in community woodland.
MM148	Policy ENV7 – Policy Wording - D (iii)	DBLPMod438	Leanne Carroll	Object	opportunity here to designate Skertingham Community Woodland as a Local Green Space even though it falls within a site allocated for development. The plan is five years old and this community woodland could now be reconsidered as a Local Green Space. There is an either/or option with the Skertingham allocation if it goes ahead - either the golf course moves into the woodland (if members still want that) or it doesn't. It shouldn't. It meets all of the designation criteria and on top of that is a green burial site which I believe makes it worthy of special consideration.	Whilst master planning work is still being developed it is not considered by the council appropriate at this time to consider designating Local Green Spaces in this area. This will be kept under review alongside periodic plan reviews.
MM148	Policy ENV7 – Policy	DBLPMod14, DBLPMod744	David Clark, Darlington FOE (Kendra Ulliyart),	Support/ Object	Support policy but consider policy needs to incorporate protection of hedgerows as well.	No direct reference is made to hedgerows but the wider requirements of Policies ENV7 & ENV8 would apply.

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

	Wording - D (iii)					
MM149	Policy ENV8 – Para 1	DBLPMod17, DBLPMod535	Nick Lightfoot (Natural England), Bellway & Story Homes (Barton Willmore)	Support	Supports the requirement for development proposals to provide net gains for biodiversity. However, this should be strengthened to specify that a minimum of 10% net gains in biodiversity are required. This would better align with the wording of the Environment Act (2021)..	The Council considers the proposed modification is sound and the ‘prevailing with national policy’ reference will enable it to seek 10% net gains consistent with the Environment Act. The Environment Act does leave scope for the percentage requirement to change so this approach gives flexibility to adapt to changes at the national level.
MM149	Policy ENV8 – Policy Wording – Insert new para 1	DBLPMod650	Story Homes (Savills)	Support	Minor amendment proposed to ensure the adopted plan remains consistent with changing national policy, specifically the adopted wording of Section 4 of Schedule 7A of the recently adopted Environment Act 2021. <i>Development proposals will be required to provide net gains in biodiversity (prevailing in national policy) and demonstrate achievement of this using the <u>latest adopted Defra Biodiversity Metric</u>.</i>	The Council considers it is important to clarify that it is the Defra Biodiversity metric which it wishes applicants to use. It is acknowledged that the ‘latest version’ is not referred to in the policy but does not consider this addition is required to ensure the policy is sound.
MM149	Policy ENV8 – Policy Wording – Insert new para 1	DBLPMod373	Alan Macnab	Object	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.	This requirement will apply to the Skerningham development.
MM151	Policy ENV8 - Policy Wording below point 4 & para 9.6.15	DBLPMod652	Story Homes (Savills)	Support	Support modification. Ensures the efficacy of the policy objectives and is consistent with national policy, most notably Schedule 7A, Part 2 of the Environment Act 2021.	Support noted
MM151	Policy ENV8 - Policy Wording below point 4 & para 9.6.15	DBLPMod373	Alan Macnab	Object	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 clearly show that biodiversity, woodland and wildlife habitats which currently exist will be replaced	This requirement will apply to the Skerningham development.
MM153	Policy ENV8 – para 9.6.8	DBLPMod373	Alan Macnab	Object	Supported	Support noted
MM156	Policy IN1 - Part c v	DBLPMod691, DBLPMod862	Banks Property, CPRE	Support	Support modification and removal of reference to northern link road.	Support noted
MM158	Policy IN1 - policy wording - C vii	DBLPMod560, DBLPMod429, DBLPMod692	Bellway & Story Homes (Barton Willmore), Hellens & Homes England, Banks Property	Support	Support modification which provides clarification and ensures the policy is effective.	Support noted.
MM159	Policy IN1 – 10.5.10 & 10.5.11	DBLPMod430	Hellens & Homes England	Support	the revised Figure 10.2 is supported as a sound addition which identifies the infrastructure required to deliver allocation H11 and clarifies the route of the “orbital route” as referenced in the supporting text.	Support noted
MM159	Policy IN1 – 10.5.10 & 10.5.11	DBLPMod218, DBLPMod863	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), CPRE	Support	Support modifications, but the strategy within the Plan, which continues to propose the construction of new roads as a means of dealing with traffic, is not compatible with planning for the climate crisis. Planning should be directed towards reducing the need to travel and encouraging modal shift towards active and public transport.	Support for modification noted.
MM159	Policy IN1 - paragraph	DBLPMod562	Bellway & Story Homes (Barton Willmore)	Object	Concerns raised with the modification. Figure 10.2 implies that the access onto the A1150 from the Great Burdon and Skerningham sites will be at the same	Policy H10 part g makes it clear detail of precise access arrangements to Skerningham require further consideration.

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

	10.5.10 and 10.5.11				<p>point. This is likely to cause implications for the layout to the north of the Great Burdon site particularly if the access locations for the Skertingham site are complicated or delayed.</p> <p>Our clients seek wording which aligns to IN1 C and request the deletion of reference to the Skertingham access road in bullet point 6.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no reference in Appendix B to these connections being required.</p>	The addition of 'and Skertingham Access Roads' to the Bullet point relating to link 'E20' may not be necessary and relates more to the 'N3' link above. The council accepts it could be deleted if necessary.
MM160	Policy IN2 policy wording part b	DBLPMod864	CPRE	Object	Support modification	Support noted
MM161	Policy IN2 – part d	DBLPMod431	Hellens & Homes England	Support	supportive of the amended text within criterion D of Policy IN2 as follows which provides clarity regarding the application of the policy when combined with supporting text as amended via modification M164.	Support noted
MM161	Policy IN2 – part d	DBLPMod221, DBLPMod779	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), Christine Fishwick	Object	Pleased to see the recognition of the need to provide for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport and specific requirement for bus service proximity and frequency. However, do not concede that a bus every 30 minutes constitutes a “regular” public transport service. This is much too infrequent; services of this type are used only by people who have no or little alternatives and are therefore not a feasible means of bringing about modal shift.	A service every 30 minutes has always been considered appropriate for Darlington Borough. Key routes have more frequent service. The council continues to liaise with operators to deliver as good a service as possible.
MM161 - policy wording part d	Policy IN2	DBLPMod522	Josh Plant (Gladman Development Ltd)	Support	Support modification. It is suggested that further flexibility is required in the policy wording that avoids strictly expecting all dwellings to be within a 400-metre distance to a bus stop.	All dwellings are not required to be within 400 metres of a bus stop it is 80% of the dwellings on a site so there is already flexibility built into the policy wording. Text has been modified to change the reference from 80% of the site to 80% of the dwellings on the site which also provides greater flexibility.
MM161 policy wording part d	Policy IN2	DBLPMod376	Taylor Wimpey (ELG)	Object	<p>Objection to criteria d. of policy IN2 as there is nothing in national planning policy to support this requirement and, as such, this element of the policy is not sound. It is envisaged that the suggested 400m requirement has been obtained from the document entitled 'Guidelines for Planning for Public Transport in Developments' published in 1999 by the Institute of Highways and Transportation (IHT) The document makes clear that the distances are guidance and should not be followed slavishly. There is no evidence or research to support the distance.</p> <p>By contrast, another report published by the IHT in 2000, 'Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot', does provide some empirical evidence stating that on average people are prepared to walk 1km and it is an acceptable distance for commuters. In summary, the two IHT documents do not appear to 'marry up'.</p> <p>Given the above, remove requirement and consider each site on its merits.</p>	Representations were made at submission on this issue and it was discussed at examination sessions. The council maintains it's stance that 400m is a well established acceptable walking distance as set out in document DBC1 in response to PQ83.
MM164	Policy IN2 new paragraph between 10.6.5 and 10.6.6	DBLPMod432, DBLPMod693, DBLPMod653	Hellens & Homes England, Banks Property, Story Homes (Savills)	Support	Support modification which identifies other material considerations to be taken into account regarding a sites proximity to existing bus services rather than solely walking distances.	Support noted

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

MM167	Policy IN4 – policy wording – para 3	DBLPMod864	CPRE	Support	Support the encouragement of cycle parking and showering facilities etc	Support noted
MM167	Policy IN4 – policy wording – para 3	DBLPMod222, DBLPMod780	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), Christine Fishwick	Object	The Plan should invoke the most recent, and the highest-level, guidance on cycle infrastructure and facilities for cyclists, namely LTN 1/20. It should state that where there is a conflict between the standards in local and national guidance, the most stringent standards should be preferred.	It is not considered appropriate for the plan to implement specific national design guidance (which could change over the duration of the plan). This matter will be picked up on in the review of the Tees Valley Highway Design Guide.
MM169	Policy IN9 – Policy wording – para 1 and part a	DBLPMod223, DBLPMod831	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis), Historic England	Support	Support modifications	Support noted
MM169	Policy IN9 – Policy wording – para 1 and part a	DBLPMod865	CPRE	Object	Policy IN 9 includes a number of criteria and refers to shadow flicker and visual dominance. We represent that consideration must now be given to noise as well and the Policy should be amended to reflect the following as criteria - Residential amenity, including noise, shadow flicker and overwhelming living conditions - visual dominance, both from residential properties and public locations as well as the other criteria listed	It is acknowledged that Policy IN9 doesn't directly refer to noise or residential amenity. However, proposals would be considered against the Local Plan as a whole and Policy DC4: Safeguarding Amenity does include these considerations.
MM170	Policy IN9 paragraph 10.11.1	DBLPMod865	CPRE	Object	We are very concerned about the whole of the Borough being identified as suitable for wind energy. We represent that there are clearly areas of the Borough which cannot be suitable for this sort of development. We therefore represent that this proposed modification is not sound.	The proposed modification establishes that in principle the whole of the Borough is suitable for wind energy development however this is subject to proposals complying with the detailed criteria set out in part a.
MM170	Policy IN9 paragraph 10.11.1	DBLPMod223	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis)	Support	Support modifications	Support noted
MM174	Chapter 11 Monitoring Framework	DBLPMod832	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM175	Glossary	DBLPMod842	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM176	Glossary	DBLPMod843	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM176	Glossary	DBLPMod473	Nigel Swinbank (Ward Hadaway)	Object	The definition of 'Entry-level exception sites' in the glossary should reference paragraph 72 in the NPPF, not paragraph 71.	Agreed, minor alteration to NPPF paragraph reference required.
MM179	Site 20 Great Burdon – part d	DBLPMod566	Bellway & Story Homes (Barton Willmore)	Support	Support modification.	Support noted.
MM180	Site 20 Great Burdon – part l	DBLPMod567	Bellway & Story Homes (Barton Willmore)	Support	Support modification.	Support noted.
MM181	Site 20 Great Burdon - Parts O and P	DBLPMod569	Bellway & Story Homes (Barton Willmore)	Support	Support modification.	Support noted.
MM182	Site 41 Coniscliffe Park South - Parts e and i	DBLPMod377	Taylor Wimpey (ELG)	Support	Support modification. Commentary provided with regards to criteria c, e, i and j in terms of how the outstanding planning application addresses these issues and requirements.	Support noted.

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

MM182 and MM185	Site 41 Coniscliffe Park South - Parts e and i	DBLPMod787	Darlington FOE (Kendra Ulliyart)	Object	Objection to principle of Coniscliffe Park North and South Developments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on biodiversity • 10% net gain required • No mitigation for farmland birds Baydale Beck and Ancient Woodland should be protected.	The comments do not relate to the modification. However, the Council considers that the Coniscliffe Park sites are suitable and sustainable locations for development as justified by the supporting evidence base, including the SA (CD03), HELAA (SD10) and Spatial Distribution of Development topic paper. The sites are required to meet quantitative and qualitative housing needs. The plan should also be read as a whole and there are a number of other policies which ensure the protection and enhancement of the natural environment.
MM182	Site 41 – Coniscliffe Park South – Part i	DBLPMod363	LC&M Parish Council	Object	Amend to read: “ <u>Significant</u> landscaping should be provided as part of the development of scheme, <u>particularly</u> on the western boundary with the adjoining Local Green Space (ref LGS14 Merrybent Community Woodland) and with the agricultural land to the north. <u>This should ensure a rural gap is maintained between the main urban area and the rural villages of Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent.</u> ”	The modification proposed is sound. The wording (appropriate landscaping) is considered appropriate and effective. A rural gap designation is not proposed by the Council between the main urban area and the villages of Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent, consequently the final suggested change is not appropriate. The Local Green Space proposed (LGS14) and the A1(M) does however provide some separation.
MM185	Site 249 Coniscliffe Park North - Parts e and i	DBLPMod523	Josh Plant (Gladman Development Ltd)	Support	Support modification. They provide presentational and technical clarity alongside consistency in the housing delivery figures.	Support noted.
MM185	Site 249 – Coniscliffe Park – Part e	DBLPMod362	LC&M Parish Council	Object	Amend to read: “... A robust and significantly landscaped boundary would also be required along the western edge of the site to distinguish between the main urban area and surrounding countryside.”	The modification proposed is sound. The wording (suitable and robust landscape buffer) is considered appropriate and effective.
MM187	Site 356 – Ingenium Parc – Policy Wording – Para 1	DBLPMod844	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM188	Site 356 – Ingenium Parc – Part e	DBLPMod845	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM190	Site 392 – Elm Tree Farm – part b	DBLPMod224	Darlington Green Party (Jo Ellis)	Object	The policy should continue to require the retention of older farm buildings on the Elm Tree Farm site. This seems not to be compatible with policy aspirations elsewhere to protect non-designated heritage assets.	There is no statutory protection on these farm buildings and they are not classed as non-designated heritage assets. Consequently, the criteria have been removed. The re-use of vacant buildings is still however encouraged in the NPPF.
MM190	Site 392 – Elm Tree Farm – part b	DBLPMod655	Kevin Ayrton (ELG) for Barratt Homes	Support	Adds to previous comments to say 150 yield should be higher. Supportive of removal of criteria b, d, f, welcomes modifications to c. Considers site 392 as amended to be fully justified, consistent with policy and sound, although effectiveness could be improved with changes outlined.	Support noted. Yields are indicative and this is outlined in the plan.
MM190	Site 392 – Elm Tree Farm – part b	DBLPMod866	John Atkinson	Object	Site 392 should be removed and Sparrow Hall Drive green space given Local Green Space designation and site replaced with Site 21 Elm Tree Farm. Sets out a range of considerations that should be made if the site continues to be included in the Plan.	Objection against site 392 noted. The site at Sparrow Hall Drive was considered for Local Green Space Designation but failed to meet the criteria. See document SD28 - Site LGS08.
MM191	Site 403 – Blackwell Grange East	DBLPMod846	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM191	Site 403 – Blackwell	DBLPMod25	Michael Green	Object	Objects to the removal of significant public benefit.	This sentence has been replaced based on advice received from Historic England to ensure consistency with national policy and

Main Modification Summary and Council Response Table

	Grange East					reference to the HIA will ensure the appropriate measures are implemented.
MM191	Site 403 – Blackwell Grange East	See Appendix D	See Appendix D	Object	Object to the removal of the site’s designation as a Local Wildlife Site and the removal of reference to this. The site is important for biodiversity, habitat and for recreation purposes. The Blands corner triangle should remain as a Local Wildlife site	The Local wildlife site hasn’t previously been identified in a Local Plan which is the mechanism to enable their formal designation. The total area proposed for designation was reduced but still protects the pond area which is identified by the Tees Valley Nature Partnership as the primary reason for identification. Notwithstanding the above there is a duty on applicants to protect priority habitats and species and deliver a net gain in biodiversity.
MM192	Site 95 – Beech Crescent East, Heighington – Part B	DBLPMod847	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM195	Appendix C – Registered Parks & Gardens	DBLPMod848	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
MM196	Appendix F	DBLPMod849	Historic England	Support	Support	Support noted
N/A	Consultation	DBLPMod515	Judith Murray (Whinfield Residents Assoc)	Object	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.	Whinfield Residents Association were emailed about the consultation on the 19 th October 2021 and had an email reminder of the consultation on 16th November 2021.
N/A	Strategic Highways	DBLPMod722	National Highways (Sunny Ali)	Support	General support for modifications and content of IDP and SOCG. Further discussions needed going forward on delivery mechanisms for mitigations.	The council fully agrees that further discussions are required independently of the plan adoption process and will arrange this with National Highways at the earliest convenience.
N/A	Local Plan	DBLPMod20, DBLPMod710, DBLPMod521	Stockton Borough Council, North Yorkshire County Council, Coal Authority	Support	None	N/A
N/A	Local Plan	DBLPMod491, DBLPMod698, DBLPMod66, DBLPMod13	Mrs J Shearn, Wendy Shelton, Sadberge Parish Council, Neasham Parish Council	Support	Sets out support for the Local Plan and the proposed modifications	Support noted.
N/A	Site 100	DBLPMod592	Church Commissioners for England (Barton Willmore)	Support	No further comments. allocation remains the same as that discussed at the EIP and we continue to assert it is suitable, available and deliverable.	Noted.

Appendix A – List of representors providing response to MM14

Comment ID	Consultee Name	Organisation
DBLPMod220	Michael Tomlinson	
DBLPMod364	Mrs Kathleen Keogan	
DBLPMod368	Mr David Phillips	
DBLPMod398	Mr Tim Ellis	
DBLPMod400	Ken Walton	
DBLPMod404	Gill Naisby	
DBLPMod410	Anne Rudkin	
DBLPMod416	Mr William Wallis	
DBLPMod417	linda foster	
DBLPMod439	Ms Janet Raper	
DBLPMod442	Mrs Joanne Brenkley	
DBLPMod447	Miss Catherine Thornley	
DBLPMod448	Mr David Boyd	
DBLPMod454	Mr Bruce McKnight	
DBLPMod462	Mr Royston Mann	
DBLPMod465	Mrs Margaret Mann	
DBLPMod468	Miss Lee Wyman	
DBLPMod472	Revd Caroline Ferguson	
DBLPMod478	Mrs Liz Knight	
DBLPMod481	Graham Knight	
DBLPMod487	Tyler Nixon	
DBLPMod492	Mr Ralph Bradley	
DBLPMod495	Ms Susan Rycroft	
DBLPMod496	Mrs Jennifer Bradley	
DBLPMod499	IB & AR Hand	
DBLPMod500	Carol McMMain	
DBLPMod505	Mr Ivor McMMain	
DBLPMod510	Mr John Dixon	
DBLPMod524	Miss Deborah Holmes	
DBLPMod553	Mrs Diana Clark	
DBLPMod563	Mr Oliver Coles	
DBLPMod571	Miss Joanne Evans	
DBLPMod573	Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier	
DBLPMod579	Claire Selmi	
DBLPMod581	Alison Gregg	
DBLPMod585	Paul Gregg	
DBLPMod597	Mr Brian Wood	
DBLPMod598	Thomas Watson	
DBLPMod604	C. Patterson	
DBLPMod607	Mr Dixon Binks	
DBLPMod611	Valerie Binks	
DBLPMod612	Dave Pattinson	

DBLPMod616	Wilfrid Graham	
DBLPMod619	Mr Eric Meadows	
DBLPMod622	Meryl Graham	
DBLPMod623	Judith Murray	
DBLPMod630	Mr Paul Isted	
DBLPMod637	Mr Stephen Patterson	
DBLPMod658	Mrs Veronica Harland	
DBLPMod661	Mrs Cynthia Park	
DBLPMod670	Karen Mosley	
DBLPMod677	Mr Chris Bowey	
DBLPMod678	Mr Terry Park	
DBLPMod686	Mrs Amanda Meeks	
DBLPMod697	Mr David Taylor	
DBLPMod703	Ms Francoise Harvey	
DBLPMod711	Mr Frank Brown	
DBLPMod724	Mrs Helena Murray	
DBLPMod731	Mrs Christine King	
DBLPMod737	D. Webb	
DBLPMod738	Ms Kendra Ulyart	Darlington Friends of the Earth
DBLPMod745	J. Owens	
DBLPMod748	Mrs M. Jones	
DBLPMod755	Mrs June Irvine	
DBLPMod757	Mr Mark Storey	
DBLPMod762	Mike Storey	
DBLPMod767	Lynn & Robert Bell	
DBLPMod772	Mr Robert Murray	
DBLPMod781	Mr Stephen Jenkins	
DBLPMod797	Mr Iain Rankin	
DBLPMod804	Berni King	
DBLPMod821	Rita and Gordon Wilkinson	
DBLPMod824	Mr Mrs C and L Williams	
DBLPMod827	James Storey	
DBLPMod833	Valery Storey	
DBLPMod836	Stephen Simon	
DBLPMod839	R Metcalfe	
DBLPMod851	Robert Fitzpatrick	

Appendix B – List of Response for MM61

DBLPMod21	Mr Alan Macnab	
DBLPMod58	Mr John Rankin	
DBLPMod72	Ms Simone Hope	
DBLPMod353	Mr David Clark	
DBLPMod366	Mrs Kathleen Keogan	
DBLPMod369	Mr David Phillips	
DBLPMod388	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE	
DBLPMod398	Mr Tim Ellis	
DBLPMod401	Ken Walton	
DBLPMod405	Gill Naisby	
DBLPMod411	Anne Rudkin	
DBLPMod440	Ms Janet Raper	
DBLPMod443	Mrs Joanne Brenkley	
DBLPMod450	Miss Catherine Thornley	
DBLPMod453	Mr David Boyd	
DBLPMod455	Mr Bruce McKnight	
DBLPMod463	Mr Royston Mann	
DBLPMod466	Mrs Margaret Mann	
DBLPMod469	Miss Lee Wyman	
DBLPMod472	Revd Caroline Ferguson	
DBLPMod476	A. Rycroft	
DBLPMod479	Mrs Liz Knight	
DBLPMod482	Graham Knight	
DBLPMod484	Fiona Rankin	

DBLPMod486	Mr Peter Evans	
DBLPMod488	Tyler Nixon	
DBLPMod493	Mr Ralph Bradley	
DBLPMod495	Ms Susan Rycroft	
DBLPMod497	Mrs Jennifer Bradley	
DBLPMod499	IB & AR Hand	
DBLPMod501	Carol McMMain	
DBLPMod507	Mr Ivor McMMain	
DBLPMod511	John Dixon	
DBLPMod518	Judith Murray	Whinfield Residents Association incorporating Friends of Beechwood
DBLPMod528	Mrs Janet Bradshaw	
DBLPMod538	Mr Chris Bowey	
DBLPMod553	Mrs Diana Clark	
DBLPMod555	Mr Terry Binks	
DBLPMod564	Mr Oliver Coles	
DBLPMod568	Mr Alan Hutchinson	
DBLPMod571	Miss Joanne Evans	
DBLPMod576	Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier	
DBLPMod580	Claire Selmi	
DBLPMod582	Alison Gregg	
DBLPMod586	Paul Gregg	
DBLPMod599	Thomas Watson	
DBLPMod601	Mr Brian Wood	
DBLPMod605	C. Patterson	
DBLPMod608	Mr Dixon Binks	

DBLPMod609	D Melbourne	
DBLPMod612	Dave Pattinson	
DBLPMod614	Valerie Binks	
DBLPMod617	Wilfrid Graham	
DBLPMod620	Mr Eric Meadows	
DBLPMod624	Meryl Graham	
DBLPMod626	Judith Murray	
DBLPMod631	Mr Paul Isted	
DBLPMod639	Mr Stephen Patterson	
DBLPMod649	Mr Kim Jackson	
DBLPMod656	Mr R Grayson	
DBLPMod659	Mrs Veronica Harland	
DBLPMod662	Mrs Cynthia Park	
DBLPMod679	Mr Terry Park	
DBLPMod682	Mrs Amanda Meeks	
DBLPMod704	Ms Francoise Harvey	
DBLPMod712	Mr Frank Brown	
DBLPMod726	Mrs Helena Murray	
DBLPMod728	Beryl Burdess	
DBLPMod732	Mrs Christine King	
DBLPMod739	D. Webb	
DBLPMod740	Ms Kendra Ulliyart	Darlington Friends of the Earth
DBLPMod746	J. Owens	
DBLPMod749	Mrs M. Jones	
DBLPMod752	Mr & Mrs Ward	
DBLPMod758	Mrs June Irvine	
DBLPMod759	Mr Mark Storey	

DBLPMod763	Mike Storey	
DBLPMod768	Lynn & Robert Bell	
DBLPMod774	Mr Robert Murray	
DBLPMod782	Mr Stephen Jenkins	
DBLPMod798	Mr Iain Rankin	
DBLPMod806	Berni King	
DBLPMod822	Rita and Gordon Wilkinson	
DBLPMod825	Mr Mrs C and L Williams	
DBLPMod828	James Storey	
DBLPMod832	Henry Cumbers	Historic England
DBLPMod834	Valery Storey	
DBLPMod840	R Metcalfe	
DBLPMod852	Robert Fitzpatrick	

Appendix C – List of Responses for MM65 & MM66

ID	Full Name	Organisation Details
DBLPMod21	Mr Alan Macnab	
DBLPMod72	Ms Simone Hope	
DBLPMod353	Mr David Clark	
DBLPMod366	Mrs Kathleen Keogan	
DBLPMod371	Mr David Phillips	
DBLPMod389	Major Frederick Greenhow MBE	
DBLPMod398	Mr Tim Ellis	
DBLPMod402	Ken Walton	
DBLPMod406	Gill Naisby	
DBLPMod412	Anne Rudkin	
DBLPMod417	Linda foster	
DBLPMod418	Mr William Wallis	
DBLPMod441	Ms Janet Raper	
DBLPMod445	Mrs Joanne Brenkley	
DBLPMod449	Mr David Boyd	
DBLPMod452	Miss Catherine Thornley	
DBLPMod458	Mr Bruce McKnight	
DBLPMod461	Mr John Rankin	
DBLPMod464	Mr Royston Mann	
DBLPMod467	Mrs Margaret Mann	
DBLPMod470	Miss Lee Wyman	
DBLPMod472	Revd Caroline Ferguson	
DBLPMod480	Mrs Liz Knight	
DBLPMod483	Graham Knight	
DBLPMod485	Mrs Kathy Barley	

DBLPMod489	Tyler Nixon	
DBLPMod494	Mr Ralph Bradley	
DBLPMod498	Mrs Jennifer Bradley	
DBLPMod502	Carol McMain	
DBLPMod508	Mr Ivor McMain	
DBLPMod512	John Dixon	
DBLPMod526	Miss Deborah Holmes	
DBLPMod553	Mrs Diana Clark	
DBLPMod556	Mr Terry Binks	
DBLPMod565	Mr Oliver Coles	
DBLPMod571	Miss Joanne Evans	
DBLPMod583	Claire Selmi	
DBLPMod584	Alison Gregg	
DBLPMod587	Paul Gregg	
DBLPMod602	Thomas Watson	
DBLPMod603	Mr Brian Wood	
DBLPMod606	C. Patterson	
DBLPMod610	Mr Dixon Binks	
DBLPMod613	D Melbourne	
DBLPMod615	Valerie Binks	
DBLPMod618	Wilfrid Graham	
DBLPMod621	Mr Eric Meadows	
DBLPMod627	Judith Murray	
DBLPMod629	Meryl Graham	
DBLPMod632	Mr Paul Isted	
DBLPMod641	Mr Stephen Patterson	
DBLPMod651	Mr Kim Jackson	
DBLPMod657	Mr R Grayson	
DBLPMod660	Mrs Veronica Harland	

DBLPMod663	Mrs Cynthia Park	
DBLPMod673	Karen Mosley	
DBLPMod680	Mr Terry Park	
DBLPMod681	Mr Alan Macnab	
DBLPMod683	Mrs Amanda Meeks	
DBLPMod705	Ms Francoise Harvey	
DBLPMod717	Mr Frank Brown	
DBLPMod727	Mrs Helena Murray	
DBLPMod733	Mrs Christine King	
DBLPMod741	D. Webb	
DBLPMod742	Ms Kendra Ulliyart	Darlington Friends of the Earth
DBLPMod747	J. Owens	
DBLPMod750	Mrs M. Jones	
DBLPMod760	Mrs June Irvine	
DBLPMod761	Mr Mark Storey	
DBLPMod764	Mike Storey	
DBLPMod769	Lynn & Robert Bell	
DBLPMod775	Mr Robert Murray	
DBLPMod786	Mr Stephen Jenkins	
DBLPMod799	Mr Iain Rankin	
DBLPMod808	Berni King	
DBLPMod823	Rita and Gordon Wilkinson	
DBLPMod826	Mr Mrs C and L Williams	
DBLPMod830	James Storey	
DBLPMod835	Valery Storey	
DBLPMod837	Stephen Simon	
DBLPMod841	R Metcalfe	
DBLPMod854	Robert Fitzpatrick	

Appendix D – List of representors providing response to MM191

Comment ID	Consultee Name	Organisation
DBLPMod30	Mr Paul McGee	
DBLPMod59	David Smith	Friends of South Park
DBLPMod60	Ms Julie Wilson	
DBLPMod64	Irma Hillary	
DBLPMod69	Mrs Rachel Swain	Walworth Castle Hotel
DBLPMod75	D Skilbeck	
DBLPMod76	Jolyon Potter	Chair Darlington for Culture & Heritage
DBLPMod78	Ms Emma Easby	
DBLPMod82	Mr Paul Carbert	
DBLPMod84	Alan Gilliland	
DBLPMod85	Paul Easby	
DBLPMod86	Helen Eyres	
DBLPMod88	Ms Laura Thurman	
DBLPMod92	Sarah Carbert	
DBLPMod93	Mr Neal Sowerby	
DBLPMod94	Helen M Price	
DBLPMod98	Louise Haithwaite	
DBLPMod100	Allan Bruce	Love Darlo Trees
DBLPMod102	Kim Smith	
DBLPMod106	Mr A Walgate	
DBLPMod107	Isaac Sparrow	
DBLPMod110	Thomas Sparrow	
DBLPMod112	Andrew Manvell	Love Darlo Trees
DBLPMod115	Christopher Green	Love Darlo Trees
DBLPMod119	Adrian Messer	
DBLPMod120	William Gilbert	
DBLPMod127	Ms Catriona McGee	
DBLPMod128	Ann Black	Blackwell Action Group
DBLPMod133	Mrs Christine Munck	Love Darlo Trees
DBLPMod139	Mr Colin Price	
DBLPMod141	Julie Manvell	Love Darlo Trees
DBLPMod143	Audrey Peacock	Blackwell Action Group
DBLPMod147	Carol Bowman	Blackwell Action Group
DBLPMod149	Koen Mooij	
DBLPMod150	Emily Williams	
DBLPMod155	Kenneth Bowman	Blackwell Action Group
DBLPMod160	Susan Taylor	Parkland Heritage Network
DBLPMod161	Kiri Jamieson	Blackwell Action Group
DBLPMod168	Keith Appleton	Parkland Heritage Network
DBLPMod170	Ruth Appleton	Parkland Heritage Network
DBLPMod174	Amanda Marshall	
DBLPMod176	Malcolm Hull	

DBLPMod179	Frank Peacock	Parkland Heritage Network
DBLPMod185	Ian Taylor	Parkland Heritage Network
DBLPMod188	Philip Wraith	
DBLPMod205	Eileen Bruce	Blackwell Action Group
DBLPMod207	Nick Williams	Blackwell Action Group
DBLPMod211	George Eyres	
DBLPMod216	Henry Carver	Blackwell Action Group
DBLPMod225	Hugh Hillary	Blackwell Action Group
DBLPMod233	Stuart Buchan	Blackwell Action Group
DBLPMod236	Ashley Carver	
DBLPMod237	Dr Elizabeth Elliott	
DBLPMod240	Denis Childs	
DBLPMod241	I Cochrane	
DBLPMod243	Mr John Bowman	
DBLPMod245	Ms Kathryn Cochrane	
DBLPMod248	Mr Jonathan Childs	
DBLPMod250	Juliet Haley Dawn Johnson	
DBLPMod252	John le Roi	Blackwell Action Group
DBLPMod256	Christine Francis	
DBLPMod259	David Annison	
DBLPMod260	Lynsey Childs	
DBLPMod264	Wilson Derbyshire	
DBLPMod265	Julie Earle	
DBLPMod268	Ms Jayne Whiting	
DBLPMod269	Peter Prior	
DBLPMod272	Mr Paul Whiting	
DBLPMod273	Alec Francis	
DBLPMod276	April Kirkpatrick	
DBLPMod278	Carole Sobkowiak	
DBLPMod280	Helena Wattsford	Parkland Heritage Network
DBLPMod284	Nigel Boddy	Councillor North Road Councillor
DBLPMod286	Jonathan Coates	
DBLPMod288	Roger Drummond	
DBLPMod292	Victoria Lamb	Resident and Parkland Heritage
DBLPMod296	Kevin Winkworth	Parkland Heritage Network
DBLPMod299	Sarah Mooij	
DBLPMod307	Basil Penney	
DBLPMod313	Veronica Turnbull	Parkland Heritage Network
DBLPMod315	Colin Barker	Parkland Heritage Network
DBLPMod317	David Stephens	Parkland Heritage Network
DBLPMod320	Andrew Wattsford	
DBLPMod321	Carol Penney	
DBLPMod322	Andrew Lamb	Parkland Heritage
DBLPMod325	Charles Walton	
DBLPMod328	Anne Wraith	Parkland Heritage
DBLPMod331	Andrew Wright	

DBLPMod333	Chris Swain	
DBLPMod343	Rachel Coates	
DBLPMod345	Rachel Jarvis	
DBLPMod347	Susan Walgate	Parkland Heritage Network
DBLPMod407	Mr Paul Foster	
DBLPMod530	Mrs Janet Bradshaw	
DBLPMod554	Mrs Rachel Nixon	
DBLPMod685	Mrs Amanda Meeks	
DBLPMod753	Stephen Scaife	
DBLPMod795	Elizabeth Hughes	
DBLPMod801	Eric Akers	Love Darlo Trees
DBLPMod784	Christine Akers	
DBLPMod790	Samantha Rickaby	
DBLPMod802	William Rowell	
DBLPMod600	Carl Watson	
DBLPMod708	Clive Rickaby	
DBLPMod714	Gillian Rickaby	
DBLPMod719	D. Puncher	
DBLPMod723	Kevin Hughes	
DBLPMod374	Ken Pattison	
DBLPMod191	Morag Meldrum	
DBLPMod399	Kenneth Haigh	
DBLPMod408	Amanda Fearenhough	
DBLPMod409	Dr Becky Lowe	
DBLPMod436	Leon Puchala	
DBLPMod554	Rachel Nixon	
DBLPMod530	Janet Bradshaw	
DBLPMod702	Amanda Meeks	
DBLPMod407	Paul Foster	
DBLPMod25	Michael Green	
DBLPMod192	Angela Rajf-Green	
DBLPMod736	Kendra Ulliyart	Darlington FOE