

APPENDIX 1

Comments Resulting in Recommended Changes to Local Plan

Comments can be viewed in full at www.darlington-consult.objective.co.uk/portal
Subject to member approval 'Officer Responses' will also be made available online.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Paul Howell				DBDLP 319	1.3.4	Paragraph	Neutral	Heritage Action Zone should be connecting with Town Centre and visitor strategy	HAZ can be integrated into this section	Rail heritage Group has informed proposals for the Heritage Action Zone area (with North Road and Railway museum) which will support the Bi-centennial celebrations
Ms Melanie Lindsley	The Coal Authority			DBDLP 1074		Other Policies, Plans, Strategies and Studies	Neutral	Omission of policy for past coal mining history	Could be considered in the supporting text (glossary) of the local Plan and more reference to Joint Waste and Minerals Plan	Add Tees Valley Joint Minerals and Waste plan 2011 with reference to Coal Authority legacy records in footnote
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 658	1.6.3	Paragraph	Neutral	More narrative required on HNT principles	Issue noted and integrated into Plan.	The Healthy New Towns Principles Diagram will be incorporated into the plan instead of the list after Paragraph 1.6.3.
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1019	1.7.2	Paragraph	Object	The Draft Local Plan does not specifically identify strategic policies as required by national policy. Paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that strategic policies should not extend to detailed matters that are more appropriately dealt with through neighbourhood plans.	The Proposed Submission Local Plan will clearly set out which policies are strategic. The Proposed Submission Local Plan will provide an update on the position and status of Neighbourhood Plans being prepared in the borough.	The Proposed Submission Local Plan will clearly set out which policies are strategic. Paragraphs 1.7.1 and 1.7.2 have been amended to provide an update on the position and status of Neighbourhood Plans being prepared in the borough.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council consider there is a need for a greater emphasis on the role of neighbourhood planning in the Local Plan.		
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1266	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Support	<p>General Support / some issues mentioned to enhance in</p> <p>Vision text: to include: enhancement of built and green Environment</p> <p>Aim 5: Countryside and Environment enhancements through SUDS and Natural Flow Management suggested</p> <p>Aim 6: Climate change: Marginal changes to the policy requested to actively encourage energy water efficient design....</p>	<p>Support noted / some areas can be improved</p> <p>5d is covered by DC 4 and part of environmental flood mitigation tools</p> <p>Vision generally has been tested and agreed through the Environment and Ecology Theme Group in 2017</p>	<p>Local Plan Vision 2.0.1 : Its coherent community, natural and historic environment <u>will be enhanced and</u> continue to be cherished protected and celebrated..... the Borough's needs for housing, jobs and other development being met, supported by new and improved <u>built and green</u> infrastructure and community facilities.'</p> <p>2.0.2 in 6. Responding to Climate Change and Reducing Energy Consumption:</p> <p>c) <u>actively encourage energy and water efficient design in all new and existing housing, industrial and commercial developments.</u></p>
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 177	2.0.1	Paragraph	Object	<p>Totally disagree that 10000 houses are required in Darlington.</p> <p>Disagree with building on green belt countryside when there are many brown field areas in Darlington.</p> <p>Object to the removal of areas such as Springfield Park and the surrounding area as this will have negative physical and mental effects on people.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 354	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>Aim 1 - We question whether the aspirational figure of 7,000 new jobs can be achieved.</p> <p>Aim 2 - We support objectives a. to d. However, we consider the number of houses DBC aspires to deliver to be excessive and unachievable.</p> <p>Aim 3 - Support objectives a and e. However, we are very concerned at some of the proposed roads and object to Darlington Northern Link Road Route B.</p>	<p>The jobs growth factored into the plan is realistic as it is based on past trends of employment growth in the borough. Further detail can be found in the officer response on the housing requirement and standard method, and the Darlington Future Employment Needs Report (September 2017) produced as part of the Local Plan evidence base.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>Only Route A of the proposed Northern Link Road is now being explored and this position will be reflected on the Key Diagram.</p>	Route option B of the proposed Northern Link Road has been removed from the Key Diagram.
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 851	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>2.)Meeting the Housing Needs of the Borough</p> <p>An objective which specifically refers to housing in rural areas to meet identified local needs should be included. This would ensure that the Local Plan reflects the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2018) which seeks at paragraphs 77-78 that:</p> <p><i>“in rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs....[and] to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive...”</i></p>	<p>Can be included in one of the bullets</p> <p>a) supply of land for new housing</p>	<p>Aim 2</p> <p>a) Maintain a supply of land for new housing developments that meets the needs of the growing number of households <u>in Urban and Rural areas of the Borough.</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1103	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	Aim 4 a) to be strengthened to include all of the historic environment of Darlington	General Support noted and minor amendment to be made.	a) Protect, maintain and enhance Darlington's historic environment and its identity as a historic market town, set amongst countryside and surrounding villages with strong links to railway, Quaker and industrial heritage.
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 885		Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment	Neutral	It is noted that an SA report has been published alongside the Draft Local Plan, and that a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) is being prepared and will be published alongside the Publication Local Plan.	Comments noted. An updated Sustainability Appraisal and a Habitats Regulation Screening Assessment will be published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan in due course. Paragraphs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 of the Local Plan has been updated to reflect this.	<p>The final sentence of paragraph 2.1.1 has been amended to read: 'The A Draft SA will be published alongside the Draft Local Plan in June 2018, with an updated SA produced to accompany the Proposed Submission Local Plan.'</p> <p>The first sentence of paragraph 2.1.2 has been amended to read: 'Alongside the SA, a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA); Screening Report has beenis being prepared.</p> <p>The final sentence of paragraph 2.1.2 has been amended to read: 'The HRA report will be published alongside the Publication Local Plan; Screening Report concludes that the emerging Local Plan is not likely to give rise to any negative impacts on any Natura 2000 sites as a result of the adoption of the document in the borough of Darlington and therefore an Appropriate Assessment is not required.'</p>
Mr Nigel Swinbank		Mr Andrew Moss	Ward Hadaway	DBDLP 45	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	<p>Support for policy to the extent that Neasham would be classified as a rural village.</p> <p>Development Limits should not be used in the Plan. Their use is not consistent with the NPPF which seeks a more flexible and positive approach.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, development limits at Neasham on the policies map should be updated to reflect the current commitment at Neasham Nursery, site ref 54. This site is being developed by a smaller builder. Reference to draft NPPF requiring that at least 20%</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The use of development limits is a long established principle in planning, which promotes sustainable patterns of development and protects the countryside, in accordance with the aims of the NPPF (2019). Establishing boundaries around the conurbation and villages also provides certainty and clarity to decisions makers, developers and local communities. It is consistent with paragraph 16 of the Framework which states, plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals. As such</p>	Remove site 54 Neasham Nursery from table 6.4 housing commitments, Appendix A Housing Trajectory and Policies Map 14. Alter development limits to include the application site area.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>of sites identified in plans are of half a hectare or less.</p> <p>Specific comments on the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and site 54:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No other sites were considered in Neasham. Site 54 is therefore that to be considered for further development. There was a significant amount of built form on the site extending beyond the site subject of planning permission 16/01020/OUT. A portion of the site has been found to be suitable for development as evidenced by the planning permission. The HELAA commentary should be updated accordingly. The balance of site 54 remains available for further development. <p>The NPPF supports some housing development in the rural area where it would enhance or maintain the viability of a community. There are existing services in Neasham which future residents could support and benefit from.</p>	<p>development limits are to be utilised in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The boundary for site 54 on the policies map includes a wider area than the approved permission (ref 16/01020/OUT) and this is an error. A variation of condition application (18/00501/FUL) was also recently approved for the site which involved alterations to the scheme and a reduction in yield to 9 dwellings. Commitments of less than 10 dwellings will not be included in the Local Plan, as such this site is to be removed from table 6.4, Appendix A Housing Trajectory and the policies map. Any completions from the scheme will however be counted towards meeting the housing requirement and target of the Local Plan. As the scheme is under construction the development limits will be altered to include the application site area.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the new requirement in the NPPF (2019) that land to accommodate at least 10% of the housing requirement should be on sites no larger than one hectare. Evidence can be provided if this requirement cannot be met.</p> <p>Comments noted regarding site 54 Neasham Nursery. The HELAA is a high level assessment of sites put forward for consideration in the Local Plan process. The permission under construction is acknowledged in the proposed amendment to the development limits above however the wider site is not consider suitable for allocation as it does not accord with the locational strategy of the plan. Housing allocations are focused on the main urban area and service villages as these</p>	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									areas provide (or will be able to provide) the level of services, facilities and employment opportunities that are required to support communities and an increase in population. It is considered that these areas are the most sustainable locations for new development.	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 590	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Support	<p>Support of policy SH 1.</p> <p>It would be useful to indicate where Darlington sits in the settlement hierarchy of the Tees Valley.</p> <p>Support for the commitment in this policy (and in Statement 1) that development in the “service villages” would be “to meet local needs” only, so will not include commuter housing estates.</p> <p>Policy intentions expressed here and in ENV3, in terms of maintaining the distinctiveness of villages and the openness of the countryside, would be best achieved by creating a green belt designation.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The introduction chapter of the Local Plan is to be updated for the next stage of plan preparation. Additional context on the Tees Valley will be added to this section.</p> <p>It should be noted that reference to local needs in statement 1 also includes borough wide needs.</p> <p>It is not the Council's intention to designate any green belt in the new Local Plan. The NPPF sets out that new green belt should only be established in exceptional circumstances for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions. It is considered that normal planning policies will be adequate to protect the countryside and to prevent the sprawl of built up areas. Further detail on green belt policy can be found in the NPPF.</p>	Add additional Tees Valley context to the introduction chapter.
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1202	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	<p>Concern that the draft Policies Map identifies the operational Airport as undesignated land outside of Development Limits and therefore classed as 'countryside' in the Settlement Hierarchy. This would clearly</p>	<p>Comments noted. Amended policy text (SH 1) suggested for clarity. Additional reasoned justification will also be applied to 6.3.4 (Development Limits).</p> <p>The suggestions from DTVA for separate policy for airport and</p>	<p>Text to be added to final paragraph of SH 1.</p> <p>All areas outside the Development Limits are to be regarded as 'countryside' <u>unless specifically identified for other uses in the plan (E1, E2 and E3).</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>conflict with its role as a key strategic location for growth during the plan period. This would also conflict with the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>Following modifications are proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Airport's boundary (see Appendix 1) (see file attached to comment DBDLP1189) should be identified on Policies Map and linked to a new airport-specific policy; Draft Policy SH1 (Settlement Hierarchy) and its supporting text should be revised to identify that DTVA is a 'Strategic Growth Location' and it will be an appropriate location for new development during the Plan period. 	<p>inclusion of Strategic Growth Location is not considered appropriate at this time but will be kept under review.</p> <p>Amendments have been made to employment allocations at the airport.</p>	<p>Additional text to be added at the end of paragraph 6.3.1.</p> <p><u>There are a number of other non housing allocations beyond development limits that are considered appropriate locations for their identified uses (policies E 1, E 2 and E 3).</u></p>
Mr Nigel Swinbank		Mr Andrew Moss	Ward Hadaway	DBDLP 38	Statement 2	Rural Villages	Object	<p>Development limits should not be used</p> <p>There needs to be definition of 'infill' which should include the filling of gaps between existing buildings and the rounding off of villages.</p> <p>The Plan should facilitate the delivery of this objective through the allocation of sites which can deliver up to 10 dwellings for affordable housing.</p>	<p>Development Limits for rural villages offer the opportunity for infill sites in villages and is further supplemented by H6 and H7 and E4 which looks at development in the countryside.</p> <p>A definition for infill development will be added to the glossary. It is however considered that the rounding off of villages does not fall under the definition.</p> <p>The approach in policy H 6 Rural Exceptions is set out in national planning policy. Para 77 of the NPPF</p>	<p>Text below to be added to the glossary:</p> <p><u>Infill development - The development of a small area of vacant land between existing buildings.</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p>states, local planning authorities should support opportunities to bring forward rural exception sites that will provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs, and consider whether allowing some market housing on these sites would help to facilitate this. In Part 1 of the SHMA (2015) there is limited spatial evidence on the distribution of affordable housing needed. There is no evidence of specific unmet needs for additional</p> <p>affordable housing in the service villages or rural villages. Consequently there is not the evidence to support the allocation of rural exception sites and a more flexible criteria based policy approach is required. A number of other local authorities in the North East region have also taken this approach.</p>	
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1023	Statement 2	Rural Villages	Object	Statement fine misspelling in Statement	Misspelling	Spelling: ..High Coniscliffe, Low Coniscliffe, Merrybent, Neasham
Gordon Pybus	Darlington Association on Disability			DBDLP 75	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Object	Request for more inclusive wording.	Alternative wording to be included as appropriate.	Apply the suggested word changes above as appropriate within the document.
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 242	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Object	Objection to potential development of Springfield Park, the Historic Lane and relocation of the Golf Course. All which provide benefits for Health and Wellbeing of local residents.	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington			DBDLP 662	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Neutral	Need of a reference to natural surveillance and the adopted Design SPD.	To be included going forward.	Reference to natural surveillance and the Design SPD to be incorporated into Policy DC 1.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
	Borough Council / Healthy New Towns									
Mr Steven Drabik	Architectural Liaison Officer Durham Constabulary			DBDLP 1096	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Neutral	Additional paragraph suggested for inclusion in reasoned justification to link to Crime and Disorder Act 1998.	Merits of it's inclusion to be considered prior to next stage of plan development.	Inserting the following to reasoned justification <i>"This policy will be implemented and monitored by making and reviewing decisions on planning applications taking into consideration the Local Authorities obligations as set out in Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998"</i> .
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1267	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Neutral	Enhanced wording suggested for point e) around integration of landscaping in proposals.	Suggested wording seems reasonable so suggest integration with Policy DC 1.	Replace point e) with the following text..... ' <i>...that <u>the layout of the proposal, associated green infrastructure, and landscaping has been developed to complement and enhance both the ecological function of the local area and character of the built environment, retaining existing features of interest.</u></i> '
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1268	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Neutral	Advised to consider including reference to climate change in sustainable design principles.	Noted. Rewording will be incorporated into the next stage of plan development.	Include climate change in sustainable design principles.
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1269	5.1.2	Paragraph	Neutral	Suggested reconsideration of wording of this paragraph.	Agreed this paragraph requires rewording.	Reword as follows: Design is not just about the architecture or style of a building. It is also about the spaces in and around the development, the quality of the relationships between the development and surrounding areas and the appropriateness of the function of the building in its context. Darlington is experiencing ongoing change and good design will help to maintain a 'sense of place' . which In turn this improves the quality of the built environment, its public spaces, its heritage and local distinctiveness, and which will all contribute to the community's quality of life helping to create a 'sense of place' .
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington			DBDLP 664	5.1.3	Paragraph	Neutral	Strengthen with link to adopted design policy.	This is a logical addition.	Change wording to "demonstrate how good design principles <i>and adopted design policy</i> have been applied..."

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
	Borough Council / Healthy New Towns									
Mr Steven Drabik	Architectural Liaison Officer Durham Constabulary			DBDLP 748	5.1.3	Paragraph	Neutral	Suggest that reference should be made to the Councils "Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document 2011"	Reference to the councils Design SPD would be useful in this introductory chapter.	Include reference to Design SPD.
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 669	5.2.6	Paragraph	Neutral	Include Healthy New Towns principles diagram.	Agree we will look at options to further integrate Healthy New Towns work.	Local Plan to Include HNT design principles diagram.
Dave McGuire	Sport England (North East)			DBDLP 102	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Support	Support and link to guidance provided.	Support noted and merits of including link to guidance to be considered.	Insert in reasoned justification: <i>'The applicant should set out within their Design and Access Statement how the proposals have been designed to take account of the requirements of this policy. Applicants are also encouraged to utilise the design principles set out within Sport England's 'Active Design' guide when preparing a development scheme in order to promote active, healthy and stronger communities.'</i>
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 595	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Object	Support for concept of policy but objection raised to the strategic allocation sites. Recognition should be given to the importance of green space, open	General support noted. Paragraph 5.2.6 acknowledges that public realm (which can include countryside) have an important role to play in health and wellbeing. This could be extended to areas of tranquility. Bullets to be numbered for clarity.	add roman numerals to bullet points under point d).

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>countryside and tranquility provide for health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Suggest renumbering bullet points under section d).</p>		
Hilary Hall	Project Manager Healthy New Towns Darlington			DBDLP 1041	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Neutral	Healthy New Towns Principles should have more prominence. Healthy New Towns Principles Diagram should be reflected in the document.	Agree HNT principles should be given more prominence and this will be considered prior to the next stage of plan development. A HNT final report is due to be published soon the findings of which will be considered.	Increase prominence of HNT principles including the incorporation of the HNT principles diagram.
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1180	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Object	<p>Objection to requirement for Health Impact Assessment. The 100 houses or more requirement is not justified and they are consider an unnecessary burden on developers that is not consistent with National Policy.</p>	<p>The link between planning and health has been long established. The built and natural environments are major determinants of health and wellbeing. This is supported by the 3 dimensions to sustainable development (see National Planning Policy Framework, 2019).</p> <p>Government guidance^[1] sets out how health and well-being and health infrastructure should be considered in planning decision making and states:</p> <p><i>'Local authority planners should consider consulting the Director of Public Health on any planning applications (including at the pre-application stage) that are likely to have a significant impact on the health and wellbeing of the local population or particular groups within it. This would allow them to work together on any necessary mitigation measures. A health impact assessment may be a useful tool to use where there are expected to be significant impacts.</i></p> <p><i>Similarly, the views of the local Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England should be sought</i></p>	<p>HIA's are considered an appropriate and government endorsed method of considering potential health impacts and encouraging improvement in major developments. They are not intended to be onerous but instead informative. Content can be proportionate to the scale of development and incorporated within existing design and access statements.</p> <p>HIA to be applied to all other major developments which would include commercial.</p> <p>Policy to read:</p> <p>h. require, in the case of development of 100 or more homes <u>and all other 'major' development</u>, the submission of a Health Impact Assessment (HIA)</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p><i>regarding the impact of new development which would have a significant or cumulatively significant effect on health infrastructure and/or the demand for healthcare services.</i></p> <p><i>Information gathered from this engagement should assist local planning authorities consider whether the identified impact(s) should be addressed through a Section 106 obligation or a planning condition. These need to meet the criteria for planning obligations.'</i></p> <p>The 100 or more unit threshold has been set to provide more certainty as to the size of development where 'significant impact' may occur.</p> <p>[1] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p>	
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Christopher Martin	WYG	DBDLP 1110	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Object	<p>Health Impact Assessment (HIA) for development of 100 homes or more is objected to this and they believe it makes the Policy DC2 unsound. Suggest removing the 100+ requirement and have this determined at pre-application stage on a case by case basis.</p>	<p>The link between planning and health has been long established. The built and natural environments are major determinants of health and wellbeing. This is supported by the 3 dimensions to sustainable development (see National Planning Policy Framework, 2018 paragraph 8).</p> <p>Government guidance[1] sets out how health and well-being and health infrastructure should be considered in planning decision making and states:</p> <p><i>'Local authority planners should consider consulting the Director of Public Health on any planning applications (including at the pre-application stage) that are likely to have a significant impact on the health and wellbeing of the local population</i></p>	<p>HIA's are considered an appropriate and government endorsed method of considering potential health impacts and encouraging improvement in major developments. They are not intended to be onerous but instead informative. Content can be proportionate to the scale of development and incorporated within existing design and access statements.</p> <p>HIA to be applied to all other major developments which would include commercial.</p> <p>Policy to read:</p> <p>h. require, in the case of development of 100 or more homes <u>and all other 'major' development</u>, the submission of a Health Impact Assessment (HIA)</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p><i>or particular groups within it. This would allow them to work together on any necessary mitigation measures. A health impact assessment may be a useful tool to use where there are expected to be significant impacts.</i></p> <p><i>Similarly, the views of the local Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England should be sought regarding the impact of new development which would have a significant or cumulatively significant effect on health infrastructure and/or the demand for healthcare services.</i></p> <p><i>Information gathered from this engagement should assist local planning authorities consider whether the identified impact(s) should be addressed through a Section 106 obligation or a planning condition. These need to meet the criteria for planning obligations.'</i></p> <p>The 100 or more unit threshold has been set to provide more certainty as to the size of development where 'significant impact' may occur.</p> <p>[1] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p>	
Gordon Pybus	Darlington Association on Disability			DBDLP 1411	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Object	Suggest changes to policy wording to be more inclusive of more disabilities. In singling out Dementia as a condition this could be to the detriment of other needs. Need for Equality Impact Appraisal before plan is adopted.	<p>Balancing varying need across a plan always requires compromise. Dementia is of significant concern nationally over the next 20 years with an aging population profile so needs to be considered alongside other specific needs. An Equalities Impact Appraisal will be produced to consider potential impacts in detail.</p>	<p>d) to be reworded accordingly:</p> <p>d. develop neighbourhoods and centres that ensuring that new developments:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> are <u>age friendly, inclusive</u>, safe and attractive, and easily accessible on foot or by bicycle. Where appropriate this should integrate dementia friendly design principles;

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have a strong sense of place which encourages social interaction; • integrate dementia friendly design principles, including benches and landmark features; • are designed to promote active travel and other physical activity;provide access to a range of facilities including transport, health and sport and leisure facilities; • are designed to promote physical activity, through the arrangement of buildings and uses, access to open space and landscaping, and the provision of facilities to support walking. • promote improvements and enhance accessibility to the borough's greenspaces and green infrastructure corridors; • improve air and water quality, and reduce noise within the main urban area; • ensure development does not have an adverse impact on the environment or residential amenity through air, noise/vibration, soil, surface and groundwater pollution; • <u>All new development that may cause groundwater, surface water, air (including odour), noise or light pollution either individually or cumulatively will be required to incorporate measures as appropriate to prevent or reduce their pollution so as to not cause unacceptable impacts on the living conditions of all existing and potential future occupants of land and buildings, the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the landscape;</u> • require, in the case of development of 100 or more homes and other 'major' <u>developments</u>, the submission of a Health Impact Assessment (HIA)(6)as part of the application to explain how health considerations have informed the design.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning)	DBDLP 1307	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Object	<p>Objection to the requirement for HIA and it is considered the 100+ house cut off is unjustified as is why it does not apply to commercial development. Further detail on the requirements of an HIA will also be required. Considered an unnecessary burden on developers.</p>	<p>The link between planning and health has been long established. The built and natural environments are major determinants of health and wellbeing. This is supported by the 3 dimensions to sustainable development (see National Planning Policy Framework, 2018 paragraph 8).</p> <p>Government guidance^[1] sets out how health and well-being and health infrastructure should be considered in planning decision making and states:</p> <p><i>'Local authority planners should consider consulting the Director of Public Health on any planning applications (including at the pre-application stage) that are likely to have a significant impact on the health and wellbeing of the local population or particular groups within it. This would allow them to work together on any necessary mitigation measures. A health impact assessment may be a useful tool to use where there are expected to be significant impacts.'</i></p> <p><i>Similarly, the views of the local Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England should be sought regarding the impact of new development which would have a significant or cumulatively significant effect on health infrastructure and/or the demand for healthcare services.</i></p> <p><i>Information gathered from this engagement should assist local planning authorities consider whether the identified impact(s) should be addressed through a Section 106 obligation or a planning condition.</i></p>	<p>HIA's are considered an appropriate and government endorsed method of considering potential health impacts and encouraging improvement in major developments. They are not intended to be onerous but instead informative. Content can be proportionate to the scale of development and incorporated within existing design and access statements.</p> <p>HIA to be applied to all other major developments which would include commercial.</p> <p>Policy to read:</p> <p>h. require, in the case of development of 100 or more homes <u>and all other 'major' development</u>, the submission of a Health Impact Assessment (HIA)</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p><i>These need to meet the criteria for planning obligations.'</i></p> <p>The 100 or more unit threshold has been set to provide more certainty as to the size of development where 'significant impact' may occur.</p> <p>[1] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p>	
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1330	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Object	<p>Objection to Health Impact Assessment requirement and particularly the 100+ house threshold. Additional information should be provided as to what would be required as part of an HIA.</p>	<p>The link between planning and health has been long established. The built and natural environments are major determinants of health and wellbeing. This is supported by the 3 dimensions to sustainable development (see National Planning Policy Framework, 2018 paragraph 8).</p> <p>Government guidance[1] sets out how health and well-being and health infrastructure should be considered in planning decision making and states:</p> <p><i>'Local authority planners should consider consulting the Director of Public Health on any planning applications (including at the pre-application stage) that are likely to have a significant impact on the health and wellbeing of the local population or particular groups within it. This would allow them to work together on any necessary mitigation measures. A health impact assessment may be a useful tool to use where there are expected to be significant impacts.'</i></p> <p><i>Similarly, the views of the local Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England should be sought regarding the impact of new development which would have a</i></p>	<p>HIA's are considered an appropriate and government endorsed method of considering potential health impacts and encouraging improvement in major developments. They are not intended to be onerous but instead informative. Content can be proportionate to the scale of development and incorporated within existing design and access statements.</p> <p>HIA to be applied to all other major developments which would include commercial.</p> <p>Policy to read:</p> <p>h. require, in the case of development of 100 or more homes and all other 'major' development, the submission of a Health Impact Assessment (HIA)</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p><i>significant or cumulatively significant effect on health infrastructure and/or the demand for healthcare services.</i></p> <p><i>Information gathered from this engagement should assist local planning authorities consider whether the identified impact(s) should be addressed through a Section 106 obligation or a planning condition. These need to meet the criteria for planning obligations.'</i></p> <p>The 100 or more unit threshold has been set to provide more certainty as to the size of development where 'significant impact' may occur.</p> <p>[1] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</p>	
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 178	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Object	Perceived loss of Springfield Park and countryside would have a negative impact on Whinfield residents health and wellbeing.	<p>See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.</p> <p>In relation to the wider countryside existing public rights of way will be protected and publically accessible green space will be integral to the masterplan. See paragraphs 6.10.9, 6.10.11 and 6.10.12 of the draft plan.</p>	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.
Mr Ben Lamb	manager Tees Rivers Trust			DBDLP 28	Policy DC 4	Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)	Neutral	Question as to if additional guidance will be provided as to when SUDS may not be appropriate.	<p>This comment is supported by Northumbrian Waters response (DBDLP734) that the onus should be on developers to deliver SUDS and only excluded in exceptional circumstances. Alternative wording has been suggested by Northumbrian Water that we will look to include in the plan going forward.</p>	As per changes recommended for comment DBDLP734
Mr David	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 201	Policy DC 4	Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage	Neutral	Concern raised if water runoff becomes contaminated.	<p>The Environment Agency has suggested strengthening the policy approach to where contamination may exist to protect the quality of the water</p>	See comment DBDLP1279

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Phillips						Systems (SUDS)			environment (see comment DBDLP1279). These recommendations will be fully taken into account before the publication stage of the local plan.	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 599	Policy DC 4	Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)	Object	Objection raised over clarity of wording and potential of contamination of surface water.	The Environment Agency has suggested strengthening the policy approach to where contamination may exist to protect the quality of the water environment (see comment DBDLP1279). These recommendations will be fully taken into account before the publication stage of the local plan.	See comment DBDLP1279.
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 675	Policy DC 4	Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)	Neutral	Further reference should be made to methods of water harvesting and retention and the role of underground storage (although this should be discouraged in the Town Centre and SPD Zone 1 where surface habitat creation should be prioritised).	The Council's Design of New Development SPD contains additional guidance on sustainable drainage and cross reference will be made to this in the reasoned justification for Policy DC 4.	Insert: <u>g. Opportunities for rainwater harvesting are utilised where appropriate.</u> Cross reference to Design of New Development SPD in the reasoned justification.
Mrs Laura Roberts	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 734	Policy DC 4	Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)	Support	General support for policy as drafted. Suggested additional wording to strengthen the approach to sewerage infrastructure and the avoidance of discharging surface water to the public sewerage system. Strengthened wording is also proposed in relation to integration of SUDS. Onus should be on developers to deliver SUDS and only excluded in exceptional circumstances.	Proposals to alter and strengthen wording are appropriate and will be incorporated into the plan.	Include: <i>"To ensure that growth can be accommodated sustainably by the sewerage infrastructure, the policy requires that in all locations surface water should be separated, with any surface water runoff entering the sewerage system being minimised and controlled. The priority is to avoid using public sewers wherever possible for the disposal of surface water. If a connection to the public sewerage network is the only option, there is a need for onsite attenuation to minimise and control the flows leaving the site".</i> and <i>"all new major development sites will be required to incorporate SUDS"</i>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier				DBDLP 979	Policy DC 4	Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)	Object	<p>Objection raised over concerns that built development (particularly Skerningham) with increased quantities of impermeable surfaces will lead to surface water drainage issues. Increased levels of surface water runoff also leads to an increased rate of pollutant transfer which requires additional treatment.</p>	<p>Areas at risk of surface water flooding have been taken into account in the layout of the Skerningham masterplan. Development proposals will also have to meet the criteria within policy DC 4, in terms of incorporating sustainable drainage systems (giving priority to natural drainage features and integrating green infrastructure) and limiting water runoff to greenfield rates. All major developments will also be required to submit a drainage plan to show the site drainage can be adequately dealt with. The Environment Agency has suggested strengthening the policy approach to where contamination may exist to protect the quality of the water environment (see comment DBDLP1279). Additional criteria is proposed for the policy.</p>	<p>See comment DBDLP1279.</p>
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1279	Policy DC 4	Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)	Neutral	<p>Recommend that this policy advises developers of potential groundwater constraints in the Darlington area. It is also recommended that if SUDS are to be incorporated into developments that the suitability of the final drainage scheme is taken into consideration. Care should be taken to ensure that SUDS which speed up infiltration to ground will not encourage leaching of pollutants into the groundwater aquifer or nearby surface water bodies. A groundwater risk assessment should be taken as part of a site specific FRA or EIA. The level of assessment should be proportionate to the potential risk/level of concern now and in the future.</p> <p>Policies recommended to cover:</p>	<p>Policy to be redrafted to incorporate the recommendations of the Environment Agency with regard to development on contaminated land and development that may affect controlled waters.</p>	<p>Alter title of policy DC 4 to Flood Risk & Water Management</p> <p>Additional text to be added to the end of policy DC 4:</p> <p><u>New developments should make an assessment of and address via mitigation measures where required, any risks from the construction and proposed use of the site to underlying groundwater, watercourses and other surface waters, in order to protect these resources and prevent contamination.</u></p> <p>Paragraph to be added to supporting text of policy DC 4, after para 5.4.9.</p> <p><u>Water resources are a particularly vulnerable aspect of the environment and it is important that groundwater, watercourses and other surface waters are protected from contamination. Darlington lies across a principal aquifer, Magnesium Limestone, a highly sensitive environmental receptor and an important source of water for a large number of public, private and industrial supplies. Pollutants can easily permeate soils</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development on Brownfield and Contaminated Land • Development which could affect Controlled Waters 		<p><u>and contaminate groundwater and development can also affect the hydrology of the area. Once contaminated, it is very difficult and costly, if not impossible, to clean ground water.</u></p> <p><u>Where risks to controlled waters are identified as part of a development appropriate remediation and the implementation of mitigation measures will be required to prevent contamination and to protect resources. If potentially polluting materials are to be used/stored either during construction works or as part of the new land use, sufficient prevention and maintenance measures should be incorporated into the development proposals. Gypsum, which is readily dissolved by flowing underground water, underlies parts of the Darlington area. Developers will need to satisfy themselves and the Local Planning Authority that their proposals for development will not be affected by this geological feature.</u></p> <p>Additional criteria to be added to policy DC 1 Sustainable Design Principles:</p> <p><u>That proposals for development on land which is affected by contamination will be permitted only if the applicant can demonstrate that the site is suitable for the proposed use and does not result in unacceptable risks to human health or the environment.</u></p> <p>Paragraph to be added to supporting text of policy DC 1 after para 5.1.14:</p> <p><u>Development on Brownfield sites and land which may be affected by contamination</u></p> <p><u>Brownfield sites selected for redevelopment may be contaminated as a result of previous uses. It is desirable that such sites which are otherwise suitable for development are brought back into productive use, but it is essential that the health and wellbeing of construction workers or the end users of any development are not put at unacceptable risk. Therefore, proposals for development on land which is likely to be affected by contamination will be</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
										<p><u>permitted only if the applicant can demonstrate that the site is or will made be safe for the proposed development and surroundings.</u></p> <p><u>The Council will have regard to Government and other appropriate regional guidance when assessing land contamination reports submitted as part of the planning process. In considering outline applications, sufficient information will be required to enable the Council to be satisfied that the development can be carried out and used safely, and that any outstanding problems are capable of solution and can be dealt with as matters of detail.</u></p>
Ms Julie Nixon				DBDLP 325	6	HOUSING	Object	<p>Objections and concerns raised to housing plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on the natural environment • Loss of habitats and wildlife. • Loss of land for food production. • Green spaces are important for physical health, mental health and general wellbeing. • More housing will result in increased traffic and congestion which will subsequently effect health via air pollution. • A quarter of homes stand empty. • Brownfield land should be used first. • Infrastructure required to support growth • More homes needed for older people. 	<p>Objections noted.</p> <p>The impacts of the Draft Local Plan on the natural environment has been considered via the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The Council is in the process of updating the information it holds on the quantity, quality and distribution of green spaces across the Borough and the outcome of this work may result in an update to the provision standards contained in the Planning Obligations SPD.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole and other policies in the plan will influence developments impact on health and wellbeing of residents, including mental health. The plan includes a health and wellbeing policy which encourages developments that support improvements to health and wellbeing in Darlington through a number of measures such as integrating health and community facilities and improving accessibility to green spaces. There are other related policies</p>	<p>Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Benefits of the natural environment and green spaces referred to including best practice examples of projects, e.g. tree planting schemes, green space enhancement, wetland creation etc. Suggested that we should only attract those people and businesses which will have a positive impact on the borough. Additional development should be kept to a minimum and should promote health, nature, design and sustainability. Examples provided.</p>	<p>on the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure, green infrastructure standards, biodiversity and sustainable design principles. Darlington is also an NHS Healthy New Towns pilot and policies in the emerging Local Plan have been informed by six Darlington Healthy New Towns Design Principles.</p> <p>Transport modelling work is ongoing to test highway mitigation schemes to ensure developments do not have an unacceptable impact on local and strategic highway network.</p> <p>Please see officer response for brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes and response on Skertingham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development.</p> <p>Policy H 4 aims to encourage a mix of new homes including market and specialised housing suitable for older people.</p>	
Mr Nigel Swinbank		Mr Andrew Moss	Ward Hadaway	DBDLP 39	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>The minimum housing requirement should be set at 492 net additional dwellings per annum equating to at least 9,840 dwellings over the Plan period. It is not sound to use the 8,440 figure given the aspirations for economic growth and the affordable housing need.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.</p> <p>With regards to catch up on any past under performance please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. This was considered in the SHMA 2017 Update and an uplift not considered necessary when an assessment of market conditions was undertaken.</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Additionally there is a need for catch up on any past underperformance.</p> <p>Without prejudice to other representations the Plan should allocate sites in the rural villages, the last sentence in the policy should be rewritten to allow for sites in the rural villages to be developed when there is not a 5 year supply including a 20% buffer.</p> <p>The reference to development limits additionally needs to be removed, as drawn they not reflecting the position on the ground.</p> <p>Following wording suggested;</p> <p><i>"At any point in the Local Plan period where there is no longer a demonstrable supply of sites to fully meet the 5 year land requirement including 20 % buffer, sustainable housing sites that would both make a positive contribution to the five year supply of housing land and be well related to the main urban area, service villages (as defined in SH1) or rural villages (as defined in SH2) will be supported. Such proposals should comprise of sustainable development and be consistent with relevant national and Local Plan policies".</i></p>	<p>The allocation of sites in rural villages does not accord with the locational strategy of the Draft Local Plan. It is considered that the most sustainable sites for new housing development are located within and adjacent to the main urban area and at the larger service villages. This also applies to the suggested rewording of the final paragraph of H 1 which is not considered appropriate.</p> <p>Development limits have been updated in the Draft Local Plan. Some alterations have been highlighted in comments received on the Draft Local Plan. Changes will be made where necessary.</p>	
Joanne Harding	Home Builders Federation			DBDLP 783	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	HBF support decision to set a housing figure above the governments standard method approach, to help support sustainable development, to boost	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target and the response on the five year supply fall-back position.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target and the response on the five year supply fall-back position.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>housing supply and to support economic prosperity.</p> <p>The Housing requirement could be confusing as it provides two requirement figures. The HBF recommend using 492 dwellings per annum as the housing requirement as identified in the SHMA 2017 update rather than introducing a lower figure.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the final paragraph of H1. HBF support the need to take action where there is not a five year housing land supply, the solution proposed does not seem appropriate. It would be expected that regardless of supply the Council would be accepting of sites that are sustainable, consistent with relevant national and Local Plan policies and make a contribution to the supply. A more proactive approach should be taken.</p>		
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 791	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Hellens Land supports the approach taken to identifying and meeting the objectively assessed housing need in Darlington. We support the Council's approach of identifying a figure based on the economic needs of the authority not the demographic projection which would lead to a fall in working age persons. This approach is in line with both existing and emerging planning policy guidance.</p> <p>Clarification is needed in Policy H1 however to ensure it is clear there is alignment between the objectively assessed housing need and housing requirement in Policy</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.</p> <p>If a five year supply of housing land can not be demonstrated allocated sites will still be looked upon positively. It's not considered necessary to alter the policy.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>H1. Suggested that the policy is amended to remove reference to the lower requirement of 422 dpa.</p> <p>Support the Council's proposal to release additional sustainable land in Darlington where there is no five year supply, however the policy should be clear that this should not come at the expense of allocated sites and that support should be given to allocated sites, particularly the strategic scale allocations, to increase their delivery before alternative and potentially competing sites are brought forward.</p>		
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 836	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Skerningham Estates Ltd support the Council's minimum requirement of 492 net additional dwellings per annum. For Darlington the standard methodology would result in a future housing need of 181 dwellings per annum. The Government is clear that the standard methodology is a minimum starting point. Draft revised Planning Practice Guidance confirmed that it is still appropriate for higher figures to be tested on the basis of employment, infrastructure, affordable housing and other factors.</p> <p>Clarification is needed in policy H1 to ensure there is clear alignment between the objectively assessed housing need and the housing requirement. Amendment suggested to set a minimum housing requirement within the policy of 492 dwellings per annum and remove the lower figure.</p>	Comments noted. Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Lichfields carried out an assessment of Darlington's housing need which came to a figure of 480 dwellings per annum. This figure would meet population and household growth, economic led needs and an uplift to help meet affordable housing needs. This supports the housing requirement identified in policy H1.</p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the impacts of using the standard methodology for assessing housing need in the north east. Reliance on household projections for the standard method which results in lower housing need figures for authorities in the north east compared to current requirements which are based on economic led scenarios. Future aspirations of the north east are not reflected in the standard method.</p> <p>Issue raised that 2016 based population projections which underpin the standard method are now notably lower than previous projections. This will effect the standard method figures when household projections are published in Sept 2018. There is an intention from the Government for the standard method to yield nationally a figure which is broadly close to ensuring that 300,000 homes are built per year. In the event of a significant change to the underlying figures the Government intends to address this through changes to the methodology.</p>		

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 854	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>NWL broadly support the Council's minimum housing requirement of 492 net additional dwellings per annum over the period 2016 to 2036 and particularly supports reference to this being a minimum requirement.</p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the final para of H1 when a five year supply cannot be demonstrated. This element of Policy H1 is at odds with other policies within the local plan (which support development beyond the limits of rural villages to meet rural and functional needs and within the development limits of rural villages) and also the NPPF. Paragraph 11 of the 2018 NPPF, when read in conjunction with Footnote 7, confirms that, where there is no five-year supply (and therefore policies are out-of-date), planning permission should be granted unless the criteria identified apply. A similar provision is set out within the 2012 NPPF (Paragraph 14). The application of a sequential approach, in which sites only in urban areas and service villages are released where there is no five-year supply, is not consistent with national planning policy and therefore this element of the policy is not sound.</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year supply fall-back position.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year supply fall-back position.
Amy ward	Planning Manager Barratt Homes			DBDLP 1003	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Confusion over the wording of the policy as there appears to be a minimum target and another target. Some clarity requested. Supportive of the higher Local Plan target of 492 dwellings per annum. The SHMA Update 2017 identifies the objectively assessed housing need as 492 dwellings per annum in line with the Local Plan</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year land supply fall-back position.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year land supply fall-back position.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>housing target. Barratt Homes therefore recommend that the Council use the Local Plan housing target.</p> <p>The Council should calculate the five year supply position on the higher Local Plan housing target - 492 dwellings.</p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the final paragraph of H1 - implies that the Council will only consider sustainable sites for development where there is not a five year land supply. Regardless of supply the Council should be accepting of sites that are sustainable, consistent with relevant national and Local Plan policies and make a contribution to the five year land supply. H1 to be reworded accordingly.</p>		
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1080	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Neutral	<p>Concern that the approach in the policy will not deliver the borough's full OAN for housing. The SHMA 2017 update identifies an OAN of 492 dwellings per annum, as such the Council should be seeking to meet this figure in full.</p> <p>The Council's five year land supply position should be tested against 492 dwellings figure rather than 422 dwellings per annum as this is an underestimation of actual need.</p> <p>Gladman are supportive of the final paragraph of H1 however consider that this element of the policy should go further to provide flexibility required by national</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and officer response on five year supply-fall back position.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and officer response on five year supply-fall back position.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								policy to ensure housing needs are met in full over the duration of the plan period and recommend that this approach is used even in circumstances where the Council can demonstrate a five year supply. Recommended to set a criteria based approach to give the Council control over sites coming forward instead of relying on a reactive measure in circumstances where the Council is no longer able to demonstrate a five year supply.		
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1183	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement is confusing as it provides two housing requirement figures, one as a minimum requirement and one as a local plan target.</p> <p>Given that the OAN figure of 492 net additional dwellings per annum has been clearly and robustly evidenced within the SHMA, any attempt by the Council to introduce a housing requirement lower than this figure is considered to be an unsound approach. The 492 figure should also be used for calculating the five year land supply.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes support the need to take action where there is not a five-year housing land supply, the solution proposed within this policy does not necessarily seem appropriate. Persimmon Homes would expect that regardless of supply, the Council would be accepting of sites that are sustainable, consistent with relevant national and Local Plan policies and make a contribution to the five-year</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year supply fall-back position.</p> <p>In addition paragraph 6.2.9 of the Draft Local Plan does state that if there is persistent and prolonged under delivery of housing, a review of the housing chapter and the housing allocations will be undertaken in order to resolve the situation.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year supply fall-back position.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								supply. Therefore, Persimmon Homes would look for the Council to be taking a more pro-active approach if there is a period where there is no longer a demonstrable five-year supply of sites. Persimmon Homes suggests that a pro active approach of a plan review, when there is no longer a demonstrable five-year supply of sites.		
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1130	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	The housing requirement as set out in Policy H1 is strongly supported as the minimum housing requirement. Uplifts recommended in the SHMA 2017 to accommodate employment growth and the need for bedspaces in class C2 dwellings. To meet the full Objectively Assessed Need the Council should therefore consider increasing the housing allocation to a total net minimum requirement of 9,840 dwellings. This could include the increase of housing allocated within Strategic Allocations.	Comments noted. Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target. There is a flexibility of sites in the plan which provides a buffer over the housing target. Taking into account the completions recorded for the first three years of the plan period there is sufficient land to provide a buffer of 16% above the remaining housing target figure. This provides a level of flexibility in the plan if some sites weren't to come forward for development. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. Contributions from windfall sites, small sites and brownfield regeneration sites within the main urban area have not been included in the supply and create additional flexibility.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart		Mr Christopher Martin	WYG	DBDLP 1112	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	DFAM objects to this approach of two housing requirement figures and believes it creates confusion for developers. As such, this approach can be regarded	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year supply fall-back position.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and officer response on five year supply-fall back position.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
N/A								<p>as unsound on the basis of being ineffective.</p> <p>Positive approach of final paragraph supported, however it should be the case that the Council should be supporting sustainable sites anyway. This part of the policy is unsound. Recommended that the Council need to be more proactive in its approach to examining housing land supply.</p>		
Frances Nicholson	Bellway Homes Limited (Durham)			DBDLP 1164	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Reference is made to Appendix A in the policy. It is assumed that there is scope for deviations from the trajectory. More explicit wording should be used to allow for greater flexibility to the delivery of housing to provide more positive opportunities.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Wording of the policy to be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>Policy H 1 to be amended as follows:</p> <p>It is anticipated that the sites will be delivered in accordance with the housing trajectory in Appendix A which indicates that a continuous five-year supply of housing will be maintained throughout the plan period. <u>The trajectory is an approximation of delivery and does not place any phasing restrictions on the sites.</u></p>
Mr G Raistrick		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1241	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>The housing requirement as set out in Policy H1 is strongly supported as the minimum housing requirement. Evidence in the SHMA Update 2017 is noted; uplift to meet the needs of workers related to jobs growth and an uplift to address the need for bedspaces in Class C2 dwellings.</p> <p>To meet the full Objectively Assessed Need the Council should therefore consider increasing the housing allocation to a total net minimum requirement of 9,840 dwellings.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.</p> <p>There is a flexibility of sites in the plan which provides a buffer over the housing target. Taking into account the completions recorded for the first three years of the plan period there is sufficient land to provide a buffer of 16% above the remaining housing target figure. This provides a level of flexibility in the plan if some sites weren't to come forward for development. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. Contributions from windfall sites, small sites and brownfield regeneration sites within the main urban area have not been included in the supply and create additional flexibility.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Miss Jennifer Earnshaw	Project Secretary Banks Property			DBDLP 1391	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Neutral	Policy H 1 states that the five year supply position will be calculated utilising the annual net housing requirement figure of 422. Banks Property believe that the target set out which factors in an economic uplift should be used to calculate the five year housing land supply position.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Steven Longstaff		DBDLP 1230	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Local Plan housing target of 492 dwelling per year which includes an uplift to support economic growth aspirations is welcomed. However, to align with conclusions of the 2017 SHMA, Taylor Wimpey consider that the Council must make this the housing requirement rather than including a lower minimum figure.</p> <p>In addition, the Council's 5 year housing land supply position must be tested against the 492 dwellings figure as the using the lower figure would not deliver sufficient housing to meet the identified housing needs.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey support the final paragraph H1 which provides a mechanism for sites to come forward outside of the development limits in the event that a 5 year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. Such an approach accords with NPPF.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.</p> <p>Support to final paragraph of H 1 noted.</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.
Thoroton and Croft Estate		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1257	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	The housing requirement as set out in Policy H1 is strongly supported as the minimum housing requirement. Evidence in the SHMA Update 2017 is noted; uplift to meet the needs of workers related to jobs growth and an uplift	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.</p> <p>There is a flexibility of sites in the plan which provides a buffer over the housing target. Taking into account the completions recorded for the first three years of the plan period there is</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>to address the need for bedspaces in Class C2 dwellings.</p> <p>To meet the full Objectively Assessed Need the Council should therefore consider increasing the housing allocation to a total net minimum requirement of 9,840 dwellings.</p>	<p>sufficient land to provide a buffer of 16% above the remaining housing target figure. This provides a level of flexibility in the plan if some sites weren't to come forward for development. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. Contributions from windfall sites, small sites and brownfield regeneration sites within the main urban area have not been included in the supply and create additional flexibility.</p>	
	Church Commissioners for England (CCE)	Ms Lucie Jowett	Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1156	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Generally supports the identified housing requirement set out within Policy H1, providing two different figures is confusing. Recommend that the Council amend the housing requirement to reflect the identified OAN in the SHMA Update 2017 (492) rather than introducing a second lower figure.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the final paragraph of H1 - generally support this approach of delivering housing in sustainable locations throughout the Borough, would however expect that support would also be provided for appropriate sites that are sustainable, consistent with relevant national and Local Plan policies and make a contribution to the five-year supply throughout the plan period. Suggestion that a more flexible and pro-active approach is taken to ensure that the identified housing need can be met.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year supply fall-back position.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and officer response on five year supply-fall back position.</p>
Mr Mark Walton		Mr Ian Lyle		DBDLP 1217	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Support the acknowledgement in the plan that there is a need to deliver substantially above the minimum housing requirement figure of 422 net additional</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year land supply fall-back position.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and officer response on five year supply-fall back position.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>dwellings per annum over the plan period.</p> <p>Concern that the suggested 'target' figure of 492 dpa (9840 dwellings over the Plan period) is an absolute ceiling to housing development numbers.</p> <p>Flexibility shown in the final paragraph of Policy H1 welcomed; where the Council appears to commit to granting planning permission for sustainable housing sites at any point during the plan period when it is not able to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land. In line with comments from the HBF however the Council should take a more proactive stance to bringing sites forward in such circumstances.</p>		
	Godolphin Developments Ltd	Ms Jennifer Nye	Lichfields	DBDLP 1264	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Supportive of the minimum housing requirement of 492 net additional dwellings per annum.</p> <p>The application of a sequential approach whereby sites only in urban areas and service villages are released where there is no five-year supply is not consistent with national planning policy and therefore this element of the policy is not sound.</p>	Please see officer response to housing requirement and housing target, and response on the five year supply fall-back position.	Please see officer response to housing requirement and housing target, and response on the five year supply fall-back position.
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephen Halliday	DBDLP 1308	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Concerns with the wording of policy H1 as it can cause uncertainty in the deliverability of the plan's aspirations and lacks clarity. The use of different housing requirement figures is objected to and is considered to fail the policy test of the Framework. 492 dwellings per annum is identified in the SHMA</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year supply fall-back position.</p> <p>With regards to identifying additional sites to come forward if delivery is failing; this is not an approach the Council will look to take as it is</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year supply fall-back position.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Update 2017 and should be used as the housing requirement and to assess the five year supply of deliverable housing land. The lower figure of 422 should not be used as it is below the requirement to deliver the jobs growth aspiration of the plan.</p> <p>The use of the term 'target' has the potential to be interpreted as a maximum delivery figure. Such an approach would not be consistent with the Framework and the terminology of 'minimum' should be used in the context of the 492 figure only.</p> <p>Support given to the final paragraph of the policy. Suggestion provided; in order to provide further certainty for communities and the development industry it would be reasonable and appropriate for the policy to identify a number of sites which could come forward where delivery is failing (can't demonstrate a five year supply). Whilst it is considered that the Neasham Road site should be allocated for development within the plan period, allocations as a potential windfall/safeguarded site could present an alternative option.</p> <p>It would be consistent with national policy to consider favourably development proposals which are sustainable and make a contribution towards housing supply, irrespective of the position on the 5 year housing land supply.</p>	<p>considered that there are sufficient sites within the plan to meet housing needs. Taking into account the completions recorded for the first three years of the plan period there is sufficient land to provide a buffer of 16% above the remaining housing target figure. This provides a level of flexibility in the plan if some sites weren't to come forward for development. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. Contributions from windfall sites, small sites and brownfield regeneration sites within the main urban area have not been included in the supply and create additional flexibility.</p>	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1334	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Generally supportive of the housing requirement, however providing two different figures is confusing and recommended that the Council amend the housing requirement to reflect the identified OAN in the SHMA Update 2017 (492 dwellings per annum) rather than introducing a second lower figure.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the final paragraph of the policy - general support to the Council's active approach to delivering housing in sustainable locations throughout the Borough, expected that support would also be provided for appropriate sites that are sustainable, consistent with relevant national and Local Plan policies and make a contribution to the five-year supply throughout the plan period. Recommendation that a more flexible and pro-active approach is taken to ensure that the identified housing need can be met.</p> <p>Where sites are unallocated, but considered to be sustainable, these should be considered on their own merits and the policy should not restrict planning applications on such sites being approved. Site at Burtree Lane is available, suitable, achievable and deliverable and can contribute to meeting the needs of Darlington's identified housing need. The site is sustainable and can be delivered in the next 5 years; it is therefore considered that the land at Burtree Lane should be allocated and given priority for development early in the plan period. However, should</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year supply fall-back position.</p> <p>With regards to the comments on the site promoted please see officer response to policy H 2 comment ref DBDLP1365.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target, and response on five year supply fall-back position.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								this not be allocated, the Council should not refuse development on this site on the basis that it is unallocated within the plan.		
Amy ward	Planning Manager Barratt Homes			DBDLP 1010	6.2.5	Paragraph	Object	<p>Five year land supply should be calculated using the higher housing requirement figure of 492 dwellings per annum. Therefore the annual requirement with a 20% buffer is actually 669. Based on the higher requirement, using the Council's proposed deliverable supply for the five year period the Council have a 5.18 year land supply. Based on BDW's reduced 5 year land supply on our assessment of sites, the Council only has a 1.7 year land supply.</p> <p>Recommendation - review the housing requirement figure used in the five year land supply.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.</p> <p>Substantial evidence base work has been undertaken to date to ensure the commitments and proposed allocations in the plan are deliverable. Consideration has been given to developer interest and physical site constraints.</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and housing target.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 608	6.2.7	Paragraph	Object	<p>CPRE objects to the provisions in this paragraph and the corresponding paragraph in policy H1. It effectively renders useless all the policy in the Plan and the consultation process if there is no longer a demonstrable supply of sites to fully meet the five year land requirement.</p>	<p>Please see officer response to five year supply fall-back position. In the circumstance where a five year supply can not be demonstrated the tilted balance of paragraph 11 of the NPPF (2019) will be engaged. Proposals will not be required to accord with policy H 7 Residential Development in the Countryside but they will be assessed against all other relevant national and Local Plan policies. Sites will need to be sustainable, make a positive contribution to the five year supply and be well related to the development limits of the main urban area or service villages.</p>	Please see officer response to five year supply fall-back position.
Mr Nigel Swinbank		Mr Andrew Moss	Ward Hadawa y	DBDLP 40	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Small sites of 0.5 hectares or less should be allocated in the rural villages. These sites contribute towards range and choice, are likely to be attractive to small and</p>	<p>Allocating sites for housing in the rural villages does not accord with the locational strategy of the Draft Local Plan. Housing allocations are focused on the main urban area and service villages as these areas provide (or will</p>	Alter development limits to include the application site area.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>medium builders and can be readily developable.</p> <p>The balance of site 54 (commitment) remains available in whole or part for further development. In the recent past the built form on this site extended significantly beyond the site subject of planning permission 16/01020/OUT (commitment 54 in Table 6.4).</p>	<p>be able to provide) the level of services, facilities and employment opportunities that are required to support communities and an increase in population. It is considered that these areas are the most sustainable locations for new development. Some housing development will be permitted in rural areas, such as rural exception sites, infill development and housing required to support the rural economy, providing they accord with all relevant national and Local Plan policies.</p> <p>The boundary for site 54 on the policies map includes a wider area than the approved permission (ref 16/01020/OUT) and this is an error. A variation of condition application (18/00501/FUL) was also recently approved for the site which involved alterations to the scheme and a reduction in yield to 9 dwellings. Commitments of less than 10 dwellings will not be included in the Local Plan, as such this site is to be removed from table 6.4, Appendix A Housing Trajectory and the policies map. Any completions from the scheme will however be counted towards meeting the housing requirement and target of the Local Plan. As the scheme is under construction the development limits will be altered to include the application site area.</p>	
Judith Murray				DBDLP 525	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Housing requirement is overstated therefore Skerningham allocation is not required. Objection to the use of green space above 'brownfield' sites for development. This does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. It is considered that the housing requirement and housing target in the Draft Local Plan reflect the objectively assessed housing needs of the borough. As such the Skerningham strategic site is required to meet these needs.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	
Amy ward	Planning Manager Barratt Homes			DBDLP 1011	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Ensure all potential allocations are deliverable in light of the policy obligations proposed.</p> <p>Concerns that site 1: Alderman Leach has a lapsed permission which suggests viability constraints. 12 dwellings is unlikely to make this site viable. Concern that Site 95: Beech Crescent East, Heighington is to be accessed from the adjoining committed site. Relying on another site in third party ownership for access is not an appropriate strategy and raises questions regarding the delivery of the site.</p> <p>Resist the creation of a specific housing mix – must be marked led. Should be a flexible approach which recognises that need and demand will vary from area to area and site to site, ensure that the scheme is viable and provides an appropriate mix for the location</p>	<p>Substantial evidence base work has been undertaken to date to ensure the commitments and proposed allocations in the plan are deliverable. Consideration has been given to developer interest and physical site constraints. A Local Plan Viability Assessment is being prepared, this will ensure that allocations are deliverable when taking into account planning obligations which are set out in the plan.</p> <p>Advanced discussions have been held with a developer for Site 1 Alderman Leach however the yield proposed for the site has reduced to below 10 dwellings. This site is therefore to be removed from the proposed allocations. The Council has an interest in the adjoining commitment, site 95 Beech Crescent East, Heighington, as such there are no concerns regarding securing access through the adjoining site.</p> <p>Please see officer responses to H 4 housing mix policy.</p>	Remove site 1 Alderman Leach from policy H 2, Appendix A and Appendix B.
Nick McLellan	Story Homes			DBDLP 1044	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Support	<p>Story Homes broadly supports, subject to minor changes, the Council's approach to allocating site 99 Maxgate Farm, MSG. Support given to site 146 Land south of the railway line and the inclusion of a site for a new primary school in this allocation. As such Story Homes have reviewed the current planning application on site 99 to remove a proposed primary school element</p>	<p>Comments noted. Site yield to be updated as suggested.</p>	Update table 6.3, appendix A and appendix B with new yield.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								to avoid duplication of future education provision in the village. This enables further capacity for housing on the site with a revised yield of 260 dwellings. The Council should amend the yield for site 99 from 226 units by 2036 to 260 units by 2036. Appendix B Allocation Statements should also be amended to reflect this change.		
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1105	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>There does not appear to be any robust assessment of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting to inform the suitability of the sites (included those that are safeguarded) for development. The SA does not provide any evidence to determine whether the sites can accommodate the quantum of development without harm to the historic environment. Some parts of the SA suggest mitigation measures without any evidence to support their inclusion, whilst others defer all matters to be dealt with at planning application stage. As a result the site specific policies do not provide any mitigation measures to inform development proposals that may come forward for the sites.</p> <p>The Plan and the supporting evidence base including the SA should be amended to ensure that it includes a robust assessment of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting to inform the suitability of the sites for development and to ensure that there are appropriate site specific mitigation measures which will minimise harm to the historic environment in line with the</p>	<p>Objection and comments noted.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of this work have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.</p>	Housing and Employment Allocation Statements have been updated to reflect Heritage Impact Assessments.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>requirements of the NPPF and the 1990 Act.</p> <p>Detail and examples provided of how to carry out a robust assessment.</p>		
Frances Nicholson	Bellway Homes Limited (Durham)			DBDLP 1165	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Paragraph 4 sets out that identified allocated sites “should address any issues or requirements as set out in Appendix B – Housing Allocation Statements.” It is considered that this policy criteria could be perceived as an absolute constraint to development on allocated sites and it would be more beneficial for decision makers to consider allocation statements in the planning balance and work with developers to find solutions. Recommended re-wording to the following; “sites should endeavour to address the issues and requirements as set out in Appendix B – Housing Allocation Statements and where they can’t any adverse impact in not doing so should be weighed against the benefits of the scheme to ensure that when it is beneficial to do so, development should be approved without delay...”.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Wording of policy to be amended.</p>	<p>Amend the final sentence of the fourth paragraph of policy H 2 Housing Allocations as outlined below:</p> <p>Schemes should <u>satisfactorily</u> address any issues or requirements as set out in Appendix B Housing Allocation Statements.</p>
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1309	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>The policy confirms the identified sites are required to meet the housing ‘target’ in Policy H1 (492). It also confirms they will be used to evidence a rolling 5 year housing land supply (currently based on the 422 figure). In the context of the above comments, there is possible further confusion with these statements which should be</p>	<p>Please see officer response to housing requirement and housing target.</p> <p>There is a flexibility of sites in the plan which provides a buffer over the housing target. Taking into account the completions recorded for the first three years of the plan period there is sufficient land to provide a buffer of 16% above the remaining housing target figure. This provides a level of flexibility in the plan if some sites weren’t to come forward for</p>	<p>Rectify discrepancies between policy H 2 and Appendix A with regards to sites 41 South Coniscliffe Park and 68 West Park.</p> <p>Please see officer response to housing requirement and housing target.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>clarified with the adoption of the 'target' figure only.</p> <p>Policy approach that site yields are indicative and that unit numbers will be determined through planning applications is supported.</p> <p>There are a number of larger sites which require further evidence to demonstrate that they will be deliverable at the rates envisaged within policy H 2. Under delivery on sites should be assumed. On this basis an appropriate buffer should be included. 20% buffer recommended.</p> <p>Council is encouraged to provide further evidence on delivery.</p> <p>Questioned if site yields have considered policy requirements, including building regulations Part M standards set out in Policy H 4.</p> <p>Discrepancies between policy H 2 and Appendix A Housing Trajectory - sites 41 South Coniscliffe Park and Site 68 West Park.</p> <p>Site comments duplicated against relevant site/policy.</p>	<p>development. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. Contributions from windfall sites, small sites and brownfield regeneration sites within the main urban area have not been included in the supply and create additional flexibility.</p> <p>Substantial evidence base work has been undertaken to date to ensure the commitments and proposed allocations in the plan are deliverable. Consideration has been given to developer interest and physical site constraints. A Local Plan Viability Assessment is being prepared, this will ensure that allocations are deliverable when taking into account planning obligations which are set out in the plan. Additional evidence on delivery will be provided at further stages of plan preparation.</p> <p>Comments noted regarding impact of accessibility standards dwellings on site yield. The site yields are however indicative and it is expected that the majority of site yields will be finalised at the planning application stage. It is also considered that there is a sufficient flexibility of sites in the plan to ensure that quantitative housing needs are met.</p> <p>Discrepancies between policy H 2 and Appendix A noted and will be rectified.</p>	
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 243	Table 6.3	Housing Allocations	Neutral	<p>Housing numbers for Skerningham are well over the Government's recommended figure. Concerns raised:</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. It is considered that the housing requirement and housing target in the Draft Local Plan reflect the objectively assessed housing needs of the borough. As such the proposed housing</p>	<p>Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If only half of the houses were needed or only half the estimated people moved to Darlington which of these areas would be developed. Could schemes be left half built out. The golf course has been sold and agreement to be rebuilt at the edge of Skertingham what happens if not all of the houses are required, would the golf course still be rebuilt. Over what timescales would a decision be made as to whether the estimated number of houses or people be reviewed. 	<p>allocations are required to meet these needs.</p> <p>Please see officer response on Skertingham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The yield for the Skertingham site is an indicative figure and will be determined at the planning application stage. More generally the NPPF requires Local Plans to be reviewed at least once every five years. During a review consideration will be given as to whether the housing requirement and housing target figures require updating.</p> <p>Development will be phased from the urban edge in a logical manner, alongside required infrastructure. The precise location of development will be determined at the planning application stage.</p>	
Mr Geoffrey Crute	Councillor Neasham Parish Council			DBDLP 379	Table 6.4	Housing Commitments	Object	<p>Neasham Parish Council supports the proposal at Paragraph 6.2.12 against further development of rural villages. It accepts that where permissions have been granted recently under the NPPF framework in the absence of a local plan those consents which can be implemented within their terms must be recognised.</p> <p>However, it is unclear whether site 54 (Neasham Nursery) in table 6.4 is limited to the area of the existing planning consent or whether the "Housing Commitment" is intended to cover the whole of the former Neasham Nursery site. Reserved matters</p>	<p>The boundary for site 54 on the policies map includes a wider area than the approved permission (ref 16/01020/OUT) and this is an error. A variation of condition application (18/00501/FUL) was also recently approved for the site which involved alterations to the scheme and a reduction in yield to 9 dwellings. Commitments of less than 10 dwellings will not be included in the Local Plan, as such this site is to be removed from table 6.4, Appendix A Housing Trajectory and the policies map. Any completions from the scheme will however be counted towards meeting the housing requirement and target of the Local Plan. As the scheme is under construction the development limits</p>	Alter development limits to include the application site area.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>have now been approved under consent 16/01020/OUT and construction is well under way. The approved development covers approximately one quarter of the whole 4.44 ha site, and extends beyond the present and proposed development limits of Neasham Village. The remainder of the site is in use as agricultural land.</p> <p>Concerns raised as the development of the remainder of the site would be contrary to other policies within the Draft Local Plan and would also go against key sustainability principles.</p>	will be altered to include the application site area.	
Mr Nigel Swinbank		Mr Andrew Moss	Ward Hadaway	DBDLP 41	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>The use of Development Limits and restricting the development of land is not fully consistent with the NPPF as they are seen to stifle sustainable development, whereas the NPPF seeks a more flexible and positive approach. Development Limits should not be used in the Plan.</p> <p>Without prejudice to the above, the development limits proposed for Neasham appear to have been rolled forward unchanged from the Darlington Local Plan 1997 and do not reflect circumstances on the ground. It is unsound for example that the dwellings currently being delivered on the site subject of planning permission 16/01020/OUT are outwith Development Limits and therefore will be subject of countryside policies.</p>	<p>The use of development limits is a long established principle in planning, which promotes sustainable patterns of development and protects the countryside, in accordance with the aims of the NPPF (2019). Establishing boundaries around the conurbation and villages also provides certainty and clarity to decisions makers, developers and local communities. It is consistent with paragraph 16 of the Framework which states, plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals. As such development limits are to be utilised in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The boundary for site 54 on the policies map includes a wider area than the approved permission (ref 16/01020/OUT) and this is an error. A variation of condition application (18/00501/FUL) was also recently approved for the site which involved alterations to the scheme and a reduction in yield to 9 dwellings.</p>	Alter development limits to include the application site area.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									Commitments of less than 10 dwellings will not be included in the Local Plan, as such this site is to be removed from table 6.4, Appendix A Housing Trajectory and the policies map. Any completions from the scheme will however be counted towards meeting the housing requirement and target of the Local Plan. As the scheme is under construction the development limits will be altered to include the application site area.	
Stephen Bibby				DBDLP 482	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>The Skerningham allocation contradicts the statements within paragraph 6.3.1 related to policy H 3 Development Limits. The site will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Destroy existing habitats and utilities: trees, woodland, meadow, hedgerows & pathways; Once gone it will never return. • Be extremely large and will contribute to blurring the identities of existing communities, while creating something so huge that it would potentially draw further interest away from the town centre. Concern that this would be a satellite, and not genuinely part of Darlington. 	<p>Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes for further detail.</p> <p>The development limits have been extended to include the proposed strategic development locations.</p> <p>Skerningham is to be planned for as a single cohesive community. Barmpton and Great Burdon will remain distinctly separate from the strategic site which is illustrated in figure 6.1 Skerningham Masterplan Framework. The site is to be well integrated with the surrounding residential areas of Whinfield and Harrowgate Hill.</p> <p>Policy H 10 Skerningham Strategic Allocation sets out that the site will provide a centrally located and well connected neighbourhood centre providing supporting local community facilities. These facilities are to meet the day to day needs of residents and it is not the intention that they will detract from the town centre. For main town centre uses the Local Plan advocates a town centre first approach which is set out in policy TC 1.</p>	Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 370	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>Objection to the extension of Development Limits into the countryside. Many of the extensions into the countryside are unnecessary if reasonable housing figures are adopted.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the Skerningham Strategic Allocation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of Grade 3 arable land. Loss of woodland and amenity space with regard to the Skerningham Community Woodland/Countryside Park. The Skerningham Strategic Allocation is at odds with the Darlington Green Infrastructure Strategy on numerous grounds. 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>It is considered that the housing requirement and housing target in the Draft Local Plan reflect the objectively assessed housing needs of the borough. As such the proposed housing allocations are required to meet these needs. The development limits have been extended to include the proposed strategic development locations.</p>	Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 546	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>Paragraph 6.3.1 is fundamentally flawed. It will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Destroy existing habitats and utilities: trees, woodland, meadow, hedgerows & pathways. Such a large site will reduce the clarity of existing communities, while creating something that will potentially draw further interest away from the town centre. This has already been witnessed 	<p>No reference is made to a particular site however it is assumed that the comments are in relation to Skerningham strategic allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>The development limits have been extended to include the proposed strategic development locations.</p> <p>Policy H 10 Skerningham Strategic Allocation sets out that the site will</p>	Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								in Ingleby Barwick and their issues are well documented.	provide a centrally located and well connected neighbourhood centre providing supporting local community facilities. These facilities are to meet the day to day needs of residents and it is not the intention that they will detract from the town centre. For main town centre uses the Local Plan advocates a town centre first approach which is set out in policy TC 1.	
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1022	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	Paragraph 69 of the NPPF states that neighbourhood plan groups should consider the opportunities for allocating small and medium sized sites that are suitable for housing. The draft Local Plan ignores this detailed work undertaken by the local community in the Draft Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Neighbourhood Plan. LCMPC therefore object to the settlement limits proposed on the policies map for Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent.	Development limits can be altered to reflect the planning permission which is under construction for three dwellings on the Merrybent Nursery site (ref 16/00496/FUL). The proposed infill site by the community at Low Coniscliffe is included within the development limits of the Draft Local Plan. The two small housing sites proposed at Merrybent in the neighbourhood plan (to the north west and south east of the linear settlement) do not accord with the locational strategy for new housing development in the Draft Local Plan. New housing is focused to the main urban area and the larger service villages as it is considered that these are the most sustainable locations for new housing development. As such the development limits have not been amended to reflect these two sites within the neighbourhood plan.	Alter development limits at Merrybent to include Merrybent Nursery site which is under construction (ref 16/00496/FUL).
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 60	6.3.1	Paragraph	Object	Allocation of Skerningham site is contrary to the aims of this paragraph. Concerns raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is open countryside of natural outstanding beauty. Site includes a burial site and medieval village with has been 	Please see officers response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>missed from Appendix C.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is beautiful natural woodland - Skerningham Community Woodland covers more than 10ha and includes rare black poplar trees and many footpaths all of which have received funding. Concerns regarding impact of development on trees. New woodland also being developed by a community forestry group. Loss of identities of existing settlements. Will destroy the countryside used by residents for recreational activities which contributes to mental health. 		
Joanne Harding	Home Builders Federation			DBDLP 804	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	<p>If the Council wishes to adopt the higher optional standards for accessible & adaptable homes the Council should only do so by applying the criteria set out in the PPG. It is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the specific case for Darlington which justifies the inclusion of optional higher standards for accessible / adaptable homes in its Local Plan policy. PPG (ID 56-07) identifies the type of evidence required to introduce such a policy, including the likely future need; the size, location, type and quality of dwellings needed; the accessibility and adaptability</p>	<p>Further evidence base work has been carried out on the housing needs of people with disabilities and the accessible and adaptable homes standards within the policy. The evidence within the Darlington Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2019: Housing for People with Disabilities (March 2019) supports the need for a target of 9% of all dwellings to meet M4(3) Category 3 requirements and 80% of all housing to meet M4(2) Category 2 requirements. This new evidence will be reflected in policy H 4 Housing Mix of the Proposed Submission Local Plan. A Local Plan Viability Assessment is also being prepared to support the plan and</p>	<p>Amendments to paragraph 3 of policy H 4:</p> <p>To ensure that new homes provide quality living environments for residents both now and in the future, the following standards from Building Regulations Approved Document M: Volume 1 (Access to and use of dwellings) will apply to <u>new dwellings</u> subject to <u>consideration of site suitability and site viability</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of all <u>new dwellings</u> will meet category 2 requirements (accessible and adaptable dwellings). 10% of market housing will meet category 3 requirements (wheelchair user dwellings) 9% affordable housing of all <u>new dwellings</u> will meet category 3

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>of the existing stock; how the needs vary across different housing tenures; and the overall viability.</p> <p>Evidence provided in Part 2 of the SHMA 2015 is severely lacking. This lack of evidence does question how the percentages identified in the policy were derived. No further information is provided in relation to the adaptability and accessibility of the existing stock, or the size, location, type and quality of dwellings needed based on future demand.</p> <p>PPG also states that policies for wheelchair accessible homes should be applied only to those dwellings where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling (ID: 56-009). Therefore, there will need to be a clear policy for how the Council will work with developers and housing associations to deliver these homes.</p> <p>The PPG is clear that 'local Plan policies should also take into account site specific factors such as vulnerability to flooding, site topography, and other circumstances which may make a specific site less suitable for M4(2) and M4(3) compliant dwellings, particularly where step free access cannot be achieved or is not viable. Where step-free access is not viable, neither of the Optional Requirements in Part M should be applied' (ID: 56-008). This does</p>	<p>will consider the requirements of the policy.</p> <p>Amendments are proposed to the policy to address the issues of site constraints and local authority nomination for category 3 wheelchair user dwellings.</p>	<p>requirements (a) or (b) (wheelchair user dwellings) . <u>Where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling, homes should meet building regulation M4 (3) (2) (b). When providing for wheelchair user housing, early discussion with the Council is required to obtain the most up to date information on specific need in the local area. Where there is no specific need identified, then M4 (3) (a) will apply, to allow simple adaptation of the dwelling to meet the future needs of wheelchair users.</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>not seem to have been taken into account within this policy.</p> <p>The HBF does not consider that this policy is required, it is considered that local needs can be met without the introduction of the optional housing standards. However, if the Council wish to pursue this policy the HBF recommends the Council ensure that an appropriate evidence base, including full viability testing, is available to support this policy in line with that set out in the PPG, that each of the requirements for consideration as set out in the PPG are contained within the policy and that appropriate viability and feasibility clauses are provided. The HBF also recommend that a transitional period is included within the policy to allow for homebuilders to adjust to the new requirements.</p>		
Joanne Harding	Home Builders Federation			DBDLP 800	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	<p>HBF generally supportive of policy approach. It is important that housing delivery will not be compromised or stalled due to overly prescriptive requirements or need to produce further evidence.</p> <p>The HBF recommends a flexible approach is taken regarding housing mix which recognises that needs and demand will vary from area to area and site to site; ensures that the scheme is viable; and provides an appropriate mix for the location. The Council need to be aware that the SHMA will only ever identify current deficits and reflects a snap-shot in time. The HBF would like to ensure greater flexibility within this</p>	<p>It is considered that the policy does have sufficient flexibility. Additional evidence relating to housing need can be submitted to support a planning application. Additional text is proposed to make it clear that a sites location and physical constraints should be considered when proposing a suitable housing mix. It is not considered necessary to add any policy wording relating to viability, however issues of housing mix and viability can be negotiate at the planning application stage.</p>	<p>Text to be added to the end of the first paragraph of policy H 4.</p> <p>...within the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or by other evidence <u>submitted in support of a planning application. A suitable housing mix should also give consideration to a sites location, physical constraints and the surrounding context.</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								policy to acknowledge that the mix can vary both geographically and over the plan period.		
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 838	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	Support for the aim of the policy. It would be appropriate for the policy to confirm that 'other evidence' could be provided by an applicant at the time of any planning application. Allowing evidence to be submitted by the applicant would ensure up-to-date market evidence was used to support a particularly housing mix is brought forward. Reliance on the SHMA could render a proposed housing mix out of date given that a SHMA may not be updated on a regular basis by the Council.	Support and comments noted. Additional text to be added to the policy to provide the clarification requested.	Text to be added to the end of the first paragraph of policy H 4. ...within the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or by other evidence <u>submitted in support of a planning application.</u>
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 797	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	It is not clear if the accessibility standards are for the plan / Borough as a whole or for individual applications. If it is for the latter we would have concerns about the inflexibility of this approach. For example it may not be appropriate to require the provision of category 3 dwellings on some individual planning applications associated with strategic allocations such as Greater Faverdale.	Comments noted regarding the clarity of the policy. Policy can be amended to make it clear that the requirements are for new housing developments. Further evidence base work has been carried out on the housing needs of people with disabilities and the accessible and adaptable homes standards within the policy. The evidence within the Darlington Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2019: Housing for People with Disabilities (March 2019) supports the need for a target of 9% of all dwellings to meet M4(3) Category 3 requirements and 80% of all housing to meet M4(2) Category 2 requirements. This new evidence will be reflected in policy H 4 Housing Mix of the Proposed Submission Local Plan.	Additional text added to policy H 4 paragraph 3: ...the following standards from Building Regulations Approved Document M: Volume 1 (Access to and use of dwellings) will apply to <u>new dwellings</u> , subject to site viability:

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 857	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	While providing a mix of house types, sizes and tenures is supported, it would be useful for the policy or supporting text to qualify whether 'other evidence' could be provided by a developer or whether this refers solely to other evidence produced by the Council. Reliance on the SHMA could render a proposed housing mix out of date given that a SHMA may not be updated on a regular basis by the Council.	Support and comments noted. Additional text to be added to the policy to provide the clarification requested.	Text to be added to the end of the first paragraph of policy H 4. ...within the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or by other evidence <u>submitted in support of a planning application.</u>
Amy ward	Planning Manager Barratt Homes			DBDLP 1013	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	<p>General support for the aim of the policy. BDW would resist the creation of a specific housing mix policy and recommend a flexible approach. Housing mix must be market led, there is a massive difference between housing need and housing demand which must be recognised.</p> <p>BDW is particularly concerned about Darlington's proposed policy to provide accessible, adaptable and wheelchair user houses. In terms of percent splits it is not realistic for 100% of all houses to meet M4(2) and M4(3) standards.</p> <p>The policy must be viability tested in line with para 173 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Wheelchair user homes also require more land take which will impact on site yields and can increase the price of these dwellings.</p> <p>Evidence provided in Part 2 of the SHMA 2015 is severely lacking. This lack of evidence does question how the percentages</p>	<p>It is considered that the policy is sufficiently flexible. Further evidence base work has been carried out on the housing needs of people with disabilities and the accessible and adaptable homes standards within the policy. The evidence within the Darlington Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2019: Housing for People with Disabilities (March 2019) supports the need for a target of 9% of all dwellings to meet M4(3) Category 3 requirements and 80% of all housing to meet M4(2) Category 2 requirements. This new evidence will be reflected in policy H 4 Housing Mix of the Proposed Submission Local Plan. A Local Plan Viability Assessment is also being prepared to support the plan and will consider the requirements of the policy.</p> <p>Comments noted regarding impact of wheelchair user dwellings on site yield. The site yields are however indicative and it is expected that the majority of site yields will be finalised at the planning application stage. It is also considered that there is a sufficient flexibility of sites in the plan to ensure that quantitative housing needs are met.</p>	<p>Amendments to paragraph 3 of policy H 4:</p> <p>To ensure that new homes provide quality living environments for residents both now and in the future, the following standards from Building Regulations Approved Document M: Volume 1 (Access to and use of dwellings) will apply to <u>new dwellings</u> subject to <u>consideration of site suitability and site viability</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>80% of all new dwellings will meet category 2 requirements (accessible and adaptable dwellings).</u> • <u>10% of market housing will meet category 3 requirements (wheelchair user dwellings)</u> • <u>9% affordable housing of all new dwellings will meet category 3 requirements (a) or (b) (wheelchair user dwellings) . Where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling, homes should meet building regulation M4 (3) (2) (b). When providing for wheelchair user housing, early discussion with the Council is required to obtain the most up to date information on specific need in the local area. Where there is no specific need identified, then M4 (3) (a) will apply, to allow simple adaptation of the dwelling to meet the future needs of wheelchair users.</u>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>identified in the policy were derived.</p> <p>PPG also states that policies for wheelchair accessible homes should be applied only to those dwellings where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling (ID: 56-009). Therefore, there will need to be a clear policy for how the Council will work with developers and housing associations to deliver these homes.</p> <p>The PPG is clear that 'local Plan policies should also take into account site specific factors such as vulnerability to flooding, site topography, and other circumstances which may make a specific site less suitable for M4(2) and M4(3) compliant dwellings, particularly where step free access cannot be achieved or is not viable. Where step-free access is not viable, neither of the Optional Requirements in Part M should be applied' (ID: 56-008). This does not seem to have been taken into account within this policy.</p> <p>BDW would urge the Council to reconsider the introduction of this policy. If the Council wish to pursue this policy they must ensure it is consistent with national policy, justified by an appropriate evidence base, including full viability testing. Consideration must also be given to the introduction of a more realistic % requirement.</p>	<p>Amendments are proposed to the policy to address the issues of site constraints and local authority nomination for category 3 wheelchair user dwellings.</p>	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1086	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	<p>General support for the aim of the policy.</p> <p>It is important to note that the housing mix as identified in the Council's latest evidence base will only provide a snapshot in time in relation to the current housing needs. As such, the policy should provide for flexibility going forward so that the Plan is able to respond to changes in circumstances at the time of an application being submitted to the local planning authority.</p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the accessibility standards set out in policy H 4. The optional technical standards should be fully evidenced on an assessment of need and viability. Given the rather prescriptive requirements proposed under this policy it appears to lack the necessary evidence base to support their justification. In addition, the PPG is also clear on policies for wheelchair accessible homes and that these should only be applied to dwellings that are the responsibility of the local planning authority. Accordingly, their needs to be further detail in terms of how the Council will engage with key stakeholders, developers and housing associations and how this element of the policy will be implemented over the plan period.</p>	<p>The policy does provide flexibility as it references that other evidence can be utilised with regards to housing needs. Additional text is to be added to clarify that such evidence can be submitted with a planning application.</p> <p>Further evidence base work has been carried out on the housing needs of people with disabilities and the accessible and adaptable homes standards within the policy. The evidence within the Darlington Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2019: Housing for People with Disabilities (March 2019) supports the need for a target of 9% of all dwellings to meet M4(3) Category 3 requirements and 80% of all housing to meet M4(2) Category 2 requirements. This new evidence will be reflected in policy H 4 Housing Mix of the Proposed Submission Local Plan. A Local Plan Viability Assessment is also being prepared to support the plan and will consider the requirements of the policy.</p> <p>Amendments are proposed to the policy to address the issues of site constraints and local authority nomination for category 3 wheelchair user dwellings.</p>	<p>Text to be added to the end of the first paragraph of policy H 4.</p> <p>...within the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or by other evidence <u>submitted in support of a planning application</u>.</p> <p>Amendments to paragraph 3 of policy H 4:</p> <p>To ensure that new homes provide quality living environments for residents both now and in the future, the following standards from Building Regulations Approved Document M: Volume 1 (Access to and use of dwellings) will apply to <u>new dwellings</u> subject to <u>consideration of site suitability and site viability</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>80% of all new dwellings will meet category 2 requirements (accessible and adaptable dwellings).</u> • <u>10% of market housing will meet category 3 requirements (wheelchair user dwellings)</u> • <u>9% affordable housing of all new dwellings will meet category 3 requirements (a) or (b) (wheelchair user dwellings) . Where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling, homes should meet building regulation M4 (3) (2) (b). When providing for wheelchair user housing, early discussion with the Council is required to obtain the most up to date information on specific need in the local area. Where there is no specific need identified, then M4 (3) (a) will apply, to allow simple adaptation of the dwelling to meet the future needs of wheelchair users.</u>
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1188	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Neutral	<p>If the Council wishes to adopt the higher optional standards for accessible and adaptable homes the Council should only do so by applying the criteria set out in the</p>	<p>Further evidence base work has been carried out on the housing needs of people with disabilities and the accessible and adaptable homes standards within the policy. The</p>	<p>Amendments to paragraph 3 of policy H 4:</p> <p>To ensure that new homes provide quality living environments for residents both now and in the future,</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
							<p>PPG. It is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the specific case for Darlington which justifies the inclusion of optional higher standards for accessible / adaptable homes in its Local Plan policy.</p> <p>Evidence provided in Part 2 of the SHMA 2015 is severely lacking. This lack of evidence does question how the percentages identified in the policy were derived.</p> <p>PPG also states that policies for wheelchair accessible homes should be applied only to those dwellings where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling (ID: 56-009). Therefore, there will need to be a clear policy for how the Council will work with developers and housing associations to deliver these homes.</p> <p>The PPG is clear that 'local Plan policies should also take into account site specific factors such as vulnerability to flooding, site topography, and other circumstances which may make a specific site less suitable for M4(2) and M4(3) compliant dwellings, particularly where step free access cannot be achieved or is not viable. Where step-free access is not viable, neither of the Optional Requirements in Part M should be applied' (ID: 56-008). This does not seem to have been taken into account within this policy.</p>	<p>evidence within the Darlington Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2019: Housing for People with Disabilities (March 2019) supports the need for a target of 9% of all dwellings to meet M4(3) Category 3 requirements and 80% of all housing to meet M4(2) Category 2 requirements. This new evidence will be reflected in policy H 4 Housing Mix of the Proposed Submission Local Plan. A Local Plan Viability Assessment is also being prepared to support the plan and will consider the requirements of the policy.</p> <p>Amendments are proposed to the policy to address the issues of site constraints and local authority nomination for category 3 wheelchair user dwellings.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to provide a transitional period for the policy requirements as they have been supported by evidence and subject to viability testing.</p>	<p>the following standards from Building Regulations Approved Document M: Volume 1 (Access to and use of dwellings) will apply to <u>new dwellings</u> subject to <u>consideration of site suitability and site viability</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>80% of all new dwellings will meet category 2 requirements (accessible and adaptable dwellings).</u> • <u>10% of market housing will meet category 3 requirements (wheelchair user dwellings)</u> • <u>9% affordable housing of all new dwellings will meet category 3 requirements (a) or (b) (wheelchair user dwellings) . Where the local authority is responsible for allocating or nominating a person to live in that dwelling, homes should meet building regulation M4 (3) (2) (b). When providing for wheelchair user housing, early discussion with the Council is required to obtain the most up to date information on specific need in the local area. Where there is no specific need identified, then M4 (3) (a) will apply, to allow simple adaptation of the dwelling to meet the future needs of wheelchair users.</u> 	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								Persimmon does not consider that this policy is required, it is considered that local needs can be met without the introduction of the optional housing standards. However, if the Council wish to pursue this policy the Council should ensure that an appropriate evidence base is available. Recommended that a transitional period is included within the policy to allow for homebuilders to adjust to the new requirements.		
Frances Nicholson	Bellway Homes Limited (Durham)			DBDLP 1168	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Support	Bellway support the principle of this policy however consider that the requirement to provide a suitable mix should not be at the detriment of the viability of a scheme. Such provision to account for the viability of a development and site specific considerations and constraints should be made in the policy.	Additional text is proposed to make it clear that a sites location and physical constraints should be considered when proposing a suitable housing mix. It is not considered necessary to add any policy wording relating to viability, however issues of housing mix and viability can be negotiate at the planning application stage.	Text to be added to the end of the first paragraph of policy H 4. ...within the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or by other evidence <u>submitted in support of a planning application. A suitable housing mix should also give consideration to a sites location, physical constraints and the surrounding context.</u>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Steven Longstaff		DBDLP 1242	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	<p>Taylor Wimpey would raise concerns over the wording of the first part of Policy H 4 as such policies need to be flexible to respond to changing circumstances over time, individual site issues as well as market demands and therefore such policies must be sufficient flexibility to not impact upon the delivery of housing.</p> <p>Welcome the wording that housing mix can be informed by other evidence.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey strongly object to the second part of Policy H4 which seeks to introduce optional technical standards above building regulations requirements for accessible and adaptable</p>	<p>It is considered that the policy does afford a level of flexibility to developers as acknowledge with the reference to other evidence. Additional text is proposed to make it clear that a sites location and physical constraints should be considered when proposing a suitable housing mix.</p> <p>Further evidence base work has been carried out on the housing needs of people with disabilities and the accessible and adaptable homes standards within the policy. The evidence within the Darlington Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2019: Housing for People with Disabilities (March 2019) supports the need for a target of 9% of all dwellings to meet M4(3) Category 3 requirements and 80% of all housing to meet M4(2) Category 2 requirements.</p>	Text to be added to the end of the first paragraph of policy H 4. ...within the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or by other evidence <u>submitted in support of a planning application. A suitable housing mix should also give consideration to a sites location, physical constraints and the surrounding context.</u>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>dwellings. The NPPG advises that local planning authorities will need to gather evidence to determine whether there is a need for additional standards in their area, and justify setting appropriate policies in their Local Plans. The requirement will also place unnecessary financial burden on development contrary to the NPPF and no viability evidence has been provided to justify the requirement.</p>	<p>This new evidence will be reflected in policy H 4 Housing Mix of the Proposed Submission Local Plan. A Local Plan Viability Assessment is also being prepared to support the plan and will consider the requirements of the policy.</p>	
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 798	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Object	<p>The government has sought to introduce flexibility to its definitions of affordable housing to enable innovation within the affordable housing sector and to facilitate the provision of many different tenures of affordable housing to meet the multifaceted needs of local communities. Policy H 5 should allow for changes in the definition of the affordable housing by making reference to the 2018 NPPF or whatever policy supersedes it. This will ensure that the Local Plan is up to date with national planning policy and that it delivers in line with the government's planning objectives.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Paragraph 3 of policy H 5 and paragraph 6.5.1 will be updated to reflect the new definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF (2019).</p>	<p>Paragraph 3 of policy H 5 and paragraph 6.5.1 will be updated to reflect the new definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF (2019). The glossary (table 12.1) will also be amended accordingly to refer to the latest version of the NPPF.</p>
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1132	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Support	<p>Policy H 5 is generally supported; however, it is considered that the policy should take the opportunity to accord with the affordable housing definition in the revised NPPF as the wording provides additional flexibility and will therefore help increase the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>The provision for off-site provision, including in relation to executive housing schemes is supported.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Paragraph 3 of policy H 5 and paragraph 6.5.1 will be updated to reflect the new definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF (2019).</p>	<p>Paragraph 3 of policy H 5 and paragraph 6.5.1 will be updated to reflect the new definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF (2019). The glossary (table 12.1) will also be amended accordingly to refer to the latest version of the NPPF.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr G Raistrick		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1250	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Support	<p>Policy H 5 is generally supported; however, it is considered that the policy should take the opportunity to accord with the affordable housing definition in the revised NPPF as the wording provides additional flexibility and will therefore help increase the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>The provision for off-site provision, including in relation to executive housing schemes is supported.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Paragraph 3 of policy H 5 and paragraph 6.5.1 will be updated to reflect the new definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF (2019).</p>	<p>Paragraph 3 of policy H 5 and paragraph 6.5.1 will be updated to reflect the new definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF (2019). The glossary (table 12.1) will also be amended accordingly to refer to the latest version of the NPPF.</p>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Steven Longstaff		DBDLP 1243	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Neutral	<p>It is not possible to comment on the proposed affordable housing requirements as the Council's Viability Assessment is not available at this stage.</p> <p>For the policy to be effective the Local Plan must include a plan which clearly shows the wards and where the different affordable housing requirements apply. It would also make the plan clearer if the suggested affordable housing requirements for each site are set out within the Housing Allocation Statements at Appendix B of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>A Local Plan Viability Assessment is being prepared, this will ensure that the affordable housing percentages, along with other planning obligations set out in the plan, are deliverable. The house building industry will be consulted on this work. The assessment will be published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>A plan can be included as an appendix to clearly show the wards and the different affordable housing requirements which apply. It is considered that with this change policy H 5 is clear and effective, subsequently it is not necessary to add the affordable requirements to the housing allocation statements in Appendix B.</p>	<p>Addition of a map as an appendices which shows the different affordable housing requirements across the borough. Reference to this to be added to policy H 5.</p>
Thoroton and Croft Estate		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1258	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Support	<p>Policy H 5 is generally supported; however, it is considered that the policy should take the opportunity to accord with the affordable housing definition in the revised NPPF as the wording provides additional flexibility and will therefore help increase the delivery of affordable housing.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Paragraph 3 of policy H 5 and paragraph 6.5.1 will be updated to reflect the new definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF (2019).</p>	<p>Paragraph 3 of policy H 5 and paragraph 6.5.1 will be updated to reflect the new definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF (2019). The glossary (table 12.1) will also be amended accordingly to refer to the latest version of the NPPF.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning)	DBDLP 1318	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Object	<p>Story Homes have significant concern that the affordable housing levels sought by the Local Plan will have significant detrimental impacts on site viability, and ultimately deliverability. It is noted that the plan is not yet supported by a plan wide viability assessment and this must be undertaken in consultation with the house building industry as a matter of urgency before further consultation is undertaken. Any future drafting must take account of the updated affordable housing definition contained within the Framework, and ensure the delivery levels have been appropriately viability tested.</p>	<p>A Local Plan Viability Assessment is being prepared, this will ensure that the affordable housing percentages, along with other planning obligations set out in the plan, are deliverable. The house building industry will be consulted on this work. The assessment will be published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 3 of policy H 5 and paragraph 6.5.1 will be updated to reflect the new definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF (2019).</p>	<p>Paragraph 3 of policy H 5 and paragraph 6.5.1 will be updated to reflect the new definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF.</p>
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 858	Policy H 6	Rural Exceptions	Object	<p>Support for the inclusion of a rural exception site policy. The policy should not be limited to 10 dwellings or less if a larger scheme would meet a greater need.</p>	<p>Support noted. Agreed to remove 10 dwelling threshold from the policy to allow larger schemes which would meet a greater need.</p>	<p>Alter first sentence of policy H 6 Rural Exceptions as outlined below:</p> <p>Small scale Affordable housing schemes of 10 dwellings or less, closely related to the identified development limits of the service villages and rural villages will be permitted providing:</p>
	Godolphin Developments Ltd	Ms Jennifer Nye	Lichfields	DBDLP 1271	Policy H 6	Rural Exceptions	Object	<p>This policy should be revised to reflect that rural exception sites can be supported in areas that the Council do not currently identify as a Rural Village, such as Great Stainton and should not limit to 10 dwellings or less if a larger scheme would meet a greater need.</p>	<p>Rural exception sites will only be permitted in the service villages and rural villages as other smaller rural settlements are not considered to be sustainable for residential development. There is also a reasonable spatial distribution of the service villages and rural villages across Darlington. As such it is considered that any needs can be suitably addressed adjacent to these settlements.</p> <p>Agreed to remove 10 dwelling threshold from the policy to allow larger schemes which would meet a greater need.</p>	<p>Alter first sentence of policy H 6 Rural Exceptions as outlined below:</p> <p>Small scale Affordable housing schemes of 10 dwellings or less, closely related to the identified development limits of the service villages and rural villages will be permitted providing:</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Peter Hughes				DBDLP 48	6.6.2	Paragraph	Object	Concern that allowing developments of 10 houses or less could lead to piecemeal extension to rural developments. Would prefer a smaller figure for such developments, or they should be identified in this plan.	<p>The approach in policy H 6 Rural Exceptions is set out in national planning policy. Para 77 of the NPPF states, local planning authorities should support opportunities to bring forward rural exception sites that will provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs, and consider whether allowing some market housing on these sites would help to facilitate this. In Part 1 of the SHMA (2015) there is limited spatial evidence on the distribution of affordable housing need. There is no evidence of specific unmet needs for additional affordable housing in the service villages or rural villages. Consequently there is not the evidence to support the allocation of rural exception sites and a more flexible criteria based policy approach is required.</p> <p>Any planning applications for such schemes would also have to adhere to other relevant local and national planning policy. Issues such as impacts on local landscape character and the visual amenity of the surrounding area would also be considered as part of the application process. This would assist to avoid piecemeal development and ensure that schemes are well integrated with existing communities.</p> <p>The 10 dwelling threshold is to be removed from the policy to allow larger schemes which would meet a greater need.</p>	<p>Alter first sentence of policy H 6 Rural Exceptions as outlined below:</p> <p>Small scale affordable housing schemes of 10 dwellings or less, closely related to the identified development limits of the service villages and rural villages will be permitted providing:</p>
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 859	Policy H 7	Residential Development in the Countryside	Object	The policy should be redrafted to reflect paragraph 79 of NPPF 2018 for dwellings of exceptional design quality.	<p>It is not intended to replicate national policy within the plan. The remainder of Policy H 7 offers local context as to when dwellings may be permissible. A reference to paragraph 79 exceptional design/innovation dwellings will be made in the reasoned justification.</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.7.1 to be updated to read:</p> <p>National planning policy states that isolated new dwellings in the countryside should be avoided. They will only be permitted in the circumstances as outlined in paragraph 5579 of the NPPF, for example if it can</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
										be demonstrated there is a specific need for a rural worker(s) or are of exceptional design quality.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 653	Policy H 8	Housing Intensification	Neutral	Consider this policy would be better as two policies.	Subheadings can be provided to make the two aspects of the policy clearer.	Policy to be split under two subheadings: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subdivision of dwellings to HMO's and self-contained flats; and 2. Backland or garden development.
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1141	Policy H 8	Housing Intensification	Object	The policy as drafted suggests only those proposals that cause significant adverse impact to an asset will be refused. Allowing anything that is less significant to be approved. This does not accord with the NPPF and weakens the protection afforded to heritage assets in Darlington. Therefore it is suggested that Bullet J be deleted and any proposals for heritage assets be dealt with in historic environment Policy ENV1.	Agree with the suggested change as it was not the intention of the policy weaken the heritage policy or national policy.	Point j. 'A conservation area or a listed building' to be deleted.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 655	6.8.8	Paragraph	Object	The second sentence of this paragraph could allow a use to be established in order to claim that it was previously developed and therefore suitable for backland development.	This sentence does not add to the justification of Policy H 8 and will be deleted.	Delete: 'However, to help support the use of previously developed land and buildings, the Council may permit proposals for development of backland sites in other uses, subject to the criteria above and other relevant policies.'
Mr Richard Branton				DBDLP 74		Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	Land in their ownership should be considered/assessed separately from adjoining land by the HELAA (site reference 101). Challenge the status of their land in the HELAA on a number of grounds. Their land should be shown as suitable for housing in the plan.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation. The land in your ownership has been assessed separately through the HELAA and SA as requested. The Council can confirm that there is not a designated Local Wildlife Site present on site 101: Land North of Lime Avenue. The site does however contain features of ecological interest and is considered to be a prospective	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation. The land in question has been assessed separately through the HELAA and SA process.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Site 101 does not contain a Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>An access to the Skerningham site across site 6 from the A167 would be a better option to the one identified further to the north on the masterplan framework.</p> <p>Request that the Council write to the site promoters to clarify the position on their land.</p>	<p>future wildlife site subject to appropriate designation procedures. Development proposals affecting this site will be required to undertake appropriate ecological evaluation, but this does not necessarily rule out development.</p> <p>The Skerningham Strategic Allocation site promoters have been made aware of the fact that the site is not designated as a Local Wildlife Site and have been written to formally as requested.</p> <p>The Masterplan Framework provided at Figures 6.1 and 6.2 of the Draft Local Plan identifies potential principle access points but does not rule out the identification of other potential access points to the site.</p>	
Burney Johnson				DBDLP 721		Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Land in their ownership should be considered/assessed separately from adjoining land by the HELAA (site reference 101). Challenge the status of their land in the HELAA on a number of grounds.</p> <p>Their land should be shown as suitable for housing in the plan.</p> <p>Site 101 does not contain a Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>An access to the Skerningham site across site 6 from the A167 would be a better option to the one identified further to the north on the masterplan framework.</p> <p>Request that the Council write to the site promoters to clarify the position on their land.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The land in your ownership has been assessed separately through the HELAA and SA as requested.</p> <p>The Council can confirm that there is not a designated Local Wildlife Site present on site 101: Land North of Lime Avenue. The site does however contain features of ecological interest and is considered to be a prospective future wildlife site subject to appropriate designation procedures. Development proposals affecting this site will be required to undertake appropriate ecological evaluation, but this does not necessarily rule out development.</p> <p>The Skerningham Strategic Allocation site promoters have been made aware of the fact that the site is not designated</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The land in question has been assessed separately through the HELAA and SA process.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p>as a Local Wildlife Site and have been written to formally as requested.</p> <p>The Masterplan Framework provided at Figures 6.1 and 6.2 of the Draft Local Plan identifies potential principle access points but does not rule out the identification of other potential access points to the site.</p>	
Mr Robert Henry Howard				DBDLP 630		Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment.</p> <p>There is a great deal of brownfield land that should be developed first.</p> <p>Development will generate extra traffic that will affect wildlife and people's quality of life.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 372	6.10.1	Paragraph	Neutral	<p>The East Coast Mainline forms a barrier to any wholesale development of the site.</p> <p>Development will result in the loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>The relocation of the golf club will impact on Skerningham Community Woodland and permissive Public Rights of Way in the area.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Phillip Thornberry				DBDLP 46	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Objection to Skerningham Strategic Allocation. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be developed as to not encroach on existing housing. Needs of existing residents considered; 	<p>Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Work on an update to the Open Space Assessment is ongoing and will provide an assessment of the quantity and quality of the borough's open spaces. This work will inform a revision of the Councils Planning</p>	Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>green spaces, road network and amenities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Springfield park is a valuable space and should not be developed or exchanged for green spaces in the new Skerningham site. 	<p>Obligations SPD the next stage of plan preparation and to ensure adequate provision for open space is made by developments. An infrastructure plan has also been prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development. Both pieces of supporting evidence base consider current provision for existing communities.</p>	
Mrs Janine Lee				DBDLP 398	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of the last accessible piece of countryside.</p> <p>Development of this size is not needed and I dispute the Council's housing requirement figures.</p> <p>Object to any loss of Springfield Park and to the proposed road across it. It should be a designated green space.</p> <p>Object to any loss of Green Lane.</p> <p>If a bypass is built any traffic removed from the A1150 will simply be replaced by that from the Skerningham development. The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution and noise.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services.</p> <p>The relocation of Darlington Golf Club makes no sense.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Valerie Binks				DBDLP 170	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>The development would result in the loss of permissive paths and Community Woodland. The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>Object to the relocation of the golf club which will impact on Skerningham Community Woodland. This should go to a public inquiry.</p> <p>The proposed access road onto Whinbush Way will remove the grassy area between Caithness Way and Tayside.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park and the impact development will have on public rights of way, including Green lane.</p> <p>Development will destroy the countryside and wildlife habitats.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Stuart Blake				DBDLP 171	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss valuable countryside, wildlife habitats and green space.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Dispute the need for this many homes.</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution, noise and affect road safety.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park. Allowing a road across Springfield Park will destroy it.</p> <p>New housing developments with affordable housing result in a higher crime rate.</p>		
Mr Ian Douglas				DBDLP 173	Policy H 10	Skerningha m Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>The proposals will destroy one of the best golf courses in County Durham.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Dixon Binks				DBDLP 182	Policy H 10	Skerningha m Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>The development would result in the loss of permissive paths and</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Community Woodland. The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>Object to the relocation of the golf club which will impact on Skerningham Community Woodland. This should go to a public inquiry.</p> <p>The proposed access road onto Whinbush Way will remove the grassy area between Caithness Way and Tayside.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park and the impact development will have on public rights of way, including Green lane.</p> <p>Development will destroy the countryside and wildlife habitats.</p>		
Simon Bainbridge				DBDLP 401	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>This proposal has been led by speculative land agents rather than by the Council.</p> <p>The proposals have no regard to the local community, land ownership, infrastructure or the effect on the town and environment.</p> <p>The proposal is at odds with the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy and standards and the Brightwater Project. It will have a catastrophic impact on wildlife.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>There is no mention of the medieval village of graves located there.</p> <p>Object to the relocation of the golf club which will impact on Skerningham Community Woodland. How can this be justified.</p>		
Alan William Macnab				DBDLP 187	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government estimates are much lower.</p> <p>The new development limit around the Skerningham allocation site will not prevent further housing development taking place in the area reserved for green space.</p> <p>All of the existing community woodland should be retained. The woodland is used as a burial site.</p> <p>Development on the golf club site will remove trees and woodland exposing properties along Green Lane.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside/agricultural land and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Object to any interference with Green lane bridleway and Springfield Park (an Asset of Community Value).</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution on roads that</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>The development limit has been drawn around the entire extent of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site in the Draft Local Plan in order to allow a comprehensive approach to be taken to the masterplanning of the whole site, and to ensure the delivery of improvements to the Skerne Valley Area alongside development on Darlington's urban edge. The Masterplan Framework (Figure 6.1) illustrates the key principles for the development of the Skerningham site and has been the basis on which the emerging Masterplan is developed. As set out in Policy H 10, the Council will only approve planning applications that adhere with the masterplan for this site, and that deliver the necessary local and strategic infrastructure (including green infrastructure) to support the development.</p> <p>The southern side of the River Skerne Valley is identified on the framework plan as strategic green infrastructure, reflecting the fact that much of this area is identified as part of a Strategic Green Corridor in the Council's Green</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								area already heavily congested, especially the A1150.	Infrastructure Strategy. However, until the masterplan is finalised and agreed with the Council the exact extent of the built up area forming the new northern edge of the town is not known and it is therefore not possible to accurately define the extent of the development limit at this stage. The Council will consider the need to amend the development limit around the Skerningham site, to reflect the final position on the extent of the built up area of the site, during future reviews of the Local Plan, due to take place at least every five years.	
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 211	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Objection to Skerningham strategic allocation. Concerns raised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a sustainable site. • Increase in traffic congestion and degradation of air quality. • Should not be building on a flood plain. • Green policy and outputs are not clear. • Green infrastructure buffer zone should be at least 100m from the River Skerne. • It is not clear that the Highways Authority Traffic Modelling justifies the housing allocation or the provision of new roads. • Any new roads should have a 100m green infrastructure buffer zone. 	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan proposes allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection was informed by detailed site assessments within the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal (available on the Council's website). The locational strategy for the proposed allocations is focused within the main urban area, as urban extensions and at the larger service villages.</p> <p>Policy H 10 and the Skerningham Masterplan Framework set out indicative green infrastructure requirements for the site. The environment chapter, and associated policies, of the Draft Local Plan also set out general requirements on developments with regards to green infrastructure and biodiversity.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.10.12 specifies that in order to create viable ecological</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									corridors buffers should measure at least 50 metres.	
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 296	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Object to the scale of development proposed on the site.</p> <p>The road network is not suitable for the additional traffic and will cause congestion, pollution, and affect road safety.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land. Reconsider building on greenbelt areas such as Springfield Park and adjacent countryside.</p> <p>A new bypass to link the A1(M) and A66 is overdue and urgently needed. However, traffic removed from the A1150 will simply be replaced by that from the Skerningham development.</p> <p>Object to a road through Springfield Park due to the impact on habitat and wildlife.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside and Springfield Park. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Building further out of the town centre will encourage people to use cars, and not support the town centre.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
A Makepeace				DBDLP 191	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Use of the word village should be discontinued as it is misleading.</p> <p>A new development must include adequate infrastructure and services.</p> <p>The development must address and resolve all environmental issues before starting.</p> <p>The development should consider all constraints both on and off the site including the east coast mainline, a proposal for a by-pass, a wind turbine site, and the flood plain.</p>	<p>Policy H 10 Skerningham Strategic Allocation does not use the word village to describe the proposal.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Colin J Spain				DBDLP 192	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Even is a link road goes ahead the additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution, noise and affect road safety. Traffic removed from the A1150 will simply be replaced by that from the Skerningham development.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Where are all the jobs coming from that would require so many houses, the town centre is struggling?</p> <p>Concerned that development will result in flooding of the River Skerne.</p>		
Maria Jabs				DBDLP 252	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	This development will increase air, traffic and noise pollution and destroy the natural countryside.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Alex Swainston				DBDLP 254	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Object to any link road development.</p> <p>Development would damage wildlife and the well-being of residents.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Anne Rudkin				DBDLP 257	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>It represents development in the countryside and a considerable expansion of the development limit contrary to the NPPF. It has not been sufficiently demonstrated that development boundaries need to be extended.</p> <p>Development will adversely affect the character, appearance and nature of the Skerningham Valley and Whinfield area and destroy wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Development will bring noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Object to the loss of recreational facilities such as permissive paths and open spaces (including</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Springfield Park which is an Asset of Community Value).</p> <p>It will result in the loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Planned development will have a negative impact on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads.</p>		
Allannah Robinson				DBDLP 277	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services (including schools and doctors).</p> <p>There is no way the A1150 can cope with more traffic. The additional traffic will cause air pollution.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>Development will result in the loss of green areas and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park. This proposal will lead to major congestion.</p> <p>The proposal to relocate the golf club into publicly accessible community woodland is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr John Rudkin				DBDLP 292	Policy H 10	Skerningha m Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>It represents development in the countryside and a considerable expansion of the development limit contrary to the NPPF. It has not been sufficiently demonstrated that development boundaries need to be extended.</p> <p>Development will adversely affect the character, appearance and nature of the Skerningham Valley/countryside and destroy wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Development will bring noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Object to the loss of recreational facilities and permissive paths including Springfield Park (which is an Asset of Community Value).</p> <p>It will result in the loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Planned development will have a negative impact on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Ken Walton				DBDLP 335	Policy H 10	Skerningha m Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Object to the scale of development proposed.</p> <p>More houses will result more traffic, affect road safety and pollution.</p> <p>Development of this site will destroy the local environment</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								and result in the loss of wildlife and open space.		
Ms Julie Nixon				DBDLP 330	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	Potentially taking away a woodland burial site is a disgrace, perhaps more of us could consider such a place when needed in the future.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mrs Margaret Moyes				DBDLP 342	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Objection to Skerningham Strategic Allocation. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an area of beautiful and varied countryside. • It is part of the Bright Water project which is used by residents for health and wellbeing. • It has many footpaths and is recommended as an area for walking by the Council. • The woods have been planted with rare native black poplars. • The consultation event ran by Theakston Estates gave no opportunity for written objections. • It would be a tragedy to lose this accessible green belt. 	<p>Please see officer response to Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Darlington does not have any designated green belt. This is a formal designation typically found in larger urban areas to prevent settlements merging.</p>	Please see officer response to Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Ralph Bradley				DBDLP 390	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>The development will destroy the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats. The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>Even if a link road goes ahead the additional traffic will cause congestion on local roads.</p>	<p>Darlington does not have any designated green belt. This is a formal designation typically found in larger urban areas to prevent settlements merging.</p>	
Mr James Wilson Chalk				DBDLP 448	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>The additional traffic will cause congestion.</p> <p>Commuters will shop on the way home and not support local shops.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services, particularly GPs and dental practices.</p> <p>Concerned about the loss of green areas and the effects on climate change, health and recreation.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside and green space.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>
Mr Paul Gannon				DBDLP 433	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment/character and amenity, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside, hedgerows and wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services (including doctors and schools). The additional traffic will cause congestion and pollution.</p> <p>Object to the loss of Springfield Park.</p> <p>Development will ruin established rights of way.</p> <p>Concerned that development will result in flooding.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>Object to the loss of green spaces. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p>		
mrs carol mcmain				DBDLP 434	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>There are not the jobs needed to support this scale of development. Need good transport links to London and the rest of the world to attract new business.</p> <p>Development of this site will result in the loss of agricultural land and wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>The additional traffic will cause congestion and increased noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p>		
Mrs Karen Gannon				DBDLP 439	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment/character and amenity, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside, hedgerows and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>Dispute the figure of creating 7000 jobs.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services (including doctors and schools). The additional traffic will cause congestion and pollution.</p> <p>Object to the loss of Springfield Park.</p> <p>Development will ruin established rights of way.</p> <p>Concerned that development will result in flooding.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>Object to the loss of green spaces. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 368	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Objection to Skerningham strategic allocation. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a development outside the urban area. • Has poor access and the existing road network is at capacity. This development provides no new infrastructure to relieve this. • The plan includes few brownfield sites. Skerningham is entirely greenfield. • Skerningham is considered to be an environmentally sensitive area constrained by the road and rail network. • Only a small part of the Skerningham strategic allocation would be developed in the plan period. Even with a Masterplan there is a significant risk the site will only be partially developed as circumstances change over the plan period and beyond. This will result in a poor outcome for the locality. Structured smaller scale development would seem far more appropriate. 	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Transport modelling work has been undertaken to test highway mitigation schemes to ensure developments proposed in the Local Plan do not have an unacceptable impact on local and strategic highway network. Policy H 10 also sets out infrastructure requirements for the site including principle access points and safeguarding corridors sufficient to provide road links through the site.</p> <p>The site has been allocated as a whole to ensure that it is planned as a single cohesive sustainable development, fully supported by necessary infrastructure.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerning ham Preservati on Group	Mr Simon Bainbri dge	Member Barmpt on and Skernin gham Preserva tion Group	DBDLP 371	Policy H 10	Skerningha m Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>There are significant infrastructure requirements needed but no indication of when they will be delivered.</p> <p>Vehicles will turn out onto the A1150 and A167 which are already running at near capacity.</p> <p>The inner Northern Link Road route would not serve the Skerningham site and would conflict with the Green Infrastructure policy.</p> <p>Object to changes to the community woodland and hedgerows (particularly as a result of the golf club relocation). This will affect wildlife and any replacement will be vastly inferior.</p> <p>Doubt that the amenity of existing residential properties can be protected.</p> <p>It represents development in the countryside and considerable expansion of the development limits of the town.</p> <p>There is no justification for the relocation of the golf club. The proposals is at odds with the Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
MRS ROSAMUN D SOWERBY				DBDLP 567	Policy H 10	Skerningha m Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>We do need more homes in Darlington but this can be done in a way that preserves our Green Belt. The plans for the north east of Darlington causes urban sprawl.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and heritage sites.</p> <p>Object to the potential changes to Public Rights of Way (including Green lane) and Springfield Park. These are used for recreation by residents and will have an impact on health and wellbeing.</p> <p>There is no justification for the relocation of the golf club.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services. The additional traffic will cause congestion and air pollution.</p>	<p>on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Darlington does not have any designated green belt. This is a formal designation typically found in larger urban areas to prevent settlements merging.</p>	
Mrs S Fenwick				DBDLP 456	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Strong object to the Skerningham allocation.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mrs Helen Downes				DBDLP 474	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched local roads.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats. The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>Development will bring noise, air and light pollution.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>
Mrs Helen Downes				DBDLP 475	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats. The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>Development will bring noise, air and light pollution.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Leanne Carroll				DBDLP 488	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>Object to the relocation of the golf club will impact on Skerningham Community Woodland. There is no justification for the relocation of the golf club.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park.</p>		
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 551	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>Development of this site will destroy the local environment and approach to Darlington.</p> <p>Unchecked council-led development can lead to soulless, uninviting sprawls, bereft of character, devoid of social inclusion and lacking in the environmental elements conducive to happy and healthy lives.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Paul Littleton				DBDLP 507	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the character of the area and the local environment.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park. This will have an</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation..</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>There is no justification for the relocation of the golf club.</p>		
Pauline Burton				DBDLP 514	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>Development will cause traffic congestion and air pollution.</p> <p>Open green spaces should be protected.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mrs C Everington				DBDLP 565	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside/agricultural land and wildlife habitats. The area is used for recreation by residents. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>This will impact on the Brightwater project.</p> <p>The areas is rich in history, the Durham Ox or Ketton Ox was bred here. Development will compromise the character and setting of the listed building on the site. The Council has overlooked</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>the deserted medieval village on the site.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services.</p>		
Stephen Bibby				DBDLP 486	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>The housing allocation is disproportionate and would unbalance the town.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>The area is used for recreation by local residents.</p> <p>Losing parkland and local footpaths is likely to have a negative impact on social integration, mental health, fitness and wellbeing.</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion and pollution affecting air quality and quality of life.</p> <p>Concerned that development will result in flooding.</p> <p>Object to the loss of public Rights of Way.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 657	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes.</p> <p>Allocating a site, 60% of which is planned to be developed after the</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The numbering of policy criteria in the Local Plan has been reviewed prior to publication.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>end of the plan period, is not appropriate in planning terms.</p> <p>There is no local employment provision for such a large development making it a commuter estate. This is not socially, environmentally or economically sustainable.</p> <p>Bullet points can be hard to refer to in a policy and it is suggested some form of sub numbering/letter is used.</p>	<p>Paragraph 72 of the NPPF is clear that larger scale development can often be the best way to secure the delivery of large numbers of new homes. The Local Plan seeks to allocate a large urban extension site at Skerningham to deliver housing to meet the needs of the Borough over the long term and to ensure that the area is properly planned in order to create a sustainable and cohesive new community with all of the infrastructure and facilities required to support it.</p> <p>The Council's emerging Local Plan provides for the creation of 7,000 new jobs within the plan period. This is in line with previously achieved job creation levels and is therefore deliverable to 2036. The emerging Local Plan identifies 175 hectares (net available) employment land on existing and proposed employment sites, most of which is situated on the east and north west sides of Darlington town.</p> <p>The Skerningham strategic allocation site also has the potential to include an element of employment land close to the A66 around Great Burdon subject to appropriate assessment and evidence of future need. The need to allocate this land specifically for employment purposes will be considered when the plan is next reviewed.</p>	
Judith Murray				DBDLP 527	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>It represents development in the countryside and a considerable expansion of the development limit contrary to the NPPF. It has not been sufficiently demonstrated that development boundaries need to be extended.</p> <p>Development will adversely affect the character, appearance and</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>nature of the Skerningham Valley/countryside and destroy wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Development will bring noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Object to the loss of recreational facilities and permissive paths including Springfield Park (which is an Asset of Community Value).</p> <p>It will result in the loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Planned development will have a negative impact on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads.</p>		
Mr John Barker				DBDLP 666	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services (including doctors surgery and schools).</p> <p>A new link road will do little to alleviate congestion within Darlington.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>This will have an impact on quality of life.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Paragraph 72 of the NPPF is clear that larger scale development can often be the best way to secure the delivery of large numbers of new homes. The Local Plan seeks to allocate a large urban extension site at Skerningham to deliver housing to meet the needs of the Borough over the long term and to ensure that the area is properly planned in order to create a sustainable and cohesive new community with all of the infrastructure and facilities required to support it. Policy H 10 recognises</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>A more conservative approach should be taken to development in this area.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park.</p>	<p>the need to retain, conserve and integrate where appropriate elements of historic and natural interest, along with green spaces on the site, in line with the provisions of other policies in the Local Plan and national policy.</p>	
Mr Peter Evans				DBDLP 569	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Point 1 attributed to Policy H 1: Housing Requirement.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched local roads (i.e. A167, A1150, Barmpton Lane and Whinbush Way). The roads have reached saturation point.</p> <p>A new access point at Springfield Park is totally unrealistic.</p> <p>The ingress/egress from the Skerningham site is badly let down by the existing road infrastructure.</p> <p>Object to the loss of green space and open countryside.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower. A third independent projection should be sought.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Andrew Burton				DBDLP 584	Policy H 10	Skerningha m Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>Development will cause traffic congestion and air pollution.</p> <p>Open green spaces should be protected.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Franz Egarter				DBDLP 626	Policy H 10	Skerningha m Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution and affect road safety, especially on Whinfield Road and Sparrowhall Drive.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services (including schools and doctors surgeries).</p> <p>There is no justification for the relocation of the golf club.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and agricultural land. The area is used for recreation by residents.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								Dispute the need for this many homes.		
Margaret Egarter				DBDLP 628	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution and affect road safety, especially on Whinfield Road and Sparrowhall Drive.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services (including schools and doctors surgeries).</p> <p>There is no justification for the relocation of the golf club.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and agricultural land. The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Miss Carole Hardy				DBDLP 674	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower. There are many new homes in Darlington that are still empty.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services (including doctors,</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Draft Policy DC 1: Sustainable Design Principles - requires developments to demonstrate that the layout, orientation and design of buildings helps to reduce the need for energy consumption, and how buildings have been made energy</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>schools and other community areas).</p> <p>Incorporate solar panel technology into developments.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside/agricultural land and wildlife habitats. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>Allowing a road across Springfield Park will spoil it.</p> <p>The relocation of the golf club will impact on Skerningham Community Woodland and wildlife habitats. There is no justification for this.</p> <p>Concerned that development will result in flooding of properties and the River Skerne.</p> <p>Main roads are already congested. The additional traffic will cause further congestion, pollution and affect road safety.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services (including schools, doctors and other local services).</p>	<p>efficient thereby reducing carbon emissions. The Council will be supportive of development proposals that incorporate solar panel technology (and other renewable energy generating technology) where appropriate to the design and location of development.</p>	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mrs Holmes				DBDLP 711	Policy H 10	Skerningha m Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads. Barmpton Lane has become a rat run. The additional traffic will cause further congestion.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside.</p> <p>Reconsider the plan and find alternative sites.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr McMain				DBDLP 716	Policy H 10	Skerningha m Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>Dispute the figure of creating 7000 jobs.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Peter Eckels				DBDLP 722	Policy H 10	Skerningha m Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Is the Local Plan still current given the speculation that the town centre will need to shrink, providing significant opportunities to develop housing.</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, air pollution and noise. Existing local infrastructure will not cope.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park.</p> <p>Object to the loss of countryside which provides a habitat to wildlife.</p> <p>In stretching the boundaries of the town it will reduce the opportunities for recreation for many residents.</p>		
Mr Chris Bowey				DBDLP 745	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the historic character of the area and the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads. The additional traffic will cause congestion, air pollution, noise and affect road safety.</p> <p>There is no justification for the relocation of the golf club.</p> <p>New tree planting to replace the loss of Community Woodland would take decades to establish.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land. If greenfield land is required, sites should be much smaller in size and more spread out to limit the impacts.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham	Mr Neil	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 849	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Support	<p>Skerningham will make a significant contribution to housing and economic growth in Darlington. Provides the</p>	<p>Support noted. Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
	am Estates Ltd	Westwick						<p>opportunity to create a vibrant, green and sustainable community.</p> <p>The development will be set within an extensive network of green and blue infrastructure - over one third of the area. The proposal will incorporate infrastructure and services provided alongside development. The site will also make provision for the relocation of Darlington Golf Club, retain Springfield Park and enhance the significance of listed buildings within the site.</p> <p>Welcome the adoption of the Healthy New Town approach to site layout and design.</p> <p>It will deliver significant economic benefits including close to 750 jobs in the construction sector and 3,400 jobs in the local economy.</p>		
Mr Alan Hutchinson				DBDLP 753	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Object to the increase in the development limit.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the character of the area and the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Development will result in a considerable loss of amenity for existing residents.</p> <p>Object to the relocation of Darlington Golf Club and the loss of community woodland and</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>public access. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Skerningham Countryside Park should be designated as a Local Green Space. The plan proposals to produce a net increase in community woodland is unrealistic and unachievable.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads. The additional traffic will cause congestion, and pollution from noise vehicles and light.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park (which is an Asset of Community Value) and should be designated as a Local Green Space.</p>		
Mrs Clare E Friskney				DBDLP 758	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Object to the loss of this area of natural beauty and to children's play areas.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads, services and facilities. Development will increase traffic congestion.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>There is no justification for the relocation of the golf club.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Andrew Keir				DBDLP 759	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>There has been insufficient public consultation regarding the proposals for Skerningham. Believe that public</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>comments will not affect the outcome.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the character of the area and the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside, green space and wildlife habitats. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Whinfield road will not be able to accommodate the additional traffic. The additional traffic will cause congestion, noise and general negative environmental effects.</p> <p>The increased traffic and equipment will adversely affect air quality.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services (including shops, schools, dentists and doctor surgeries).</p> <p>Support the comments made in the Whinfield Residents Association objection.</p>		
Dawn Makepeace				DBDLP 760	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside, wildlife habitats and historical assets (including the location of a Roman amphitheatre). This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Having checked with Durham County Council's Archaeology Section, there is no record of a Roman amphitheatre on the Skerningham site evident on the</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes when there are other areas of Darlington that could be modernised and put back on the map as desirable housing.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park.</p>	Historic Environment Record for this area.	
Ms Helen McIntyre				DBDLP 709	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of a beautiful historic area and wildlife habitats. In 8 years the woodland has matured and provides a home to wildlife, some of which is endangered due to overdevelopment of the countryside.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services (including DMH, GP surgeries, Police, Fire and Ambulance etc.).</p> <p>The plan contains a lot of contradiction.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr John Atkinson				DBDLP 618	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, air pollution, noise and affect road safety.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside, open</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>The 45% refers to land outside of the developed area of the site and covers the large green corridor along the southern side of the River Skerne which will incorporate areas of accessible green space, managed</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>space and wildlife habitats. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>There is no justification for the relocation of the golf club.</p> <p>If the 45% green space includes the golf club then this is not available to existing residents unless they become members.</p> <p>I question whether there is a breach of process in allowing Bellway to apply for permission to build 142 homes on Elm Tree farm at this late stage of the consultation process for the local plan when it forms part of the Skerningham allocation site.</p>	<p>agricultural land and the relocated Darlington Golf Club. Further green space will be provided within the remainder of the site, creating an extensive network of green infrastructure connecting residential areas and community facilities, delivered in line with Policy ENV 4. This position will be clarified in the supporting text to the policy.</p> <p>Planning applications can be submitted at any point in time and must be considered against the adopted policies at the time the application is determined. The Council cannot prevent a landowner or developer submitting a planning application and, once submitted, has a duty to decide the application within a set timescale or face an appeal from the applicant against non-determination. The policies contained in the Draft Local Plan can only be given limited weight at this stage due to their position in the plan preparation process.</p>	
Miss Joanne Evans				DBDL P 641	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower. Suggest a third independent projection to provide more certainty.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads. Local roads (including Barmpton Lane and Whinbush Lane) will not cope with the additional traffic. An access across Springfield Park is totally unrealistic. The simple addition of mini roundabouts or traffic lights</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. The housing projection will be tested thoroughly when the Local Plan is examined by an independent Inspector appointed by the Government during a public hearing.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>does not constitute an improvement.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside, open space, footpaths/bridleways and wildlife habitats. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land and use of empty properties (such as the Rolling Mills site in Whessoe Road).</p> <p>I can see the merits of some greenfield sites such as Great Burdon and West Park as these already have suitable existing road structures and are adjacent to existing urban developments.</p>		
Mrs Claire Wayper				DBDLP 872	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park. Allowing a road across Springfield Park would mean that it was no longer safe for children.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>The resulting pollution would be detrimental to health.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land (such as McMullen Road, West Park and Albert Hill).</p>		
Mr Chris Jackson				DBDLP 811	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Agree with other objections on the Skerningham development.</p> <p>The roads cannot cope. The additional traffic will cause congestion, air pollution and affect road safety.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Miss Diane Nicholson				DBDLP 825	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment.</p> <p>There is no justification for the relocation of the golf club to the community woodlands, leading to the further loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads (Whinfield Road, Salters Lane North). It would be difficult to turn right out of Oak Wood</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Drive unless traffic lights were installed.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park. If the proposed development on land to the north of Sparrow Hall Drive is built how would it affect the plans for this access road?</p>		
Gill Naisby				DBDLP 818	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>There is a difference between green spaces and countryside.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads. The additional traffic will cause congestion and air pollution.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Diane Dobson				DBDLP 879	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park and walking routes. Where will teenagers go and what will be left for them to do with their time.</p> <p>Housing developments currently in the area share the space sympathetically will local wildlife and green spaces. The proposed development is so large it will remove virtually all wildlife and safe green space.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p>		
Mr Ian Downes				DBDLP 824	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>The local road infrastructure cannot handle the existing traffic volumes, adding extra traffic will exacerbate problems.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services (including doctors, dentists, hospital services and schools).</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park. Allowing a road across Springfield Park will introduce a significant hazard.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Ms Janet Raper				DBDLP 940	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>There is very little in the town centre now. Look at converting empty premises in the centre for residential use. There are plenty of</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								empty houses and other buildings available.		
Mr Keith Stodart				DBDLP 941	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>We should be protecting our green space, priority should be given to the development of brownfield land and use of empty properties. Even more properties are available in the town centre with the loss of large retailers.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services (including primary schools and nurseries).</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion and pollution.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park.</p> <p>Object to the loss of countryside walks, woodland and wildlife.</p> <p>The relocation of the golf club will destroy the community woodland at Skerningham Countryside Park. There is no justification for the relocation of the golf club.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Ms Laura Gardner				DBDLP 958	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>The additional traffic along Sparrow Hall Drive and Whinfield Road will cause congestion, pollution, noise and affect road safety.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and landscape,</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>resulting in the loss of local wildlife and recreational opportunities. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and local services (including doctors and schools).</p> <p>Development will devalue property in the area.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes.</p> <p>The town centre is diminishing.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land and use of empty properties.</p>		
Mrs Liz Knight				DBDLP 961	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Request that the Skerningham allocation is removed from the plan and that the need for its inclusion is reviewed at the time of production of the next Local Plan in 2036.</p> <p>It represents development in the countryside and a considerable expansion of the development limit.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>countryside/agricultural land and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Object to the loss of public rights of way/permissive paths (including changes to Green lane) and community woodland that are extensively used by residents for recreation. When such routes are provided alongside development they are inferior.</p> <p>Development will bring noise, air and light pollution.</p> <p>The relocation of the golf club will impact on Skertingham Community Woodland. The relocation of Darlington Golf Club makes no sense.</p> <p>New tree planting to replace any loss of Community Woodland would take 20-30 years to establish. Plan suggests that any new woodland would be separated by some distance from the Skertingham Countryside Park itself.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>Even if a link road goes ahead the additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution, noise and affect road safety. Traffic removed from the A1150 will simply be replaced by that from the Skertingham development.</p> <p>There has been insufficient public consultation regarding the</p>		

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>proposals for Skerningham. There has been no meaningful consultation with the local community on the proposals prior to the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park (which is an Asset of Community Value). Allowing a road across Springfield Park will destroy it.</p>		
Mr Knight				DBDLP 966	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Request that the Skerningham allocation is removed from the plan and that the need for its inclusion is reviewed at the time of production of the next Local Plan in 2036.</p> <p>It represents development in the countryside and a considerable expansion of the development limit.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside/agricultural land and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Object to the loss of public rights of way/permissive paths (including changes to Green lane) and community woodland that are extensively used by residents for recreation. When such routes are provided alongside development they are inferior.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Development will bring noise, air and light pollution.</p> <p>The relocation of the golf club will impact on Skerningham Community Woodland. The relocation of Darlington Golf Club makes no sense.</p> <p>New tree planting to replace any loss of Community Woodland would take 20-30 years to establish. Plan suggests that any new woodland would be separated by some distance from the Skerningham Countryside Park itself.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>Even if a link road goes ahead the additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution, noise and affect road safety. Traffic removed from the A1150 will simply be replaced by that from the Skerningham development.</p> <p>There has been insufficient public consultation regarding the proposals for Skerningham. There has been no meaningful consultation with the local community on the proposals prior to the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park (which is an Asset of Community Value). Allowing a road across Springfield Park will destroy it.</p>		

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Kim Bainbridge				DBDLP 1039	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Residents knew nothing of this proposal until land speculators Theakstons undertook falsely named "consultation" where no feedback was encouraged by the questionnaires given. However it would appear that DBC have been in consultation with Theakstons and have adopted their plan entirely.</p> <p>The Skerningham Masterplan is at odds with the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy and standards.</p> <p>It fails to mention the medieval village or graves located among the black poplars.</p> <p>There is no justification for the relocation of the golf club. Surely no permission could be given to relocate a golf club from the edge of town to a designated wildlife area which is less accessible and would destroy woodland planted with public money as part of the Tees Forest.</p> <p>Any development on this area, including the golf club will be severely detrimental to the wildlife and contribute to the national devastation of woodland and farmland bird numbers.</p> <p>There is poor access to the site and more housing will lead to untenable traffic congestion on the A1150 and Winbush Way.</p> <p>Surely no development can take place on Skerningham as if Route</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The Skerningham Community Woodland is not a designated wildlife area. Draft Policy H 10 specifies that there must be a net gain in the area of community woodland on the site.</p> <p>There is currently no guarantee that the plans for a Northern Link Road will be delivered and, as such, the plan therefore has to be prepared under the assumption that it will not be forthcoming and that the growth proposed in the plan does not rely on its delivery. However, it would also be short-sighted for the emerging plan to compromise the future delivery of the Northern Link Road should the business case be ratified and funding obtained for its delivery. Therefore, the proposed layout of development on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation, as indicated on the Masterplan Framework plans in the Draft Local Plan (Figures 6.1 and 6.2), would enable the delivery of either the inner or outer route options without having a significant impact on the delivery of the wider Skerningham site, and indeed having a number of potential benefits. However, it should be noted that only the outer link road route is now being explored and this has been reflected in changes to the policy wording and supporting text of the Proposed Submission Local Plan document.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								B was chosen it would render the masterplan unworkable.		
Mr Roger Fitzpatrick- Odamier				DBDLP 994	Policy H 10	Skerningha m Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>It represents development in the countryside and a considerable expansion of the development limit contrary to the NPPF. It has not been sufficiently demonstrated that development boundaries need to be extended.</p> <p>Development will adversely affect the character, appearance and nature of the Skerningham Valley and Whinfield area and destroy wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Development will bring noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Object to the loss of recreational facilities such as permissive paths and open spaces and is therefore contrary to Policy DC 2.</p> <p>It will result in the loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Planned development will have a negative impact on local infrastructure.</p> <p>The area is unsustainable as development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads.</p> <p>The development is isolated and will result in more cars on the roads increasing pollution.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1142	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>The Plan and the supporting evidence base including the SA should be amended to ensure that it includes a robust assessment of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting to inform the suitability of the sites for development and to ensure that there are appropriate site specific mitigation measures which will minimise harm to the historic environment in line with the requirements of the NPPF and the 1990 Act.</p> <p>The last line of the policy incorrectly repeats the NPPF (it is not protect and conserve). It should also ensure that it is correct in referencing assets that are within and adjacent to the boundary.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of this work have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of the Heritage Impact Assessment have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.</p>
Frances Nicholson	Bellway Homes Limited (Durham)			DBDLP 1170	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Supportive of this urban extension however greater emphasis needs to be placed on the need to fully consider the viability of forthcoming development.</p> <p>The Elm Tree Farm site (reference number 392) should not be shown as part of the wider Skerningham strategic allocation site. Request that the site is omitted from the strategic allocation site to avoid confusion and potential risk that housing on an identified and readily deliverable allocation might become unnecessarily prejudiced or delayed.</p> <p>It is noted that a proposed principle access point would run in close proximity to site 392 Elm Tree Farm. Bellway consider that this vehicular access point could</p>	<p>The Council has prepared a Whole Plan Viability Assessment in support of the Local Plan that has been used to inform its decisions on the viability of allocation sites, taking into account, and testing affordable housing standards and other proposed costs to development resulting from proposed local planning policies, as required by the NPPF and NPPG.</p> <p>The Elm Tree Farm site was included within the boundary of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (but not double counted in terms of housing figures) because it forms a logical extension of the masterplan framework area. However, in recognition that this site forms a separate allocation changes have been made to the Policies Map and the Skerningham Masterplan Framework plan, Figure 6.1, to reflect this position.</p>	<p>The Skerningham Strategic Allocation boundary has been amended to remove the Elm Tree Farm site (site ref 392).</p> <p>The Skerningham Masterplan Framework, Figure 6.1, has been changed so that the legend refers to the 'Masterplan Framework Boundary' as opposed to the 'Site Boundary', and the framework plan has been amended to more closely reflect the layout of development in the planning application for the Elm Tree Farm site.</p> <p>The following point has been added to the housing allocation statement for Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm in Appendix B:</p> <p><u>'f. Development should be in broad alignment with the Skerningham Masterplan Framework (Figure 6.1) and the development principles contained in Policy H 10: Skerningham Strategic Allocation.'</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								be successfully accommodated alongside the development of site 392 and therefore so not object or raise concerns regarding its proposed alignment.		The Greater Faverdale Masterplan Framework, Figure 6.3, has been changed so that the legend to refers to the 'Masterplan Framework Boundary' as opposed to the 'Site Boundary'
Gillian McKittrick				DBDLP 1192	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower. With industries moving out of the north east who is going to buy them - or do you have plans for them all to be social housing?</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land and use of empty properties.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution and affect road safety.</p> <p>Object to the proposed closing of Springfield Park.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside, rights of way and wildlife habitats. The area is used for recreation by residents. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
David McKittrick				DBDLP 1194	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower. With industries moving out of the north east who is going to buy them - or do you</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>have plans for them all to be social housing?</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land and use of empty properties.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution and affect road safety.</p> <p>Object to the proposed closing of Springfield Park.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside, rights of way and wildlife habitats. The area is used for recreation by residents. This will have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p>	on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	
Ms Julie Nixon				DBDLP 1370	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on the countryside and loss of nature/wildlife. • The area is used for walking and exercising. • Area of flood risk. • Impact on heritage assets and burial site. • Impact on woodland. • Traffic congestion in the area and impacts on highway safety, 	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								pollution and public health.		
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 1376	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Support	The strategic allocation can complement the delivery of either link road option but equally would not be compromised if the plans for the road were not progressed.	Support noted. Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1294	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Neutral	There is the potential to create a significant country/urban park in the Skerne valley, restoring a more natural function to this section of modified river. Any development should contribute to such restoration and ensure that it does not compromise such a scheme through encroachment onto the floodplain.	Comment noted and agreed. Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Tim Ellis				DBDLP 84	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside/agricultural land. Allowing a road across Springfield Park will destroy it. Development will put a strain on town's already overstretched roads and services.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.
Mr Simeon Hope				DBDLP 249	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	Dispute the need for this many houses. The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution and road traffic accidents. Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and the relocation of	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation. Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Darlington Golf Club is especially egregious.</p> <p>Suggestion of planting new woodland to replace that lost is risible.</p> <p>Development will interfere with the popular Springfield Park.</p> <p>There has been insufficient public consultation regarding the proposals for Skerningham. Believe that public comments will not affect the outcome.</p>		
Alan Hutchinson	Whinfield Residents Association			DBDLP 166	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>It represents development in the countryside and a considerable expansion of the development limit.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside/agricultural land and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Object to the loss of public rights of way/permissive paths (including changes to Green lane) and community woodland that are extensively used by residents for recreation. When such routes are provided alongside development they are inferior.</p> <p>Development will bring noise, air and light pollution.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p>	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>The relocation of the golf club will impact on Skerningham Community Woodland. The relocation of Darlington Golf Club makes no sense.</p> <p>New tree planting to replace any loss of Community Woodland would take 20-30 years to establish. Plan suggests that any new woodland would be separated by some distance from the Skerningham Countryside Park itself.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>Even if a link road goes ahead the additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution, noise and affect road safety. Traffic removed from the A1150 will simply be replaced by that from the Skerningham development.</p> <p>There has been insufficient public consultation regarding the proposals for Skerningham. There has been no meaningful consultation with the local community on the proposals prior to the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park (which is an Asset of Community Value). Allowing a road across Springfield Park will destroy it.</p>		
Dave McGuire	Sport England (North East)			DBDLP 103	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Neutral	Clarification required on how the proposals will affect Springfield Park and further detail needed on	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								the relocation of Darlington Golf Club.	The relocation of Darlington Golf Club will result in a facility of at least equivalent in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location to the satisfaction of national policy. Further details on the clubs relocation will be provided as the proposals develop. Also please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	
Mrs Donna Greenhow				DBDLP 185	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution and noise.</p> <p>The local roads are already overstretched.</p> <p>Use weight restrictions to remove HGV traffic from the A1150, they can then use either the A66 and A689 to access Teesport.</p> <p>Development of this site, and the relocation of the golf course, will have an adverse impact on the local environment and result in the loss of valuable countryside, woodland and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park. Children and adults need safe places for their well-being and mental health.</p> <p>Object to any development along the River Skerne corridor.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The lack of North bound slip roads at junction 57 of the A1(M) means it is not a viable option to stop HGV's from using the A1150, and until a new alternative is provided, the A1150 will continue to be the main route used for traffic moving between South Durham and Teesside.</p>	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.
Andrea Toulson				DBDLP 596	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park and the surrounding countryside. This will</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>have an impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p>		
Mr Simon Jones				DBDLP 946	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>The Skerningham proposals has been hidden until very recently, a development of this size requires to be its own entity.</p> <p>Darlington has many areas in need of regeneration.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services (including schools and doctors surgery).</p> <p>Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park they will destroy the area forever.</p> <p>The development would affect our amenity.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.
Mr Sean Bowman				DBDLP 81	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Object to the Skerningham site on a number of grounds including increased traffic, loss of countryside, wildlife, loss of park areas for children, removal of public right of way walks in open fields.</p> <p>Concerned that development will result in flooding of the river.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Major Frederick				DBDLP 91	6.10.2	Paragraph	Object	Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower. DBC are the only local authority in the area to have	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Greenhow MBE								<p>greatly over estimated housing requirements.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the character of the area and the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside and wildlife habitats. The area is used for recreation by residents.</p> <p>MP Jenny Chapman did a walk around and stated that this area should not be developed, but left for the protection of its wildlife and residents to enjoy.</p> <p>Object to the loss of permissive paths and community woodland that are extensively used by residents for recreation. The area also includes a medieval village and the ancient and historic Green lane.</p> <p>Development will bring noise, air and light pollution.</p> <p>The local roads are already overstretched. Even if a link road goes ahead the additional traffic will cause congestion and pollution. Use weight restrictions to remove HGV traffic from the A1150, they can then use either the A66 and A689 to access Teesport.</p> <p>Object to the relocation of the golf club which will result in the loss of publicly accessible community woodland. New tree planting to replace the loss of Community</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>Paragraph 60 of the NPPF makes it clear that the standard method for calculating housing need is the minimum starting point for local authorities. Darlington Borough Council are not the only local authority in the area to be planning for growth above the level set out under the standard methodology, with all of the other Tees Valley local authorities also planning for growth above this level.</p> <p>The lack of North bound slip roads at junction 57 of the A1(M) means it is not a viable option to stop HGV's from using the A1150, and until a new alternative is provided, the A1150 will continue to be the main route used for traffic moving between South Durham and Teesside.</p>	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Woodland would take decades to grow and mature.</p> <p>There has been insufficient public consultation regarding the proposals for Skerningham with residents. The consultation undertaken by the developer was not fit for purpose. DBC should have involved the public at a much earlier stage.</p> <p>Object to the inclusion of Springfield Park. Children and adults need safe places for their well-being and mental health.</p>		
Stephen Bibby				DBDLP 487	6.10.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>Transitional and ultimate impact on infrastructure and services will be a challenge.</p> <p>Green land and park land is threatened - where do children, football teams play in future. Where will dogs be walked?</p> <p>How can you talk about retaining and enhancing hedgerows & trees - the plan eradicates them?</p> <p>How will you ensure that the introduction of new schools will not adversely impact existing schools?</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 374	Figure 6.1	Skerningham Masterplan Framework	Object	<p>The plan lacks much detail and it is largely meaningless. There is a failure to show the East Coast railway line, a considerable hindrance to the development of the site and the River Skerne which forms an important part of</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>the Indicative Strategic Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>The indicative location for the Golf Club would be on top of the two Listed properties and the Deserted Medieval Village of Skerningham and on top of Skerningham Countryside Park and Skerningham Community Woodland, all promoted by DBC in their Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p>		
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 1378	6.10.8	Paragraph	Neutral	Suggest that the south east corner of the site is indicated as safeguarded land for employment purposes, and reviewed as part of any future update to the Council's employment land evidence base.	Agreed. Paragraph 6.10.8 acknowledges that the south east corner of the site has potential for future employment provision and that the need to release this part of the site for employment use will be considered when the Local Plan is next reviewed, and as part of any future update/review of the Council's employment land evidence base. The supporting text has been amended to make it clear that there is the potential for between 15-30 hectares of employment land in this location.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 65	6.10.10	Paragraph	Object	Feel the only reason DBC want a link road in and are promoting this especially inner link road Route B to push Skerningham development on a much larger scale than local residents were expecting it started with Darlington golf course to be built on into the major potential up to 4,500 homes which will spoil and destroy this openspace greenbelt corridor or countryside, and cause much worse traffic congestion in the area, pollution and noise for already established urban developments in the area.	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Darlington does not have any designated green belt. This is a formal designation typically found in larger urban areas to prevent settlements merging.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr	Member	Mr	Member	DBDLP 405	6.10.10	Paragraph	Object	Plans for a Northern Link Road have not moved forward and are	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Simon Bainbridge	Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Simon Bainbridge	Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group					<p>an aspiration rather than a realistic proposal that can inform the development of the site. This major infrastructure project could render the whole masterplan void.</p> <p>Any crossing of the East Coast Mainline is a considerable issue there have had no satisfactory response on the progress of discussions with Network Rail.</p>		
Mr Neil Minto				DBDLP 809	6.10.10	Paragraph	Object	<p>A link road from the A1(M) south, just south of the Tees bridge will give access to the A66(M) without going through Skerningham area and again losing important green belt areas.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Junction 57 of the A1(M) is outside of the borough. However, this is an option that has been discussed previously with Highways England but they currently have no intention to pursue the project. The Council continue to engage with Highways England on strategic highways matters.</p> <p>Darlington does not have any designated green belt. This is a formal designation typically found in larger urban areas to prevent settlements merging.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 406	6.10.11	Paragraph	Object	<p>45% of the green infrastructure cannot possibly be retained:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the golf club is relocated; agricultural land will be minimal and clash with residential uses; and the River Skerne corridor cannot be preserved if Route B of the Northern Link Road goes ahead. 	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 1379	6.10.11	Paragraph	Neutral	Request a change to the paragraph to state that the site will retain 'around' rather than 'over' 45% accessible green infrastructure and managed agricultural land, so as not to be overly prescriptive.	Comment noted. Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 66	6.10.13	Paragraph	Object	Object to any access road forming part of Springfield Park it will cause noise, disruption and pollution and cause more traffic congestion as the heavy traffic on the A1150.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 407	6.10.13	Paragraph	Object	Object to the proposed changes to Springfield Park (which is an Asset of Community Value). Allowing a road across Springfield Park will destroy it. Extending the park to the north is inadequate and will be cut off by Green Lane. Putting a road across the park is unacceptable on safety and aesthetic grounds. Springfield Park should be removed from the plan.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 67	6.10.14	Paragraph	Object	The site also contains Skerningham Medieval Village that is not mentioned for some reason on page 138 of the plan (Appendix C: Darlington's Heritage Assets).	Skerningham Medieval Village is not a Scheduled Monument and is therefore not included on the list on page 138 of the plan. The potential location of Skerningham Medieval Village is identified on Figure C.1 showing Areas of High Archaeological Potential across the Borough. Under draft Policy ENV 1 development proposals involving ground disturbance in this area must be accompanied by an archaeological evaluation report.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 408	6.10.14	Paragraph	Object	<p>Development will compromise the character and setting of the two Listed Building on the site.</p> <p>There is a failure to recognise the Skerningham deserted medieval village.</p> <p>Northern Link Road Route B would destroy these historic assets.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mrs Laura Roberts	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 739	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Neutral	Support sites allocation. Site should be required to incorporate sustainable drainage systems.	Support noted and agree with suggested change to policy.	<p>Include reference to the need for the site to incorporate sustainable drainage systems under criterion x.</p> <p>Add Bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> incorporates a sustainable drainage system.
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1107	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Object	<p>There needs to be some evaluation of the potential impact of development on the Grade II Listed building within the site and Stockton & Darlington Railway HAZ.</p>	<p>Where necessary, the Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures identified have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.</p>	Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of the Heritage Impact Assessment have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1143	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Object	<p>The Plan and the supporting evidence base including the SA should be amended to ensure that it includes a robust assessment of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting to inform the suitability of the sites for development and to ensure that there are appropriate site specific mitigation measures which will minimise harm to the historic</p>	<p>Where necessary, the Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures identified have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.</p>	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of the Heritage Impact Assessment have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.</p> <p>The final sentence of Policy H 11 has been amended to read: "The site design and layout will need to protect <u>must protect and conserve and enhance</u> the Scheduled Monument Listed Building on the site, and its setting, <u>and the historic Stockton & Darlington Railway</u> in accordance with policy ENV 1 and ENV 2. which</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>environment in line with the requirements of the NPPF and the 1990 Act.</p> <p>The last line of the policy incorrectly repeats the NPPF (it is not protect and conserve). It should also ensure that it is correct in referencing assets that are within and adjacent to the boundary - there is no scheduled monument in the site but a Grade II heritage asset.</p>		incorporates the trackbed of the historic Stockton and Darlington Railway.'
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1295	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Neutral	Site should be used as an opportunity to re-naturalise the watercourse with SUDS used as the main method of surface water drainage.	Comments noted	<p>Criteria to be added to H 11 x.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> incorporates sustainable drainage systems. <p>The plan should also be read as a whole and consideration given to policies DC 4 and EN 7 which prioritise the incorporation of SUDS into development schemes and encourage the restoration of natural watercourses.</p>
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1213	Policy E 1	Safeguarding Existing Employment Opportunities	Object	Suggestion of more flexibility of uses for employment generating uses beyond the traditional employment uses B1 B2 B8.	Table 7.2 specifies the suggested uses for each site in more detail. Other uses can be considered flexibly through the planning application process.	<p>Text to be reworded as follows:</p> <p>The following existing employment areas, as shown on the Policies Map, are promoted and safeguarded for existing and ongoing economic investment. Within these areas, planning permission will be granted in line with the 'suggested uses' of each site set out below. Proposals for other employment uses not falling within the 'suggested uses' of specific sites will only be permitted where the Borough Council is satisfied that they will not have detrimental effect on the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining or nearby properties or prejudice the development of adjacent sites.</p>
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 670	7.1.12	Paragraph	Neutral	Which four sites have been identified through the Helaa as mixed use sites ?	<p>There are only three sites which have been identified for mixed use for the plan going forward</p> <p>Site 185 Greater Faverdale</p>	Paragraph 7.1.12 to change "...two new sites have been identified through the...(HELAA)...".

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p>Site 352 Barton Street Haughton Road</p> <p>Site 355 Lingfield Point</p> <p>The fourth initial mixed use site 361 DTVA Airport North has been re-assessed as an Employment Site only after excluding Site 16 and including Site 27 after the Tees Valley Mayor took over the running of the Airport and land from Peel holding which voided residential development.</p>	<p>Site 352 - Remains an employment site due to applications being granted for residential uses on other parts of the site.</p>
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Christopher Martin	WYG	DBDLP 1106	Policy E 3	Darlington Farmers Auction Mart Relocation	Object	<p>Widening the boundary of the allocation so that it reflects the previous outline consent (rather than the smaller reserved matters boundary).</p> <p>Ensure the mix of uses also reflect the previous outline consent (in addition to those uses listed in Policy E3 currently) so that the land can be brought forward in a flexible manner .</p> <p>Better define the uses within Policy E3 to create more certainty to our Client; and</p> <p>Consider the future potential for a mixed use sustainable development on our Client's wider landholdings in the form of a new settlement/Garden Village</p>	<p>Boundary of the site can be amended based on previous applications and architectural vision. Mix of uses considered accurately in policy E3 which outlines ancillary rural uses and related agricultural uses.</p> <p>Mixed use for residential settlement / garden village is ruled out at this location as it is not considered a sustainable location for residential use.</p>	<p>Change Boundary of site on Policy map.</p>
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1149	Policy E 4	Economic Development in the Open Countryside	Object	<p>Para 2 Suggestion in policy that where it is possible and appropriate, proposals for the re-use of a heritage asset will be approved. This policy does not provide the same level of</p>	<p>Comments noted and to be amended</p>	<p>1st sentence Para 2 should be amended to read:</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>protection and will not safeguard Darlington's heritage assets.</p> <p>What does Bullet B means in terms of make use of retained features? If a feature is deemed to be part of the significance of a heritage asset then, make use would not always be appropriate. As not all features can be actively used.</p>		<p>Where possible and appropriate existing buildings including designated or non-designated heritage assets shall be retained and reused.</p> <p>Bullet b) to read Make use of retained features that contribute to local distinctiveness or historic interest if appropriate;</p>
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 676	Policy TC 1	Darlington - Town Centre Boundary	Object	<p>Town Centre Uses not defined</p> <p>Boundary of Town Centre wrongly defined (spelling mistake) a 167</p>	<p>Town Centre Uses defined in Para 8.1.5</p> <p>Correct boundary description could be more precise</p>	<p>Minor changes for description of boundary</p> <p>The Town Centre boundary is shown in the policies map and includes South of St Augustines Way (A68), South of Northgate Roundabout and South of St Cuthberts Way (A167) to the north ,</p>
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 680	Policy TC 3	Additional Site for Town Centre Uses	Object	<p>Site "Number" 271 not visible on any Policy map / TC 3 policy hatching includes the Town Centre boundary.</p>	<p>Site Number as in table and text not visible</p> <p>The Site is allocation for additional Retail uses for the Town Centre First Policy which also helps to implement the Town Centre First policy and allows the sequential test for retail development.</p>	<p>Delete Site Number from Table in Policy TC3 and notation on policies map to be changed to differentiate from Town Centre Fringe and boundary revised to exclude properties on Northgate.</p>
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 682	Policy TC 4	District and Local Centres	Object	<p>Are other District and Local Centres missing (North road etc.</p> <p>Reference point "iii" mentions a set of criteria that uses must satisfy to be acceptable.</p>	<p>The approach of this new Local Plan sets to only retain and safeguard Centres in Cockerton and Mowden due to their characteristic and safeguarding purpose.</p>	<p>Reword Policy TC4 to:</p> <p>The boundaries of the District and Local Centres are identified on the Policies Map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cockerton (District Centre) ● Mowden (Local Centre) <p>Types of uses that will be acceptable within the boundaries include shops, financial services, restaurants and cafes, drinking establishments, hot food takeaways, and a range of community and leisure</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
										<p>facilities (included within classes A2-A5, D1 and D2 of the Use Classes Order) so long as they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Are physically integrated with the rest of the centre; and b. Will ensure the vitality and viability of the centre is maintained.
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 141	Policy TC 6	Darlington - Town Centre Fringe	Object	<p>Objection to undefined "High density" in TC6</p> <p>Should be within NPPF 2018 guidelines of chapter 11 achieving appropriate densities for Town centres</p>	<p>Reference to 'high density' has been removed in a suggested rewording of this policy. Ultimately acceptable densities will be determined at application stage and will also be expected to reflect the requirements of the Council's Design of New Development SPD.</p>	<p>Reword of policy TC6 to:</p> <p>'Development and regeneration of the Town Centre Fringe will be promoted throughout the plan period to deliver a range of mixed use development and environmental improvements.</p> <p>To support the delivery of the remaining priorities identified the Town Centre Fringe Masterplan; development in this area should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Manage flood risk along the whole of the river corridor <u>that incorporates enhanced river habitat and green infrastructure within the River Skerne Strategic GI corridor</u>; b) Conserve historic buildings in the area, with an emphasis on creating opportunities for the celebration of Darlington's Heritage; c) Provide an improvement of existing housing in the area; d) Provide improvements in connectivity for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport into and through the area to allow access to jobs, leisure and business opportunities. <p>Removal of the Gas Holder on Valley Street North poses a significant constraint to development and it's removal and site remediation at the earliest opportunity will be supported.'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 684	Policy TC 6	Darlington - Town Centre Fringe	Object	<p>The old Town Centre Fringe Masterplan is not enough to kickstart regeneration - A new plan is needed to identify all possible opportunities for residential development to press government to release resources for brownfield development.</p> <p>Policy is imprecise and should include excluded options</p> <p>"Perhaps the phrase "Included options for intensified land use re-development:" would be better replaced with "Development permitted in the Town Centre Fringe are:"</p>	<p>The NPPF makes clear that we should only rely on sites that have a reasonable prospect of coming forward. This would not prevent an updated Town Centre Fringe Masterplan or Strategy from being developed.</p>	<p>Reword of policy TC6 to:</p> <p>'Development and regeneration of the Town Centre Fringe will be promoted throughout the plan period to deliver a range of mixed use development and environmental improvements.</p> <p>To support the delivery of the remaining priorities identified the Town Centre Fringe Masterplan; development in this area should:</p> <p>a) Manage flood risk along the whole of the river corridor <u>that incorporates enhanced river habitat and green infrastructure within the River Skerne Strategic GI corridor;</u></p> <p>b) Conserve historic buildings in the area, with an emphasis on creating opportunities for the celebration of Darlington's Heritage;</p> <p>c) Provide an improvement of existing housing in the area;</p> <p>d) Provide improvements in connectivity for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport into and through the area to allow access to jobs, leisure and business opportunities.</p> <p>Removal of the Gas Holder on Valley Street North poses a significant constraint to development and it's removal and site remediation at the earliest opportunity will be supported.'</p>
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1275	Policy TC 6	Darlington - Town Centre Fringe	Neutral	<p>Point D) green corridor schemes is too weak. Enhance the ecological functioning of the river to achieve Water Framework Directive objectives</p>	<p>Noted and appropriate rewording suggested.</p>	<p>Reword of policy TC6 to:</p> <p>'Development and regeneration of the Town Centre Fringe will be promoted throughout the plan period to deliver a range of mixed use development and environmental improvements.</p> <p>To support the delivery of the remaining priorities identified the Town Centre Fringe Masterplan; development in this area should:</p> <p>a) Manage flood risk along the whole of the river</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
										<p>corridor <u>that incorporates enhanced river habitat and green infrastructure within the River Skerne Strategic GI corridor</u>;</p> <p>b) Conserve historic buildings in the area, with an emphasis on creating opportunities for the celebration of Darlington's Heritage;</p> <p>c) Provide an improvement of existing housing in the area;</p> <p>d) Provide improvements in connectivity for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport into and through the area to allow access to jobs, leisure and business opportunities.</p> <p>Removal of the Gas Holder on Valley Street North poses a significant constraint to development and it's removal and site remediation at the earliest opportunity will be supported.'</p>
Ms Julie Nixon				DBDLP 326	9	ENVIRONMENT	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment, resulting in the loss of valuable countryside/agricultural land and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>The plan does not deliver in terms of meeting any existing human or environmental concerns nor does it consider the need that many people have to connect with the natural world as part of the human psyche.</p> <p>The plan should be conserving and improving green space and include new tree planting and wetland creation.</p> <p>The Skerningham area is used for recreation by residents.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>The landowners on the Skerningham site are working together to bring the site forward and have not indicated that there is any reason for any part of the site to be considered unavailable. Paragraph 72 of the NPPF is clear that larger scale development can often be the best way to secure the delivery of large numbers of new homes.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>How will this fit with the Brightwater Project?</p> <p>Houses should not be built in flood zones.</p> <p>Object to any loss of community woodland and impact on history /heritage and burial site.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services (including health, education and emergency services).</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, and affect people's health.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>Lets become a town that attracts more environmentally sensitive/friendly businesses.</p> <p>Why are we not regenerating existing properties and land.</p> <p>We should be encouraging environmentally friendly design, construction and materials.</p> <p>Building at Skerningham would be more detrimental and difficult as there are many more landowners involved than in other locations which is more costly and complicated.</p>		

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
MRS ELIZABETH WATSON				DBDLP 875	9	ENVIRONMENT	Object	<p>The Council set an excellent Tree and woodland strategy 2011-2020 to proactively manage and enlarge the tree population of the Borough of Darlington in order to protect our historic heritage of trees and provide a valued environmental amenity for future generations.</p> <p>Providing more housing units in inappropriate places e.g. Blackwell Meadows, Blackwell Grange East (HELAA009), Beaumont Hill (HELAA039) will have severe Impact on Biodiversity and Ecology.</p>	<p>Policy ENV 7 seeks to deliver net gains for biodiversity as a result of development. The policy is clear that any adverse effects on the environment should in the first instance be avoided and then mitigated where possible. Compensation will only be considered as a last resort. This approach is in line with national policy.</p> <p>Clause DIII of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to better reflect the provisions of paragraph 175c of the NPPF in respect of ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation and Blackwell Grange East.</p>	<p>The penultimate sentence of Clause DIII of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'New development will not be permitted that would result in the loss, fragmentation, isolation or deterioration of ancient woodland <u>or ancient or veteran trees unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists</u>the need for and benefits of the development in that location clearly outweigh the harm.'</p>
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1297	9	ENVIRONMENT	Neutral	<p>Darlington has a general responsibility not to compromise the achievement of UK compliance with the Water Framework Directive (WFD). A fundamental objective of WFD is that there should be no deterioration in the ecological condition of any waterbody. It is also the default objective for every waterbody to be improved to good ecological potential by 2027.</p> <p>All waterbodies within the Darlington Borough Council currently fail to meet the criteria for good ecological status, or potential, and action is needed to improve the ecological condition of our waterbodies.</p> <p>Darlington needs to incorporate WFD priorities, and reflect Northumbria River Basin Management Plan (RBMP)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Changes have been made to policy ENV 4 to reflect the Council's obligations under the Water Framework Directive.</p>	<p>A new criterion has been added to Policy ENV 4 after criterion C (and necessary consequential changes to policy numbering have been made) to read: '<u>Expecting development to improve local water quality, wherever possible, taking into account the Northumbria River Basin Management Plan;</u>'</p> <p>Draft Local Plan criterion D of Policy ENV 4 has been amended to read: 'D. Working with partners and the community to bring forward priority projects and measures identified in Darlington's Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Northumbria River Basin Management Plan;</p> <p>The following new text (along with the accompanying footnote) has been added to the supporting text of Policy ENV 4 after paragraph 9.4.10: '<u>The EU Water Framework Directive became part of UK law in 2003* with the primary objectives of achieving good ecological status in water bodies, and providing protection for drinking water sources and protected sites (Natura 2000 sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest). These requirements are reflected in the Environment Agency's Northumbria River Basin Management Plan which covers the Darlington</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>information on waterbody improvement priorities, in local planning policies, Infrastructure Delivery Plans and in the determination of individual planning applications.</p> <p>Darlington must also consider what actions or measures contained in the RBMP relate to them and implement the necessary actions accordingly.</p> <p>The Local Plan uses the terms 'infrastructure' and 'green infrastructure' in several places. The Council should be specific when using the term 'infrastructure' whether this includes or excludes 'green infrastructure'.</p>		<p><u>Borough. In making decisions on spatial plans and planning applications, the Council has a duty to have regard to the Northumbrian River Basin Management Plan to ensure the protection and improvement of water quality. Changes to the design of development proposals will often avoid harm to water bodies. Development that would adversely affect the quality or quantity of surface or groundwater, flow of groundwater or ability to abstract water will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that no significant adverse impact would occur or mitigation can be put in place to minimise this impact within acceptable levels.</u></p> <p><u>*Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) Regulations 2003'</u></p>
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1099		Safeguarding the Historic Environment	Object	<p>Historic England is concerned that the Plan policies do not contain a robust framework to deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment in Darlington and to guide how the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied locally. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · There does not appear to be an adequate, up-to date and relevant evidence base on the historic environment. · It does not set out a positive and clear strategy for the historic environment – in both its policies and site allocations. · It does not contain strategic policies which would appropriately safeguard the area's heritage assets in particular Policy 	<p>DBC has engaged with Historic England during the preparation of the emerging Local Plan and will continue to do so as the plan progresses towards examination. Changes to the plans key heritage policies (ENV 1 and ENV 2) have been made to reflect discussions held with Historic England since the Draft Local Plan consultation stage.</p> <p>Where directed by Historic England, the Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures identified through this work have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.</p>	<p>Please see recommended changes to heritage policies.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of the Heritage Impact Assessment have been included within the the policy, supporting text and/or the Housing and Employment Statements as appropriate.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>ENV1.</p> <p>· In terms of the site Allocations, no assessment has been made of the impact the principle of an allocation may have on the significance of the heritage assets (including within the SA). Reference is made to the need to consider this when the development comes forward but the Plan needs to demonstrate that the site can accommodate development to the quantum proposed without harm to the historic environment during the Plan making stage not be deferred to the application stage.</p>		
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1100		Safeguarding the Historic Environment	Object	<p>A requirement of the NPPF (Paragraph 169) is that a sound local plan will be based on a strong and up-to-date evidence base about the historic environment. This should be used to assess the significance of the heritage assets in the area and the contribution they make to the town.</p> <p>The draft plan does not appear to have this and therefore, Historic England objects to the Plan.</p> <p>Suggested amendments</p> <p>That an evidence base on the historic environment be put together to accompany the Plan prior to the next stage.</p>	<p>Where necessary, the Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures identified have been included within policy and/or supporting text.</p>	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of the Heritage Impact Assessment have been included within the the policy, supporting text and/or the Housing and Employment Statements as appropriate.</p>
MR MICHAEL GREEN				DBDLP 237	9.1.2	Paragraph	Support	<p>Support for paragraph 9.1.2 noted.</p> <p>Detailed comment relating to the heritage, environmental and archaeological significance of, and</p>	<p>In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009: Blackwell Grange East relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised</p>	<p>In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009: Blackwell Grange East relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>community connection to, the Blackwell Grange East site (site ref 9). A full copy of which can be viewed on the Council Planning Policy Consultation Portal at http://darlington.objective.co.uk/portal</p> <p>Object to the proposal to allocate Blackwell Grange East site (site ref 9) for residential development.</p>	<p>site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.</p> <p>Where necessary, the Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures identified have been included within policy and/or supporting text.</p>	<p>replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of the Heritage Impact Assessment have been included within the the policy, supporting text and/or the Housing and Employment Statements as appropriate.</p>
MR MICHAEL GREEN				DBDLP 274	9.1.2	Paragraph	Support	<p>Support for paragraph 9.1.2 noted.</p> <p>Detailed comment relating to the heritage, environmental and archaeological significance of, and community connection to, the Blackwell Grange East site (site ref 9). A full copy of which can be viewed on the Council Planning Policy Consultation Portal at http://darlington.objective.co.uk/portal</p> <p>Object to the proposal to allocate Blackwell Grange East site (site ref 9) for residential development.</p>	<p>In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009: Blackwell Grange East relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.</p> <p>Where necessary, the Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.</p>	<p>In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009: Blackwell Grange East relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.</p> <p>Depending on the outcome of the Council's Heritage Impact Assessment, changes to the plan may be necessary prior to the publication of the Submission Draft Local Plan.</p>
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 411	9.1.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>No account has been taken of the historic environment in the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (including Skerningham Manor and the deserted medieval village).</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>
Mrs Jennifer				DBDLP 445	9.1.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>The Local Plan does not support the environment within the Skerningham and Barmpton area -</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Bradley								it will destroy it. It may include new green areas but will destroy existing irreplaceable green areas.	The Local Plan should be read as a whole. All relevant policies in the plan will be taken into account when a planning application is submitted for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation. Therefore, the applicant will need to demonstrate that their proposals meet the requirements of not only Policy H 10, but also other relevant policies in the plan including those in the environment section.	
Mr Ralph Bradley				DBDLP 463	9.1.2	Paragraph	Object	The Local Plan does not support the environment within the Skerningham and Barmpton area - it will destroy it. It may include new green areas but will destroy existing irreplaceable green areas.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation. The Local Plan should be read as a whole. All relevant policies in the plan will be taken into account when a planning application is submitted for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation. Therefore, the applicant will need to demonstrate that their proposals meet the requirements of not only Policy H 10, but also other relevant policies in the plan including those in the environment section.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Neil Minto				DBDLP 816	9.1.7	Paragraph	Object	Yes the Quakers did a lot for the town. You seem to have forgotten the Town Library in Crown Street from your list!	Reference to the Crown Street Library is made in Appendix C: Darlington's Heritage Assets, however a further reference has been added to the supporting text to policy ENV 1.	The second sentence of paragraph 9.1.7 has been amended to read: '...including South Park, the indoor market and clock tower, <u>Crown Street Library</u> , and the Friends Meeting House.'
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 68	Policy ENV 1	Protecting, Enhancing and Promoting Darlington's Historic Environment	Object	There is no reference to the Skerningham medieval village in relation to the Skerningham Strategic Allocation. DBC has not listed this medieval village on page 138 of their consultation draft June 2018 when they have included many other medieval villages?	Skerningham deserted medieval village is not included in the lists of designated heritage assets on page 138 of the Draft Local Plan because it is not a designated asset. It is however included on the local Historic Environment Record (HER) maintained by Durham County Council. The area associated with the potential location of the deserted medieval village of Skerningham is included on Figure C.1 showing Areas of High	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p>Archaeological Potential, found in Appendix C of the Draft Local Plan. Under the provisions of Policy ENV 1, development proposals on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation must be accompanied by an archaeological evaluation report.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation.</p>	
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skertingham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skertingham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 840	Policy ENV 1	Protecting, Enhancing and Promoting Darlington's Historic Environment	Object	<p>It is not clear from reading Policy EN1 (C) what 'archaeological evaluation' relates to in the context of sites over 1 ha in size, whether this means a desk-based assessment, geophysical survey or trial trenching. Skertingham Estates Ltd suggests the following amendment to ensure consistency with the NPPF (para. 189).</p> <p>"Outside Areas of High Archaeological Potential, planning applications on sites of more than 1 hectare must be accompanied by an archaeological evaluation report, unless the area is already known to have been archaeologically sterilised by previous development (such as mineral extraction). The archaeological evaluation report should consist of a desk-based assessment. A geophysical survey and targeted trial trenching should only be undertaken if necessary."</p>	<p>Comment noted. This point is picked up in paragraph 9.1.21 of the supporting text to the policy and has been amended from the Draft Local Plan text to more closely reflect NPPF paragraph 189.</p>	<p>The first sentence of paragraph 9.1.21 has been amended to read: '...Durham County Council take the approach that <u>an appropriate</u> desk-based assessment and, <u>where necessary</u>, a field evaluation is required for all development proposals affecting an area of 1 hectare or more...'</p>
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 860	Policy ENV 1	Protecting, Enhancing and Promoting Darlington's Historic Environment	Object	<p>Conservation areas, listed buildings and historic parks and gardens</p> <p>To ensure consistency with national planning policy, which allows harm to a heritage asset to be balanced against the public</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Changes to Policy ENV 1 have been recommended following discussions with Historic England.</p>	<p>Please see recommended changes to Policy ENV 1: Protecting, Enhancing and Promoting Darlington's Historic Environment.</p> <p>The first sentence of paragraph 9.1.21 has been amended to read: '...Durham County Council take the approach that <u>an appropriate</u> desk-based assessment and, <u>where necessary</u>, a field evaluation is required for</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
							<p>benefits of a proposal (Paragraphs 133-134 of the 2012 NPPF and Paragraphs 195-196 of the 2018 NPPF), Policy ENV1 should be updated.</p> <p>In its current form, the parts of Policy ENV1 which relate to development (including demolition) within conservation areas and which affects listed buildings and historic parks and gardens do not allow for the public benefits of the proposal to be balanced against any harm which may be caused and is therefore not consistent with national planning policy.</p> <p>Archaeological sites and scheduled monuments</p> <p>There is no definition provided of an 'archaeological evaluation'. We would suggest that the following wording is added to the policy. It includes an acknowledgement that the information submitted with an application should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal, in line with the NPPF (Paragraph 128 or 189 of the 2012 and 2018 NPPF):</p> <p><u>The archaeological evaluation report should consist of a proportionate desk-based assessment. A geophysical survey and targeted trial trenching should only be undertaken if necessary.</u></p>	<p>Paragraph 9.1.21 of the supporting text to the policy specifies what is meant in terms of ecological evaluation. However, the text has been amended to more closely reflect NPPF paragraph 189.</p> <p>There is no conflict between the policies stance on securing the optimal viable use for heritage assets and paragraph 196 of the NPPF.</p>	<p>all development proposals affecting an area of 1 hectare or more...'</p>	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Non-designated heritage assets</p> <p>This part of Policy ENV1 is not consistent with either version of the NPPF (Paragraphs 135 and 197 respectively) which requires a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. In its current form, this part of Policy ENV1 does not have a positive approach to development affecting non-designated heritage assets and should be amended to be in line with the NPPF.</p> <p>Securing optimum viable use</p> <p>Both versions of the NPPF are clear that securing the optimum viable use may be a public benefit of a proposal and Planning Practice Guidance confirms that “harmful development may sometimes be justified in the interests of realising the optimum viable use of an asset”. This section of Policy ENV1 is not consistent with the relevant paragraphs of the 2012 and 2018 NPPFs and should not require all proposals to secure the optimum viable use of a heritage asset.</p> <p>Energy efficiency</p> <p>This part of Policy ENV1 does not reflect the balance of harm against the public benefits of a proposal as set out in the NPPF and should be amended to ensure consistency.</p>		
Ms Emily	Historic England			DBDLP 1151	Policy ENV 1	Protecting, Enhancing and	Object	Historic England's response contains detailed recommended changes to Policy ENV 1, a full	DBC had engaged with Historic England during the preparation of the Local Plan and will continue to do so	Please see recommended changes to heritage policies.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Hrycan						Promoting Darlington's Historic Environment		copy of which can be viewed on the Council Planning Policy Consultation Portal at http://darlington.objective.co.uk/portal	as the plan progresses towards examination. Changes to the plans key heritage policies (ENV 1 and ENV 2) have been made to reflect discussions held with Historic England since the Draft Local Plan consultation stage.	
Mr G Raistrick		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1251	Policy ENV 1	Protecting, Enhancing and Promoting Darlington's Historic Environment	Object	<p>Generally support Policy ENV1 but object to part A) Conservation Areas, which states that "Built development will not be permitted on public and private open spaces within or adjacent to conservation areas".</p> <p>Public and private open spaces within or adjacent to CA's may be most sustainable location for development and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and national guidance in both the NPPF and PPG provides specific protection for buildings and areas of special architectural and historic interest. Further protection and additional constraints are not required and is not "sound".</p>	Changes to Policy ENV 1 have been made to reflect discussions held with Historic England since the Draft Local Plan consultation stage.	Please see recommended changes to heritage policies.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 413	9.1.12	Paragraph	Object	The statement that Listed buildings will be protected and great weight will be given to the conservation of heritage assets needs to be robustly supported. The Skerningham Strategic Allocation will flout this with regard to the Listed buildings within the allocation, the historic heritage of the site and the Deserted Medieval Village of Skerningham.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 69	9.1.13	Paragraph	Object	Skerningham Medieval village is historic village from Medieval times 1066-1540 forms part of proposed Skerningham 251 Map 7 but seems that DBC forgot to	Skerningham deserted medieval village is not included in the lists of designated heritage assets on page 138 of the Draft Local Plan because it is not a designated asset. It is however included on the local Historic Environment	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								include this Medieval village on page 138?	<p>Record (HER) maintained by Durham County Council.</p> <p>The area associated with the potential location of the deserted medieval village of Skertingham is included on Figure C.1 showing Areas of High Archaeological Potential, found in Appendix C of the Draft Local Plan. Under the provisions of Policy ENV 1, development proposals on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation must be accompanied by an archaeological evaluation report.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation.</p>	
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 70	9.1.19	Paragraph	Object	<p>Skertingham Medieval village is within proposed 251 Map 7 but not appearing on DBC sites listed on page 138?</p>	<p>Skertingham deserted medieval village is not included in the lists of designated heritage assets on page 138 of the Draft Local Plan because it is not a designated asset. It is however included on the local Historic Environment Record (HER) maintained by Durham County Council.</p> <p>The area associated with the potential location of the deserted medieval village of Skertingham is included on Figure C.1 showing Areas of High Archaeological Potential, found in Appendix C of the Draft Local Plan. Under the provisions of Policy ENV 1, development proposals on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation must be accompanied by an archaeological evaluation report.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation.
Mr David				DBDLP 71	9.1.20	Paragraph	Object	<p>Skertingham Medieval village within proposed development 251 Map 7 see attached.</p>	<p>Skertingham deserted medieval village is not included in the lists of designated heritage assets on page 138 of the Draft</p>	Please see officer response on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Clark									<p>Local Plan because it is not a designated asset. It is however included on the local Historic Environment Record (HER) maintained by Durham County Council.</p> <p>The area associated with the potential location of the deserted medieval village of Skertingham is included on Figure C.1 showing Areas of High Archaeological Potential, found in Appendix C of the Draft Local Plan. Under the provisions of Policy ENV 1, development proposals on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation must be accompanied by an archaeological evaluation report.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation.</p>	
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skertingham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skertingham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 1387	9.1.21	Paragraph	Object	<p>Paragraph 9.1.21 requires field evaluation for all sites of 1ha or more. Skertingham Estates Ltd queries whether there will be a need for trial trenching, should a desk top assessment / geophysical survey not identify any unknown anomalies. Skertingham Estates Ltd suggests that this paragraph is amended as follows:</p> <p><i>“Outside of the identified Areas of High Archaeological Potential, Durham County Council take the approach that desk-based assessment field evaluation is required for all development proposals affecting an area of 1 hectare or more, unless it is already known to have been archaeologically sterilised by previous development such as mineral extraction. Should the desk top assessment identify archaeological potential, a</i></p>	<p>Comment noted. Paragraph 9.1.21 of the supporting text to the policy has been amended to more closely reflect NPPF paragraph 189.</p>	<p>The first sentence of paragraph 9.1.21 has been amended to read: '...Durham County Council take the approach that <u>an appropriate</u> desk-based assessment and, <u>where necessary</u>, a field evaluation is required for all development proposals affecting an area of 1 hectare or more...'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<i>geophysical survey should be undertaken to identify any unknown anomalies. Following the results of the geophysical survey targeted trial trenching may then be required. The reasoning underpinning this is that archaeological investigation and research in recent decades has shown right across the country that the number and geospatial density of archaeological sites is far higher than previously imagined and so the likelihood of encountering archaeology on a site of this size or larger has increased."</i>		
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 1386	9.1.25	Paragraph	Object	<p>Paragraph 9.1.25 advises that the council will seek to secure the optimum viable use for a building, and that it may be converted to a new use if it can be demonstrated that it will be compatible with its significance. The NPPF 2018 makes provision for public benefits to outweigh any harm which is not considered in this paragraph.</p> <p>The following change is suggested to this paragraph in accordance with the NPPF 2018 (para. 196):</p> <p><i>"For statutorily protected buildings, those within conservation areas and non-designated heritage assets, the Council will seek to secure the optimum viable use. Keeping a building in its original use is preferred, as it generally has least impact on its character or appearance. It may be converted to a new use, if it can be demonstrated that it will be</i></p>	Objection noted. The change made to the supporting text is in line with paragraph 196 of the NPPF.	The final sentence of paragraph 9.1.25 has been amended to read: 'It may be converted to a new use, if it can be demonstrated that it will be compatible with the significance and the setting of the historic building, and not detract from other evidential, historic, aesthetic or communal heritage values, <u>or unless there are public benefits which outweigh the harm.</u> '

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<i>compatible with the significance and the setting of the historic building, and not detract from other evidential, historic, aesthetic or communal heritage values, or unless there are public benefits which outweigh the harm."</i>		
Rosalind Kain	Darlington Borough Council			DBDLP 2	Policy ENV 2	Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&DR)	Support	The branchlines are not currently indicated on the Proposals Map. The two S&DR branchlines (historically known as Darlington and Croft) within the Borough should be added to the adopted version of the Map.	Agreed, the branchlines have been added to policies map.	The S&DR branchlines have been added to the policies map.
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1056	Policy ENV 2	Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&DR)	Neutral	Durham County Council welcome the acknowledgement of the importance of the assets connected to the railway and also the acknowledgement of the importance of partnership working with us. We would have concerns that the application of a 50m 'corridor' for the trackbed and branchlines may in practice prove overly restrictive and difficult to implement, however we remain committed to working with you to ensure a comprehensive and consistent policy approach for the asset.	Comment noted. Reference to the 50m corridor has been removed from Policy ENV 2.	Please see recommended changes to heritage policies.
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1161	Policy ENV 2	Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&DR)	Object	Historic England's response contains detailed recommended changes to Policy ENV 2, a full copy of which can be viewed on the Council Planning Policy Consultation Portal at http://darlington.objective.co.uk/portal DBC had engaged with Historic England during the preparation of the Draft Local Plan and will	Please see recommended changes to the Local Plan's heritage policies (ENV 1 and ENV 2) which have been discussed and agreed with Historic England.	Please see recommended changes to the Local Plan's heritage policies (ENV 1 and ENV 2) which have been discussed and agreed with Historic England.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								continue to do so as the plan progresses towards examination. Changes to the plans key heritage policies (ENV 1 and ENV 2) have been made to reflect discussions held with Historic England since the Draft Local Plan consultation stage.		
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 687	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Support	<p>CPRE welcomes the purposes of Policy ENV3 and notes the strong parallels with the purposes of Green Belt designation (NPPF para 80) such that it is not clear why the Local Plan does not simply designate Green Belt to fulfil the policy objectives.</p> <p>The gap between Low Coniscliffe and the urban area should be added as a rural gap.</p> <p>Policy ENV3,C): “Retain and improve...”, should this not be “Retaining and improving...”</p> <p>Policy ENV3,D): “Protect and enhance...”, should this not be “Protecting and enhancing...”?</p>	<p>The NPPF (paragraph 135) makes it clear that new Green Belts should only be established in exceptional circumstances. There has not been any major change in circumstances that would make the adoption of new Green Belt necessary, and normal planning and development management policies (including Policy ENV 3) are considered adequate to deal with development proposals around the Borough's settlements. The Local Plan sets out a clear strategy for the borough and identifies sufficient land to accommodate the identified needs of the Borough over the plan period.</p> <p>Low Coniscliffe was not identified under criterion A)1. of Policy ENV 3 due to the planning permission granted on land to the North East of the village (application reference 16/01231/FUL) between the village and the proposed development limit of Darlington, taking into account the South Coniscliffe Park allocation site (site ref. 41). However, the status of Low Coniscliffe as a rural village distinct from Darlington town has not changed in the Local Plan, as recognised by the settlement hierarchy (see pages 17-20 of the Draft Local Plan) and by the extent of the settlements development limit. Should planning permission for this site lapse in the future, the Council would be able to reconsider whether to include Low Coniscliffe under Policy</p>	<p>The start of Policy ENV 3 criterion C has been amended to read: 'Retaining and improving...'</p> <p>The start of Policy ENV 3 criterion D has been amended to read: 'Protecting and enhancing...'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									ENV 3 criterion A)1 when reviewing the Local Plan.	
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1280	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Neutral	<p>The current green infrastructure should be maintained to benefit and maintain the species populations and habitats already present and to prevent their deterioration in the long term.</p> <p>B iii) All developments, particularly green corridors and green infrastructure should support the connectivity of habitats and wildlife. These connections should be increased in scope and scale and be of high biodiversity value to maintain the connectivity function.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The combination of Policies ENV 3, ENV 4, ENV 5 and ENV7 will help to maintain and enhance green and blue infrastructure across the Borough, and with it species populations and habitats.</p> <p>Criterion B)iii of Policy ENV 3 has been amended to reflect the comment.</p>	<p>Criterion B)iii of Policy ENV 3 has been amended to read: ' iii. Retain <u>and support their</u> connectivity for people, <u>habitats</u> and wildlife.'</p>
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 72	9.3.5	Paragraph	Object	<p>Springfield Park has been there for many years and serves for the recreational purposes mental and physical health of many local residents yet DBC rejected having it designated as a green space? perhaps as the interested property developers had their sights set on it and want a access road on the land it is on?</p>	<p>Planning Practice Guidance states that:</p> <p>'Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.'</p> <p>Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process. This position has</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added under 9.5.6 to read: <u>'Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process.'</u></p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p>been reflected in the supporting text to Policy ENV 6.</p> <p>Following additional engagement with the public and other stakeholders on the future of Springfield Park in January 2020, organised at the request of Council Members, the park has been removed from the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site. As a result of this change in the status of Springfield Park, it has been reassessed as a potential Local Green Space, and is recommended to be added as a Local Green Space in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 418	9.3.5	Paragraph	Object	Applications for Local Green Space in the Skerningham area have been effectively suspended by the Skerningham Strategic Allocation "Masterplan" although they would all appear to compliment the sentiments of the statement.	<p>Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process. This position will be reflected in the supporting text to Policy ENV 6.</p>	A new paragraph has been added under 9.5.6 to read: <u>'Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process.'</u>
Dr Ellen Bekker	Lead Adviser Natural England			DBDLP 299	9.4.3	Paragraph	Support	Footnote 29 (p 84) should read 'In Darlington designated wildlife sites include <u>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</u> '.	Noted. The Local Plan has been amended accordingly.	Footnote 29 on page 84 has been amended to read: 'In Darlington designated wildlife sites include <u>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)</u> ...'
Alan Marshall	Mowden Ward Councillor			DBDLP 89	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Support	Whilst supportive of Policy ENV 4, I would like to see Darlington's current urban tree canopy cover of 16% being enhanced by requiring housing developers to plant	The revised NPPF (2019) stipulates that local planning authorities should seek opportunities for achieving net environmental gains through development (such as through new habitat creation or improved public	The third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'Development will be expected to <u>minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity.</u>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>enough trees so their canopy cover is at least 25%.</p> <p>This has been incorporated in the Wycombe Council Local Plan.</p>	<p>access to the countryside), including net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>Policies ENV 4, ENV 6 and ENV 7 all seek to protect and enhance existing green infrastructure in the Borough, with Policy ENV 5 requiring new provision on developments over a certain size. As referred to under paragraph 9.6.12, the Council are also looking to identify a number of biodiversity offsetting sites to help compensate for the impact of development on biodiversity in the Borough where new provision cannot be made on-site in line with Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8.</p> <p>Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 has been amended to reflect the revised NPPF expecting developments to provide net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>Clause DIII of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to better reflect the provisions of paragraph 175c of the NPPF in respect of ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees.</p>	<p>Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by:</p> <p>The final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfill its planning duties in relation to <u>minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.</u>'</p> <p>The penultimate sentence of Clause DIII of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'New development will not be permitted that would result in the loss, fragmentation, isolation or deterioration of ancient woodland or ancient or veteran trees unless <u>there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists</u> the need for and benefits of the development in that location clearly outweigh the harm.'</p>
Dave McGuire	Sport England (North East)			DBDLP 104	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Object	<p>Sport England's playing field policy allows the development of minor peripheral parts of a playing field site that are unsuitable for playing pitches provided the development does not;</p> <p>The proposed development affects only land incapable of forming part of a playing pitch and does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduce the size of any playing pitch; 	<p>Comment noted. The policy wording of Policy ENV 4 has been amended to reflect the concerns of Sport England.</p>	<p>The first bullet point of criterion F iii of Policy ENV 4 has been amended to read: 'the sports facilities on the site would be best retained and enhanced through the development of a small part of the site <u>land that is incapable of forming part of a playing pitch and will not prejudice the use of the playing field, and</u> where the benefits of the development to sport and recreation clearly outweigh the loss of the land;'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • result in the inability to use any playing pitch (including the maintenance of adequate safety margins and run-off areas); • reduce the sporting capacity of the playing field to accommodate playing pitches or the capability to rotate or reposition playing pitches to maintain their quality; • result in the loss of other sporting provision or ancillary facilities on the site; or • prejudice the use of any part of a playing field and any of its playing pitches. <p>Sport England are concerned that the Plan's exception as written might legitimise situations where Sports Clubs see the selling of a land asset as being a quick and easy way of securing their financial future or enabling the development of a sports facility that could funded another way or isn't best sited there. Whilst not necessarily citing either of these scenarios, the Council should be mindful of what happened at the Railway Athletic Sports Ground where it was seen as expedient to sell over 25% of the site to residential development, yet now the site it too constrained to house all of the junior teams which are aligned to it and so additional</p>		

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>pitches are being created at Staindrop Road.</p> <p>In light of the above Sport England wishes to object to Policy ENV4 F (iii)</p>		
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 145	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Neutral	<p>We are concerned the amount of green infrastructure is being progressively reduced due to developments. Planning should seek to increase or at least maintain the current 16% green infrastructure.</p>	<p>The revised NPPF (2019) stipulates that local planning authorities should seek opportunities for achieving net environmental gains through development (such as through new habitat creation or improved public access to the countryside), including net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>Policies ENV 4, ENV 6 and ENV 7 all seek to protect and enhance green existing green infrastructure in the Borough, with Policy ENV 5 requiring new provision on developments over a certain size. As referred to under paragraph 9.6.12, the Council are also looking to identify a number of biodiversity offsetting sites to help compensate for the impact of development on biodiversity in the Borough where new provision cannot be made on-site in line with Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8.</p> <p>Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 has been amended to reflect the revised NPPF expecting developments to provide net gains for biodiversity.</p>	<p>The third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'Development will be expected to <u>minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity.</u> Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by:'</p> <p>The final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfill its planning duties in relation to <u>minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.</u>'</p>
Mr Richard Cowen	Acting Chair Durham Bird Club			DBDLP 615	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Object	<p>The policy needs to take into account the benefits of Natural Capital. This now features in the revised NPPF paragraphs 170 and 171 and we believe takes the principle a step further than previously. The benefits are claimed to help well-being and so can assist in the health of the community and indeed create</p>	<p>DBC recognise the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystems services. Policy ENV 7 seeks to deliver net gains for biodiversity as a result of development. However, it is acknowledged that the policy wording in Draft Local Plan Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 could be amended to strengthen this objective and better reflect the</p>	<p>The third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'Development will be expected to <u>minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity.</u> Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by:'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>better environments for any workforce.</p> <p>While this Policy needs to go further specifically in creating habitats in appropriate places. This goes beyond say provided nest boxes for garden birds and should aim at bringing hirundines (swallows and martins), swifts and even, in appropriate cases, birds of prey into the work environment.</p>	<p>NPPF. This change her been recommended.</p> <p>The Council's adopted Revised Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) includes a number of measures for improving the biodiversity of development proposals including introducing nesting boxes, green roofs, street trees and fruit trees, wetlands etc. This advice is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and is referenced under several policies in the emerging Local Plan. The Council intends to retain and update this SPD following the adoption of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>The final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfill its planning duties in relation to <u>minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.</u>'</p>
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 691	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Neutral	Needs reference to 'net gain' for biodiversity and 25 Year Environment Plan.	<p>Comment noted. Policy ENV 7 seeks to deliver net gains for biodiversity as a result of development. However, it is acknowledged that the policy wording in Draft Local Plan Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 could be amended to strengthen this objective and better reflect the NPPF. This change has been recommended.</p>	<p>The third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'Development will be expected to <u>minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity.</u> Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by.'</p> <p>The final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfill its planning duties in relation to <u>minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.</u>'</p>
Doris Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 954	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Support	There is a need to maintain and manage important green spaces, nature sites and to improve village services and infrastructure. For example Public Rights of Way are considered as important for public enjoyment of the countryside and highways improvements, such as street lighting, are required for reasons of highway safety.	<p>Comment noted. Policies ENV 4 and ENV 5 recognise the importance of green infrastructure to the local environment and peoples health and wellbeing and seek to protect existing spaces, and deliver new spaces, as part of development.</p> <p>Public rights of way are afforded protection under Policies IN 1 and IN 2 of the Draft Local Plan. However, it has been acknowledged that the plan</p>	<p>Criterion e of Policy IN 1 has been amended to read: 'e. <u>Protecting Improving and enhancing protecting public rights of way...</u>'</p> <p>The following additional text has been added to the supporting text of Policy IN 1 between paragraphs 10.1.18 and 10.1.19: '<u>The Borough's network of public rights of way, including permissive routes, provides an important recreational resource that enables the public to experience and enjoy the natural, built and historic environments through activities such as walking, cycling and horse riding. As such, these routes play an</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Retain a village character for Middleton St George,</p> <p>Maintain and where possible improve the quality of life for existing residents</p> <p>Maintain and where possible improve local services and infrastructure.</p>	<p>could be amended to more closely reflect the wording of the NPPF, and to provide clearer guidance on how development proposals affecting public rights of way will be considered.</p> <p>The village status of Middleton St George is recognised under Policy SH 1 and its supporting text, whilst Policy ENV 3 seeks to maintain the rural gaps between Middleton St George, Middleton One Row and Oak Tree.</p> <p>Where required, new services and infrastructure will be required alongside new development to support the needs of residents.</p>	<p><u>important role in ensuring the physical and mental health and wellbeing of residents as well as contributing to the Borough's visitor offer. The network is also an important sustainable transport resource, providing safe connections for low carbon forms of travel within, around and between settlements.</u></p> <p><u>Wherever possible, public rights of way should be retained in situ and their recreational and amenity value enhanced as a result of development, for example through improvements to surface and boundary treatments, and through the provision of improved facilities (such as gates, stiles and signage etc.). Developments that, through poor design, negatively affect the amenity of a public right of way will not be supported. In some circumstances, it may be more appropriate to divert the route of a public right of way along a suitable alternative route that provides at least as good recreational and amenity value as the one being replaced. Important factors to consider where a route is to be diverted will include the safety, directness, convenience and attractiveness of the right of way following development. Where possible, routes should be diverted to maintain key views and long range vistas. New development should not demonstrably deter the use of a public right of way.'</u></p> <p>Paragraph 10.1.19 of the Draft Local Plan has been amended to read: 'For walking, the existing network of public rights of way is safeguarded by Policy ENV 4, and aNew Walking and cycling provision will be made within the Strategic and Local Green Corridors identified in the Darlington's Green Infrastructure Strategy, and covered by Policy ENV 4. These corridors...'</p>
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 862	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Object	<p>Policy ENV4 is significantly more restrictive than both the 2012 and 2018 NPPFs in that the definition of green space provided at 9.4.3 includes all agricultural land, the urban fringe and open countryside,</p>	<p>Footnote 30 makes it clear that for the purposes of Policy ENV 4 criterion F the term green space refers to all public and private, formal and informal, types of green infrastructure listed under paragraph 9.4.3 excluding urban fringe, agricultural land and open countryside. Wildlife friendly green space is</p>	<p>The following definition of Blue Infrastructure has been added to the Glossary: '<u>Blue Infrastructure is a term used to describe a wide range of landscape elements linked to water including rivers, streams, lakes, pools, ponds and other water courses. Blue Infrastructure can include both natural and man-made landscape elements.</u>'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>as well as wildlife-friendly green space.</p> <p>Neither the 2012 nor 2018 NPPF apply such a stringent test to the development of green space. Footnote 6 of the 2018 NPPF are clear about which policies can indicate that development should be restricted.</p> <p>There is also no definition of "green and blue infrastructure" within the Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy ENV4 is therefore not positively prepared, justified or consistent with either the 2012 or 2018 NPPFs and should be amended.</p>	<p>however included in the definition and thereby offered protection by the policy.</p> <p>A definition of Green Infrastructure is provided in the Glossary to the Local Plan at Appendix A, however, a definition of Blue Infrastructure has also now been included.</p>	
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1283	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Support	<p>We support the opening paragraph.</p> <p>The wording of ENV4 subsections could be strengthened by the removal of caveats. For example:</p> <p>'A. All new development..... should <u>will</u> through good design, seek to conserve and enhance...'</p> <p>The buffer for watercourses is not defined in the Green Infrastructure Strategy, although it does contain within the legend for the map of the Green Infrastructure Network, reference to a 30 metre buffer from Strategic Corridors (Tees & Skerne) and a 15 metre buffer from local corridors (West Beck, Cocker Beck, Baydale Beck). We recommend that in order to ensure the ecological functioning of</p>	<p>Comments noted. Agree with suggested changes regarding strengthening the wording of Policy ENV 4.</p> <p>Footnote 30 has been amended to refer to component parts of the green corridors forming constituting green spaces for the purpose of Policy ENV 4 criterion F.</p>	<p>Criterion A of Policy ENV 4 has been amended to read: 'All new development...should <u>will</u> through good design, seek to conserve and enhance...'</p> <p>Criterion B of Policy ENV 4 has been amended to read: 'All new development that is crossed by a proposed strategic or local green corridor (...) should <u>will</u> incorporate the green corridor into the sites layout and design.'</p> <p>Footnote 30 has been amended to read: 'For the purpose of Policy ENV 4 criterion F the term green space refers to all public and private, formal and informal, types of green infrastructure listed under paragraph 9.4.3, <u>including component parts of the strategic and local green corridors, but excluding urban fringe, agricultural land, and open countryside and private gardens.</u>'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>these watercourses the buffer strip should be at least the Flood Zone 3 outline or 50 metres, whichever is the greatest.</p> <p>‘B. All new developments that cross a proposed strategic or local green corridor <u>will</u> incorporate the green corridor into the sites layout and design’</p> <p>F. We suggest that ‘Strategic and local green corridors’, and in particular those around the Tees, Skerne, Cocker, West and Baydale Becks, as defined by the Darlington Green Infrastructure Strategy, are added to the exclusions detailed in footnote 30. The reason for this is that it could be difficult to determine if there was a surplus of such river corridor, difficult to replace such areas, and loss is likely to result in a deterioration of Water Framework Directive (WFD) status, or would compromise the achievement of WFD objectives, particularly where waterbodies are defined as already being heavily modified.</p>		
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1287	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Neutral	<p>ENV4 & 5: We would suggest considering Blue Green Infrastructure as a means of increasing resilience to urban flooding, note the Blue Green Space Adaption work by Newcastle University as examples of what might be achieved.</p>	<p>A definition of Blue Infrastructure has been provided in the Glossary to the Local Plan at Appendix A and Policy ENV 4 has been re-titled to raise the profile of blue infrastructure.</p>	<p>The following definition of Blue Infrastructure has been added to the Glossary: <u>‘Blue Infrastructure is a term used to describe a wide range of landscape elements linked to water including rivers, streams, lakes, pools, ponds and other water courses. Blue Infrastructure can include both natural and man-made landscape elements.’</u></p> <p>The title of Policy ENV 4 has been amended to read: ‘Green <u>and Blue</u> Infrastructure’</p> <p>The sub heading before paragraph 9.4.1 has been amended to read: ‘Green <u>and Blue</u> Infrastructure’</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 694	Policy ENV 5	Green Infrastructure Standards	Neutral	Amend to 'Green Infrastructure <i>must</i> be designed a multifunctional <i>blue-green</i> spaces performing the above functions'	Agree in part.	The third paragraph of Policy ENV 5 has been amended to read: ' Where appropriate Green infrastructure should be designed as multi-functional <u>blue-green</u> space performing a range of the above functions.'
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1286	Policy ENV 5	Green Infrastructure Standards	Neutral	Suggested revised wording 9.4.7: '...In addition, development of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation is expected to will include enhancements of the river corridor to the north of the town.'	Agree with suggested changes to supporting text.	The final sentence of paragraph 9.4.7 has been amended to read: 'In addition, development of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (see Policy H 10) is expected to will include enhancements of the river corridor to the north of the town.'
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1288	Policy ENV 5	Green Infrastructure Standards	Neutral	ENV4 & 5: We would suggest considering Blue Green Infrastructure as a means of increasing resilience to urban flooding, note the Blue Green Space Adaption work by Newcastle University as examples of what might be achieved.	A definition of Blue Infrastructure has been provided in the Glossary to the Local Plan at Appendix A and Policy ENV 4 has been re-titled to raise the profile of blue infrastructure.	The following definition of Blue Infrastructure has been added to the Glossary: ' <u>Blue Infrastructure - Blue Infrastructure is a term used to describe a wide range of landscape elements linked to water including rivers, streams, lakes, pools, ponds and other water courses. Blue Infrastructure can include both natural and man-made landscape elements.</u> ' The title of Policy ENV 4 has been changed to read: 'Green <u>and</u> Blue Infrastructure' The sub heading before paragraph 9.4.1 has been amended to read: 'Green <u>and</u> Blue Infrastructure'
Dr Ellen Bekker	Lead Adviser Natural England			DBDLP 298	9.4.4	Paragraph	Support	The text refers to 'movement (see Policy N 1)'; we presume this is Policy IN 1.	Noted. The text has been corrected accordingly.	The final sentence of paragraph 9.4.4 has been amended to read: '...and movement (see Policy IN 1) across the Borough.'
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham	DBDLP 421	9.4.5	Paragraph	Object	The Skerne buffer zone in the Skerningham Strategic Allocation would be destroyed by Route B of the inner Northern Link Road.	Only the outer link road route is now being explored and this has been reflected in changes to the policy wording and supporting text.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
	Preservation Group		Preservation Group							
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 843	9.4.14	Paragraph	Object	Skerningham Estates Ltd notes and supports the comments regarding maintenance of green spaces but requests that a minor amendment is made 9.4.14: ... <i>a maintenance levy will typically be applied...</i>	Comment noted. The supporting text to the policy has been amended to reflect this comment. It is acknowledged that there may be situations where other arrangements to maintain greenspaces may be more appropriate.	The second sentence of paragraph 9.4.14 has been amended to read: '...a maintenance levy will <u>typically</u> be applied...'
Alan Hutchinson	Whinfield Residents Association			DBDLP 168	Policy ENV 6	Local Green Space	Object	<p>The following sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) LGS02 – Springfield Park (ii) LGS03 – Green Lane (iii) LGS04/LGS013 – Skerningham Countryside Park (iv) LGS07 – Muscar House Farm (v) LGS08 – Sparrowhall Drive <p>The fact that Skerningham Countryside Park was proposed by 2 different organisations is indicative of the importance that local communities place on this particular site.</p> <p>There is no mention of the sensitivity surrounding burial sites in Skerningham Countryside Park, nor any proposal to accommodate them into the masterplan.</p> <p>Using the proposed Skerningham masterplan as a pretext for refusing to include the sites is unfair and not in the public interest. It presupposes that the masterplan is all-powerful and supersedes any other compelling</p>	<p>Planning Practice Guidance states that:</p> <p><i>'Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.'</i></p> <p>Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process.'</p> <p>Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process. This position has been reflected in the supporting text to Policy ENV 6.</p> <p>Following additional engagement with the public and other stakeholders on the future of Springfield Park in January 2020, organised at the request of Council Members, the park has been removed from the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site. As a result of this change in the status of Springfield</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added under 9.5.6 to read: <u>'Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process.'</u></p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The name of site LGS01 has been changed to 'Beech Wood'.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>evidence. The LGS sites should inform the masterplan, and not vice versa.</p> <p>If the sites meet the criteria for Local Green Designation on their merits then they should be so designated, irrespective of whether DBC would find that to be inconvenient for their so-called "masterplan".</p> <p>We welcome the designation of LGS01, but it should be noted that the site is known locally as "Beech Wood", and not "Beech Road/Winbush Park" [sic – usual spelling is "Whinbush"].</p>	<p>Park, it has been reassessed as a potential Local Green Space, and is recommended to be added as a Local Green Space in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 147	Policy ENV 6	Local Green Space	Object	<p>The table shows an extremely limited list of local green space, a survey carried out a few years ago listed a wealth of green spaces. Why is the list limited?</p>	<p>Green spaces listed under Policy ENV 6 are being designated as Local Green Space. These are a relatively new type of designation enabling local communities to identify green areas of particular importance to them for special protection through either a local or neighbourhood plan. The NPPF makes it clear that Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas and sets out strict criteria that must be met to justify designation.</p> <p>A number of additional Local Green Space submissions have been made during the consultation on the Draft Local Plan and have been assessed in line with the existing methodology prior to making a decision on what sites should be designated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added under 9.5.6 to read: <u>'Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process.'</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p>All other green spaces are however still offered protection under Policy ENV 4 and the NPPF.</p> <p>Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process. This position has been reflected in the supporting text to Policy ENV 6.</p>	
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 422	Policy ENV 6	Local Green Space	Object	<p>The following were some of the Local Green Spaces which were nominated for inclusion in the Draft Local Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) LGS02 – Springfield Park (ii) LGS03 – Green Lane (iii) LGS04/LGS013 – Skerningham Countryside Park (iv) LGS07 – Muscar House Farm (v) LGS08 – Sparrowhall Drive (vi) LGS01- Beech Wood <p>Only LGS01 (Beech Wood) has been approved. The Local Green Spaces Report, which rejects the other 5 sites uses the phrase: “<i>Site is within a potential strategic allocation area. Development of this area is to be informed by a</i></p>	<p>Planning Practice Guidance states that:</p> <p><i>‘Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.’</i></p> <p>Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process. This position has been reflected in the supporting text to Policy ENV 6.</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added under 9.5.6 to read: <u>‘Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process.’</u></p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The name of site LGS01 has been changed to 'Beech Wood'.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p><i>masterplan.....Scoped out of assessment and not recommended for designation.”</i></p> <p>We believe that using the proposed Skerningham Strategic Allocation Masterplan as a pretext for refusing to include the sites is not in the public interest. It presupposes that the Masterplan is all-powerful and supersedes any other compelling evidence for Local Green Space designation. The LGS sites should inform the Masterplan, and not vice versa.</p> <p>If the sites meet the criteria for Local Green Designation on their merits then they should be so designated, irrespective of the “Masterplan” which has not even reached a stage where it might be considered in the public domain.</p>	<p>Following additional engagement with the public and other stakeholders on the future of Springfield Park in January 2020, organised at the request of Council Members, the park has been removed from the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site. As a result of this change in the status of Springfield Park, it has been reassessed as a potential Local Green Space, and is recommended to be added as a Local Green Space in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 693	Policy ENV 6	Local Green Space	Object	<p>CPRE welcomes the use of the new designation of Local Green Spaces in Policy ENV 6 and the recognition that these can also be designated through Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>However, the number of sites designated looks a very short list. How does it relate to the Open Spaces Strategy where many sites were listed?</p> <p>CPRE understands local Parish Councils and organisations were asked to submit its of spaces they considered should be “Local Green Spaces”, but many have been turned down and for some there had been no response at the time of writing this submission. It is</p>	<p>The NPPF makes it clear that Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas and sets out strict criteria that must be met to justify designation.</p> <p>A report setting out the Council's consideration of potential Local Green Spaces sites is available on the Council's website. The Council has reviewed submissions made as part of the Draft Local Plan consultation prior making a decision on what sites should be included in the Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>All other green spaces are however still offered protection under Policy ENV 4 and the NPPF.</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added under 9.5.6 to read: <u>'Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process.'</u></p> <p>The following sentence has been added to paragraph 9.5.5: <u>'In addition to the Local Plan, communities have the opportunity to identify and designate land as Local Green Spaces in neighbourhood plans.'</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								known that some, such as Whinfield Residents Association and Middleton St George Parish Council are pursuing the matter, but it is still cause for great concern as these spaces are crucial to residents' quality of life.	<p>Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process. This position has been reflected in the supporting text to Policy ENV 6.</p> <p>A reference has been added to the supporting text of Policy ENV 6 to acknowledge that communities can identify and designate Local Green Spaces in neighbourhood plans.</p>	
Mr Alan Hutchinson				DBDLP 754	Policy ENV 6	Local Green Space	Object	<p>I strongly object to DBC rejecting applications for certain Local Green Spaces in the Draft Local Plan. In particular LGS02 (Springfield Park) and LGS04/LGS013 (Skerningham Countryside Park) would appear to clearly meet the criteria. To dismiss them because of the spurious reason that the areas are covered by a masterplan which has to take precedence is not good enough. The designation of the Local Green Spaces should come first on their merits, then the masterplan adapts to what is already there.</p>	<p>Planning Practice Guidance states that:</p> <p><i>'Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.'</i></p> <p>Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process. This position has</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added under 9.5.6 to read: 'Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process.'</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p>been reflected in the supporting text to Policy ENV 6.</p> <p>Following additional engagement with the public and other stakeholders on the future of Springfield Park in January 2020, organised at the request of Council Members, the park has been removed from the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site. As a result of this change in the status of Springfield Park, it has been reassessed as a potential Local Green Space, and is recommended to be added as a Local Green Space in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	
Mr A Macnab	Middleton St George Parish Council			DBDLP 822	Policy ENV 6	Local Green Space	Neutral	<p>We are pleased to see that a number of sites proposed by the Parish Council have been included in the Draft Local Plan (Playing Field at Station Road, Water Park, and Almora Hall field).</p> <p>We have now submitted evidence for more spaces on the list which we expect to also be included in the Local Plan (including: The Front at Middleton One Row, Haxby Road Play Area, the 3 Allotments, Green Gap/Field at Middleton Lane, St George's Church, The Whinnies, etc.) We will continue with this task.</p>	<p>The Council has assessed new Local Green Space submissions made as part of the Draft Local Plan consultation, in line with the existing methodology, prior making a decision on what sites should be designated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</p>	<p>Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of the Heritage Impact Assessment have been included within the the policy, supporting text and/or the Housing and Employment Statements as appropriate.</p>
Mrs Liz Knight				DBDLP 963	Policy ENV 6	Local Green Space	Object	<p>The following sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces:</p> <p>(i) LGS02 – Springfield Park</p> <p>(ii) LGS03 – Green Lane</p>	<p>Planning Practice Guidance states that:</p> <p><i>'Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable</i></p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added under 9.5.6 to read: <u>'Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>(iii) LGS04/LGS013 – Skerningham Countryside Park</p> <p>(iv) LGS07 – Muscar House Farm</p> <p>(v) LGS08 – Sparrowhall Drive</p> <p>The fact that Skerningham Countryside Park was proposed by 2 different organisations is indicative of the importance that local communities place on this particular site.</p> <p>There is no mention of the sensitivity surrounding burial sites in Skerningham Countryside Park, nor any proposal to accommodate them into the masterplan.</p> <p>Using the proposed Skerningham masterplan as a pretext for refusing to include the sites is unfair and not in the public interest. It presupposes that the masterplan is all-powerful and supersedes any other compelling evidence. The LGS sites should inform the masterplan, and not vice versa.</p> <p>If the sites meet the criteria for Local Green Designation on their merits then they should be so designated, irrespective of whether DBC would find that to be inconvenient for their so-called “masterplan”.</p> <p>We welcome the designation of LGS01, but it should be noted that the site is known locally as “Beech Wood”, and not “Beech Road/Winbush Park” [sic – usual spelling is “Whinbush”].</p>	<p><i>locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.</i></p> <p>Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process. This position has been reflected in the supporting text to Policy ENV 6.</p> <p>Following additional engagement with the public and other stakeholders on the future of Springfield Park in January 2020, organised at the request of Council Members, the park has been removed from the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site. As a result of this change in the status of Springfield Park, it has been reassessed as a potential Local Green Space, and is recommended to be added as a Local Green Space in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	<p><u>necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process.</u></p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The name of site LGS01 has been changed to 'Beech Wood'.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Knight				DBDLP 968	Policy ENV 6	Local Green Space	Object	<p>The following sites should be designated as Local Green Spaces:</p> <p>(i) LGS02 – Springfield Park</p> <p>(ii) LGS03 – Green Lane</p> <p>(iii) LGS04/LGS013 – Skerningham Countryside Park</p> <p>(iv) LGS07 – Muscar House Farm</p> <p>(v) LGS08 – Sparrowhall Drive</p> <p>The fact that Skerningham Countryside Park was proposed by 2 different organisations is indicative of the importance that local communities place on this particular site.</p> <p>There is no mention of the sensitivity surrounding burial sites in Skerningham Countryside Park, nor any proposal to accommodate them into the masterplan.</p> <p>Using the proposed Skerningham masterplan as a pretext for refusing to include the sites is unfair and not in the public interest. It presupposes that the masterplan is all-powerful and supersedes any other compelling evidence. The LGS sites should inform the masterplan, and not vice versa.</p> <p>If the sites meet the criteria for Local Green Designation on their merits then they should be so designated, irrespective of whether DBC would find that to be</p>	<p>Planning Practice Guidance states that:</p> <p><i>'Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.'</i></p> <p>Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process. This position has been reflected in the supporting text to Policy ENV 6.</p> <p>Following additional engagement with the public and other stakeholders on the future of Springfield Park in January 2020, organised at the request of Council Members, the park has been removed from the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site. As a result of this change in the status of Springfield Park, it has been reassessed as a potential Local Green Space, and is recommended to be added as a Local Green Space in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added under 9.5.6 to read: <u>'Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process.'</u></p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The name of site LGS01 has been changed to 'Beech Wood'.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>inconvenient for their so-called "masterplan".</p> <p>We welcome the designation of LGS01, but it should be noted that the site is known locally as "Beech Wood", and not "Beech Road/Winbush Park" [sic – usual spelling is "Whinbush"].</p>		
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1033	Policy ENV 6	Local Green Space	Object	<p>The proposed allocation of Merrybent Community Woodland as a local green space within policy ENV 6 is supported. However, LCMPC object to the lack of inclusion of the medieval manor, dovecot and tower at Low Coniscliffe, Merrybent Drive green, Merrybent Green and Low Coniscliffe green space, as set out within the LCMNP. Full details of the proposals are contained within a local green space background paper, this sets out the demonstrable importance of these spaces to the local community.</p>	<p>Support noted. A reference has been added to the supporting text of Policy ENV 6 to acknowledge that communities can identify and designate Local Green Spaces in neighbourhood plans.</p>	<p>The following sentence has been added to paragraph 9.5.5: '<u>In addition to the Local Plan, communities have the opportunity to identify and designate land as Local Green Spaces in neighbourhood plans.</u>'</p>
Major Frederick Greenhow MBE				DBDLP 97	9.5.3	Paragraph	Object	<p>The following areas should be designated as Local Green Space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skerningham Countryside Park • Muscar House Farm • Springfield Park & Green Lane <p>A lot of evidence was provided by the Whinfield Residents Association (WRA), believing that the above plus other sites met with the Local Green Space designation.</p>	<p>Planning Practice Guidance states that:</p> <p><i>'Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. In particular, plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.'</i></p> <p>Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is</p>	<p>A new paragraph has been added under 9.5.6 to read: '<u>Whilst the Local Plan does not designate any Local Green Spaces that currently fall within sites allocated for development in the plan, future reviews of the Local Plan will enable these areas to be reconsidered once there is more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process.</u>'</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Both the Barmpton & Skerningham Preservation Group (BSPG) and the WRA supported by their residents / communities and our local MP - Jenny Chapman MP (who herself walked this ground on the 4th November 2017) have strongly highlighted the importance that Skerningham Country Park in particular should remain a 'Green Space' and not become a development site.</p>	<p>more certainty over the layout of proposed development on these sites and any necessary compensatory measures resulting from the planning application process.</p> <p>Following additional engagement with the public and other stakeholders on the future of Springfield Park in January 2020, organised at the request of Council Members, the park has been removed from the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site. As a result of this change in the status of Springfield Park, it has been reassessed as a potential Local Green Space, and is recommended to be added as a Local Green Space in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 227	9.6.1	Paragraph	Object	<p>The Council is prioritising short term growth ahead of longer term more sustainable proposals to mitigate flood risk, and safeguard and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Efforts to preserve and enhance biodiversity can add to the size of growth of the economy and peoples well-being.</p> <p>The Local Plan outputs should be more balanced between the economy and biodiversity. Stronger biodiversity outputs should include no net losses but instead net gains.</p> <p>Examples should include housing/employment proposals being sympathetic to the existing wildlife and their habitat and</p>	<p>The Local Plan provides a long term 20 year plan for the Boroughs growth and development. The Council has adopted a balanced strategy to meeting its housing requirement through the allocation in the Draft Local Plan of 26 sites of which 14 sites are 150 dwellings or less, and a further 6 sites are under 500 dwellings. Furthermore, the sites are appropriately spread across urban extensions, the urban area and the Boroughs larger service villages.</p> <p>New development will be focused in areas of low flood risk (Flood Zone 1) and should adhere to the requirements of policy DC 4 (Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems).</p> <p>Policy ENV 7 seeks to deliver net gains for biodiversity as a result of</p>	<p>The third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'Development will be expected to <u>minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by:</u></p> <p>The final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfill its planning duties in relation to <u>minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.</u>'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>promote its longevity. Nest boxes, hedgehog highways, fruit trees in gardens, nectar-rich planting for our pollinators and even wall cavities for bats and starlings. Further measures include increasing the size of green infrastructure buffer zones surrounding new developments and new roads to 100m on all sides. Red Hall Nature Reserve and the new road is a good example of this. Ingenium Parc is being developed along these lines and if this continues this will be another good example of Green Infrastructure working.</p> <p>The financial contribution from each development and business rate levy for employment sites could be used to fund ongoing management and maintenance of the nature reserve and the landscaped area surrounding each development / industrial unit.</p>	<p>development. However, it is acknowledged that the policy wording in Draft Local Plan Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 could be amended to strengthen this objective and better reflect the NPPF. This change has been recommended.</p> <p>The Council's adopted Revised Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) includes a number of measures for improving the biodiversity of development proposals including introducing nesting boxes, green roofs, street trees and fruit trees, wetlands etc. This advice is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and is referenced under several policies in the emerging Local Plan. The Council intends to retain and update this SPD following the adoption of the Local Plan.</p>	
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 230	9.6.2	Paragraph	Support	Farmland species are declining in the borough and these must be included in proposals to protect and enhance biodiversity.	Support noted. Policy ENV 7 seeks to deliver net gains for biodiversity as a result of development. However, it is acknowledged that the policy wording in Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 could be amended to strengthen this objective and better reflect the NPPF.	<p>Amend the third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 to read: 'Development will be expected to <u>minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by:</u></p> <p>Amend the final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfill its planning duties in relation to <u>minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.</u></p>
Dr Ellen	Lead Adviser			DBDLP 300	9.6.2	Paragraph	Support	Footnote 37 refers to the Conservation of Habitats and	Noted. The reference in footnote 37 has been updated.	Footnote 37 has been amended to read: "Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Bekker	Natural England							Species Regulations 2010, which should now be 2017.		2006, and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 2010"
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 231	9.6.5	Paragraph	Support	Farmland species are declining in the borough and these must be included in proposals to protect and enhance biodiversity.	Support noted. Policy ENV 7 seeks to deliver net gains for biodiversity as a result of development. However, the policy wording in Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 has been amended to strengthen this objective and better reflect the NPPF.	<p>The third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'Development will be expected to <u>minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity.</u> Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by:'</p> <p>The final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfil its planning duties in relation to <u>minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.</u>'</p>
Mr Ben Lamb	manager Tees Rivers Trust			DBDLP 31	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Neutral	Recommendation that implementation of the Your Tees Catchment Partnership (YTCP) Management Plan should also be supported within the plan.	Comment noted. Changes have been made to policy ENV 4 to reflect the Council's obligations under the Water Framework Directive.	<p>A new criterion has been added to Policy ENV 4 after criterion C (along with necessary consequential changes to policy numbering) to read: '<u>Expecting development to improve local water quality, wherever possible, taking into account the Northumbria River Basin Management Plan;</u>'</p> <p>Criterion D of Draft Local Plan Policy ENV 4 has been amended to read: 'D. Working with partners and the community to bring forward priority projects and measures identified in Darlington's Green Infrastructure Strategy and the Northumbria River Basin Management Plan;</p> <p>The following new text (along with the accompanying footnote) has been added to the supporting text of Policy ENV 4 after paragraph 9.4.10: '<u>The EU Water Framework Directive became part of UK law in 2003* with the primary objectives of achieving good ecological status in water bodies, and providing protection for drinking water sources and protected sites (Natura 2000 sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest). These requirements are reflected in the Environment Agency's Northumbria River Basin Management Plan which covers the Darlington Borough. In making decisions on spatial plans and planning applications, the Council has a duty to have</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
										<p><u>regard to the Northumbrian River Basin Management Plan to ensure the protection and improvement of water quality. Changes to the design of development proposals will often avoid harm to water bodies. Development that would adversely affect the quality or quantity of surface or groundwater, flow of groundwater or ability to abstract water will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that no significant adverse impact would occur or mitigation can be put in place to minimise this impact within acceptable levels.</u></p> <p><u>*Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) Regulations 2003'</u></p>
Alan Hutchinson	Whinfield Residents Association			DBDLP 169	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Object	<p>If even only part of the Skertingham Countryside Park were lost, biodiversity would be adversely affected.</p> <p>It is difficult to comprehend how the proposed relocation of the golf course would enhance or protect the River Skerne Strategic Corridor.</p> <p>The Skertingham masterplan conflicts with Point DIII and H of Policy ENV 7.</p> <p>There appear to be no environmental benefits to residents of Whinfield in allowing the relocation of the golf course.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The Skertingham Strategic Allocation does not conflict with Policy ENV 7 criterion DIII and H. The Council would argue that the benefits of the strategic allocation clearly outweigh any resulting loss, and that Policy H 10 requires suitable replacement planting to be undertaken, resulting in a net increase in the area of community woodland as a result of development.</p> <p>The site is required to provide a pattern of well integrated and interconnected green spaces across the site, protect the amenity of existing residential properties (in line with Policy DC 3) and retain and enhance existing hedgerows and trees wherever possible together with other measures.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skertingham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skertingham Preservation	DBDLP 424	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Object	<p>It is difficult to comprehend how the proposed relocation of the golf course would enhance or protect the River Skerne Strategic Corridor, or how the corridor could be maintained if the inner</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Only the outer link road route is now being explored and this has been reflected in changes to the policy wording and supporting text.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
			tion Group					Northern Link Road proposal, Route B were built.		
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 696	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Object	<p>Whilst CPRE agrees with the concepts in Policy ENV7 and wishes to support it, we find the wording and referencing chaotic, vague and imprecise and in places, repetitive, for example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites appear in both Policy ENV7.D and ENV7. E and F. 2. Policy ENV3.C. Rural area: There is an earlier intimation that "...the areas listed below, as identified on the Policies Map,...", but in the legend for the mapping there is no designated colouring/hatching/etc, for "Rural area" – or is it the lack of colouring/hatching/etc that is significant? <p>CPRE is concerned when wording and referencing is imprecise and open to legal challenge. Precision in language is essential, especially in view of the number of cases relating to planning applications which have been taken to the courts where words, sentences and punctuation have been forensically analysed for meaning and where case law upholds it is what a policy says the matters, not its intention.</p>	Comment noted. The policy has been amended to clarify these points.	<p>Part DII of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: II. Local Nature Reserves and Local Wildlife Sites Development likely to have an adverse effect on any of the Borough's Local Nature Reserves or Local Wildlife Sites will only be permitted if it can be shown that the reasons for the development or benefits to the local community from the development outweigh the interest or value of the site and any harm can be overcome by mitigation or compensation measures.</p> <p><u>Designate new Local Nature Reserves which meet the Natural England Criteria to ensure the protection of land and species, including Red Hall Wetland, Mill Lane (spanning the Skerne), and Cocker Beck.</u></p> <p><u>Local Wildlife Sites are identified and selected for their local nature conservation value. They protect threatened species and habitats acting as buffers, stepping stones and corridors between nationally-designated wildlife sites. Darlington has sites such as Blackwell Meadows, Coatham Grange and West Cemetery.'</u></p> <p>The following statement after Policy ENV 7 criterion DIII has been deleted: 'New wildlife sites will be designated as appropriate.'</p> <p>Criterion E and F of Policy ENV 7 have been deleted.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Richard Cowen	Acting Chair Durham Bird Club			DBDLP 619	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Object	<p>While Durham Bird Club clearly supports policies to protect biodiversity (particularly in relation to birds) we are concerned about a number of developments that have taken place in Darlington or are proposed that may have a detrimental impact on this (including proposals at Coniscliffe and Skertingham).</p> <p>We note the proposals of the revised NPPF in respect of compensation (eg paragraphs 32 and 175) and also the impact of Footnote 6 to it. We trust that the issue of compensation is one that should arise only very rarely but when it does, it is likely to impact on an important site.</p> <p>As far as woodland is concerned, we note the provisions of the revised NPPF relating to ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees at paragraph 175(c) and question whether this wording in this Policy is wholly consistent it.</p>	<p>Noted. The second paragraph of Policy ENV 7 makes it clear that compensation would only be considered appropriate as a last resort.</p> <p>Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 will be amended to reflect the revised NPPF expectation that developments provide net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>Clause DIII of Policy ENV 7 will be amended to better reflect the provisions of paragraph 175c of the NPPF in respect of ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees.</p>	<p>Amend the third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 to read: 'Development will be expected to <u>minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by:</u></p> <p>Amend the final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfill its planning duties in relation to <u>minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.</u>'</p> <p>Amend the penultimate sentence of Clause DIII of Policy ENV 7 to read: 'New development will not be permitted that would result in the loss, fragmentation, isolation or deterioration of ancient woodland <u>or ancient or veteran trees unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists</u>the need for and benefits of the development in that location clearly outweigh the harm.'</p>
Mr Richard Cowen	Acting Chair Durham Bird Club			DBDLP 624	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Object	<p>While Durham Bird Club clearly supports policies to protect biodiversity (particularly in relation to birds) we are concerned about a number of developments that have taken place in Darlington or are proposed that may have a detrimental impact on this (including proposals at Coniscliffe and Skertingham).</p> <p>We note the proposals of the revised NPPF in respect of compensation (eg paragraphs 32 and 175) and also the impact of Footnote 6 to it. We trust that the issue of compensation is one that</p>	<p>Noted. The second paragraph of Policy ENV 7 makes it clear that compensation would only be considered appropriate as a last resort.</p> <p>Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 has been amended to reflect the revised NPPF expectation that developments provide net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>Clause DIII of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to better reflect the provisions of paragraph 175c of the NPPF in respect of ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees.</p>	<p>The third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'Development will be expected to <u>minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by:</u></p> <p>The final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfill its planning duties in relation to <u>minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.</u>'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>should arise only very rarely but when it does, it is likely to impact on an important site.</p> <p>As far as woodland is concerned, we note the provisions of the revised NPPF relating to ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees at paragraph 175(c) and question whether this wording in this Policy is wholly consistent it.</p>		<p>The penultimate sentence of Clause DIII of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'New development will not be permitted that would result in the loss, fragmentation, isolation or deterioration of ancient woodland or ancient or veteran trees unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists the need for and benefits of the development in that location clearly outweigh the harm.'</p>
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 695	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Neutral	Reference to net gain for biodiversity and 25 Year Environment Plan.	<p>Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 has been amended to reflect the revised NPPF expecting developments to provide net gains for biodiversity and the Governments 25 Year Environment Plan.</p>	<p>The third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'Development will be expected to minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by:'</p> <p>The final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfill its planning duties in relation to minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.'</p>
Mrs Liz Knight				DBDLP 964	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Object	<p>If even only part of the Skertingham Countryside Park were lost, biodiversity would be adversely affected.</p> <p>It is difficult to comprehend how the proposed relocation of the golf course would enhance or protect the River Skerne Strategic Corridor.</p> <p>The Skertingham masterplan conflicts with Point DIII and H of Policy ENV 7.</p> <p>There appear to be no environmental benefits to residents</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The Skertingham Strategic Allocation does not conflict with Policy ENV 7 criterion DIII and H. The Council would argue that the benefits of the strategic allocation clearly outweigh any resulting loss, and that Policy H 10 requires suitable replacement planting to be undertaken, resulting in a net increase in the area of community woodland as a result of development.</p> <p>The site is required to provide a pattern of well integrated and interconnected green spaces across the site, protect the</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skertingham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								of Whinfield in allowing the relocation of the golf course.	amenity of existing residential properties (in line with Policy DC 3) and retain and enhance existing hedgerows and trees wherever possible together with other measures.	
Mr Knight				DBDLP 969	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Object	<p>If even only part of the Skerningham Countryside Park were lost, biodiversity would be adversely affected.</p> <p>It is difficult to comprehend how the proposed relocation of the golf course would enhance or protect the River Skerne Strategic Corridor.</p> <p>The Skerningham masterplan conflicts with Point DIII and H of Policy ENV 7.</p> <p>There appear to be no environmental benefits to residents of Whinfield in allowing the relocation of the golf course.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The Skerningham Strategic Allocation does not conflict with Policy ENV 7 criterion DIII and H. The Council would argue that the benefits of the strategic allocation clearly outweigh any resulting loss, and that Policy H 10 requires suitable replacement planting to be undertaken, resulting in a net increase in the area of community woodland as a result of development.</p> <p>The site is required to provide a pattern of well integrated and interconnected green spaces across the site, protect the amenity of existing residential properties (in line with Policy DC 3) and retain and enhance existing hedgerows and trees wherever possible together with other measures.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1289	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Neutral	<p>The wording of ENV7 does not secure the achievement of the DEFRA 25 Year Plan of net environmental gain. Suggest revised 3rd para: 'Development should will enhance biodiversity in order to provide environmental net gains where possible by...'</p> <p>We support and applaud the specific actions listed for the River Tees and the River Skerne Strategic Corridors. We suggest that the Cocker Beck/West Beck/Baydale Beck system is also</p>	<p>Comments noted. Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 have been amended to reflect the revised NPPF expecting developments to provide net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>The River Tees and River Skerne are the two main rivers crossing the borough and both identified in Darlington's Green Infrastructure Strategy as strategic green corridors, therefore, given their status it was considered appropriate that Policy ENV 7 sets out specific actions for both river corridors. Whilst also clearly important, in order to minimise the length of this strategic policy, it was</p>	<p>The third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'Development will be expected to <u>minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by:</u>'</p> <p>The final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfill its planning duties in relation to <u>minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.</u>'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>included with specific actions listed.</p> <p>The Council should consider for inclusion in the list of priorities specific water dependent sites that are upstream of proposed development allocations and so could be contributing natural flood management benefits. Of particular relevance is the Burtree Marshes LWS.</p> <p>There is also potential to enhance the ecological condition of the floodplain around Broken Scar that may have downstream flood risk benefits and provide a strategic wildlife offer on a sub-regional/regional scale.</p> <p>A & B Invasive species – revised wording to ‘manage, and where possible eradicate’</p>	<p>not considered prudent to include specific measures for the other watercourses referred to within the policy. However, it is recognised that the policies supporting text could include a reference to the actions set out in the GI Strategy for the other strategic and local green corridors, including the Cocker Beck, West Beck and Baydale Beck.'</p> <p>The final sentence of Policy ENV 8 has been amended accordingly to reflect the comment regarding invasive species.</p>	<p>The following text has been added as a new paragraph after paragraph 9.6.6: '<u>Darlington's Green Infrastructure Strategy includes a number of measures to improve the environmental and recreational value of the borough's strategic and local green corridors, and should be read alongside this policy when considering development proposals affecting a green corridor.</u>'</p> <p>The final sentence of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'Where developers identify the presence of non-native invasive species on-site, measures will be required to contain the species and ensure it is effectively <u>managed, or where possible eradicated, dealt with</u> during development.'</p>
Major Frederick Greenhow MBE				DBDLP 100	Policy ENV 8	Assessing a Development's Impact on Biodiversity	Object	<p>The Biodiversity and Geodiversity would be greatly affected by any development on Skerningham Countryside Park. The building of houses and a new golf club would not protect wildlife and fauna along the Skerne Corridor - but would have a complete adverse affect. You cannot build a woodland overnight it takes 10 - 20 years. I strongly object to the development within Skerningham Country Park as there are no environmental benefits whatsoever to either the communities, wildlife and landscape - only detrimental effects.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>
Dr Ellen	Lead Adviser			DBDLP 301	Policy ENV 8	Assessing a Development's Impact on Biodiversity	Support	<p>Policy ENV 8 should read 'Assessing a Development's Impact on Biodiversity' or</p>	<p>Comments noted. The plan should be read as a whole and it is not necessary to add cross references to other policies</p>	<p>The title of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'Assessing a Development's Impact on Biodiversity'.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Bekker	Natural England					ts Impact on Biodiversity		'Assessing Development Impacts...'. There should also be clarity that this policy does not override ENV 7 D (I), in particular that development that has adverse effects would not normally be permitted and would only be allowed in certain circumstances. In addition, compensation for significant harm to a SSSI will need to be determined on a case-by-case basis (as the policy refers to creating priority habitats, but it will depend on the SSSI affected, which type of mitigation would be appropriate).	<p>in most circumstances. Given that Policy ENV 8 follows immediately on from ENV 7 it is not considered necessary in this case. In addition, it not considered necessary to refer to compensation being considered on a case-by-case basis. Policy ENV 7 makes it clear that compensation for significant adverse effects to biodiversity or geodiversity will only be considered as a last resort. This implies that each case will need to be considered on their own merits to determine whether or not it would be considered acceptable.</p> <p>The title of Policy ENV 8 has been amended accordingly.</p>	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 697	Policy ENV 8	Assessing a Developments Impact on Biodiversity	Neutral	There is almost a feeling that if a developer follows this procedure and submits an application having followed it they will get permission. Is this not a "how to do it", a process, rather than a policy?	<p>The policy follows the 'mitigation hierarchy' set out in paragraph 175 a) of the NPPF. Policy ENV 7 makes it clear that compensation for significant adverse effects to biodiversity or geodiversity will only be considered as a last resort. Policy ENV 8 makes it clear to applicants how planning applications affecting biodiversity interests will be considered, and the information that will be required to determine them. However, the wording of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to strengthen the principle that significant harm to biodiversity should be avoided wherever possible.</p>	<p>The first sentence of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: '...will need to follow the following sequence of actions <u>set out below</u> to identify and <u>how harm to biodiversity can be avoided, or failing that adequately mitigated impact on biodiversity and geodiversity</u> where this is possible.'</p>
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1290	Policy ENV 8	Assessing a Developments Impact on Biodiversity	Neutral	Suggested revised wording final point – 'Where developers identify the presence of non-native invasive species on-site, measures will be required to contain the species and ensure it is effectively managed, or where possible, eradicated during development.'	<p>Agree with suggested change to policy.</p>	<p>The final paragraph of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'Where developers identify the presence of non-native invasive species on-site, measures will be required to contain the species and ensure it is effectively dealt with <u>managed, or where possible, eradicated</u> during development.'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 228	9.6.10	Paragraph	Object	<p>The Council is prioritising short term growth ahead of longer term more sustainable proposals to mitigate flood risk, and safeguard and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Efforts to preserve and enhance biodiversity can add to the size of growth of the economy and peoples well-being.</p> <p>The Local Plan outputs should be more balanced between the economy and biodiversity. Stronger biodiversity outputs should include no net losses but instead net gains.</p> <p>Examples should include housing/employment proposals being sympathetic to the existing wildlife and their habitat and promote its longevity. Nest boxes, hedgehog highways, fruit trees in gardens, nectar-rich planting for our pollinators and even wall cavities for bats and starlings. Further measures include increasing the size of green infrastructure buffer zones surrounding new developments and new roads to 100m on all sides. Red Hall Nature Reserve and the new road is a good example of this. Ingenium Parc is being developed along these lines and if this continues this will be another good example of Green Infrastructure working.</p> <p>The financial contribution from each development and business rate levy for employment sites could be used to fund ongoing management and maintenance of</p>	<p>The Local Plan provides a long term 20 year plan for the Boroughs growth and development. The Council has adopted a balanced strategy to meeting its housing requirement through the allocation in the Draft Local Plan of 26 sites of which 14 sites are 150 dwellings or less, and a further 6 sites are under 500 dwellings. Furthermore, the sites are appropriately spread across urban extensions, the urban area and the Boroughs larger service villages.</p> <p>New development will be focused in areas of low flood risk (Flood Zone 1) and should adhere to the requirements of policy DC 4 (Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems).</p> <p>Policy ENV 7 seeks to deliver net gains for biodiversity as a result of development. However, the policy wording in Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 have been amended to strengthen this objective and better reflect the NPPF.</p> <p>The Council's adopted Revised Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) includes a number of measures for improving the biodiversity of development proposals including introducing nesting boxes, green roofs, street trees and fruit trees, wetlands etc. This advice is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and is referenced under several policies in the emerging Local Plan. The Council intends to retain and update this SPD following the adoption of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>The third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'Development will be expected to <u>minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by:</u>'</p> <p>The final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfill its planning duties in relation to <u>minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.</u>'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								the nature reserve and the landscaped area surrounding each development / industrial unit.		
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 229	9.6.11	Paragraph	Object	<p>The Council is prioritising short term growth ahead of longer term more sustainable proposals to mitigate flood risk, and safeguard and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Efforts to preserve and enhance biodiversity can add to the size of growth of the economy and peoples well-being.</p> <p>The Local Plan outputs should be more balanced between the economy and biodiversity. Stronger biodiversity outputs should include no net losses but instead net gains.</p> <p>Examples should include housing/employment proposals being sympathetic to the existing wildlife and their habitat and promote its longevity. Nest boxes, hedgehog highways, fruit trees in gardens, nectar-rich planting for our pollinators and even wall cavities for bats and starlings. Further measures include increasing the size of green infrastructure buffer zones surrounding new developments and new roads to 100m on all sides. Red Hall Nature Reserve and the new road is a good example of this. Ingenium Parc is being developed along these lines and if this continues this will be another good example of Green Infrastructure working.</p>	<p>The Local Plan provides a long term 20 year plan for the Boroughs growth and development. The Council has adopted a balanced strategy to meeting its housing requirement through the allocation in the Draft Local Plan of 26 sites of which 14 sites are 150 dwellings or less, and a further 6 sites are under 500 dwellings. Furthermore, the sites are appropriately spread across urban extensions, the urban area and the Boroughs larger service villages.</p> <p>New development will be focused in areas of low flood risk (Flood Zone 1) and should adhere to the requirements of policy DC 4 (Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems).</p> <p>Policy ENV 7 seeks to deliver net gains for biodiversity as a result of development. However, the policy wording in Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8 has been amended to strengthen this objective and better reflect the NPPF.</p> <p>The Council's adopted Revised Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) includes a number of measures for improving the biodiversity of development proposals including introducing nesting boxes, green roofs, street trees and fruit trees, wetlands etc. This advice is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and is referenced under several policies in the emerging Local Plan. The Council intends to retain and update this SPD following the adoption of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>The third paragraph of Policy ENV 7 has been amended to read: 'Development will be expected to <u>minimise the impact on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including establishing coherent and resilient ecological networks, as a minimum to ensure no net loss of biodiversity or geodiversity. Development should enhance biodiversity in order to provide net gains where possible by:</u>'</p> <p>The final sentence of the second paragraph of Policy ENV 8 has been amended to read: 'This ensures the Council can fulfill its planning duties in relation to <u>minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity and geodiversity and ensure no net loss of the Borough's natural resources.</u>'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								The financial contribution from each development and business rate levy for employment sites could be used to fund ongoing management and maintenance of the nature reserve and the landscaped area surrounding each development / industrial unit.		
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 700	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Neutral	Importance of encouraging walking and hierarchy of mode needs should be more prominent.	Additional emphasis on sustainable methods of transport provided in the chapter introduction. Otherwise the main policy and supporting text is already reflective of a transport hierarchy balanced in favour of walking and cycling, public transport then highways.	Change 10.0.1 to read: The majority of new residential, commercial and employment development is therefore guided to the main towns and larger villages <u>and sustainable methods of transport will be prioritised.</u>
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 937	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Object	Highways England require further evidence in order for the plan to be found sound. A substantial number of proposed sites have been identified by this review that will potentially impact on the SRN, namely the A1 (M) and the A66 which surround the wider Darlington area. Additional evidence required: 1. Details should be supplied in relation to the size and location of any allocation of pitches for gypsies and travellers, in order to confirm that they will not have an impact on the SRN.	Transport modelling work is ongoing to test highway mitigation schemes to ensure developments do not have an unacceptable impact on local and strategic highway network. An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development. A Local Plan Viability Assessment is being prepared, this will ensure that allocations are deliverable when taking into account planning obligations which are set out in the plan. Highways England will remain integral to this process and will be kept informed of progress.	To be covered in supporting evidence and Statement of Common Ground with Highways England.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>2. Details of any additional sites to be considered.</p> <p>3. Additional detail should be provided as to the probable impacts of the development traffic upon the SRN, and the capacity or viability of the SRN to cope with the scale of the proposed development. The traffic impact at the SRN of sites included will need to be considered further by DBC in association with Highways England. Although some discussion of this is made in the SA in Appendix G in relation to potential mitigatory measures for each site and developer contributions, this needs to be reflected in the LP. If highway mitigation measures are likely to be required as part of a development, the viability of such will also need to be considered.</p> <p>4. An assessment of the cumulative traffic impact of all the Local Plan sites is required, alongside discussion surrounding any likely mitigation measures that would be required at key SRN junctions.</p> <p>Highways England's key concern remains</p>		

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								the cumulative impact of traffic from all Plan sites upon the SRN and how this will be mitigated.		
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1216	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Object	<p>Separate Airport Policy requested to cover:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airport role • Masterplan • Strategic Growth Area • Safety with specific references in the policy to circulars and zones to be on policies map. 	<p>It is not considered a standalone Airport Policy would offer significant benefits. Whilst the continued operation of the airport is supported by the council in planning terms there is little that can be done to secure this than isn't already factored into the suite of relevant policies within the plan.</p> <p>Airport safeguarding areas will be included on the policies map as opposed to an appendix.</p>	Airport safeguarding areas will be included on the policies map.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 699	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Object	<p>Suggest formatting changes to policy.</p> <p>Concern over impacts of highway infrastructure.</p>	<p>Formatting to be reviewed across the document before publication.</p> <p>New highway infrastructure will need to be subject to more detailed environmental consideration in due course.</p>	Review policies across the document for consistency of formatting.
Gordon Pybus	Darlington Association on Disability			DBDLP 76	Policy IN 2	Improving Access and Accessibility	Object	<p>Suggest changes to policy wording to be more inclusive of more disabilities. In singling out Dementia as a condition this could be to the detriment of other needs. Need for Equality Impact Appraisal before plan is adopted.</p>	<p>Balancing varying need across a plan always requires compromise. Dementia is of significant concern nationally over the next 20 years with an aging population profile so needs to be considered alongside other specific needs. An Equalities Impact Appraisal will be produced to consider potential impacts in detail.</p>	Policy DC 2 to be reworded see comment DBDLP1411 for details.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) -			DBDLP 702	Policy IN 2	Improving Access and Accessibility	Neutral	<p>Criteria on provision/improvement of disabled access appears out of place.</p>	<p>It is assumed this comment is against IN2 d not IN3 as submitted. Seeking improvement to access buildings is considered a vital part of improving access and accessibility is considered an integral part of the plan. It is</p>	Point d. to be moved to the top of the list and points renumbered appropriately.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
	Darlington Group								accepted that point d is perhaps a little out of place with the other points mainly relating to sustainable and public transport connectivity. This point will be moved to the top of the list as it then represents a logical hierarchy of building access then footpath access then public transport access and facilities.	
Mr Steven Drabik	Architectural Liaison Officer Durham Constabulary			DBDLP 765	Policy IN 2	Improving Access and Accessibility	Neutral	Suggested inclusion of wording to ensure safe design principles for new footpaths and cycleways.	Policy can be reworded accordingly but the matter is also considered as part of the Design of New Development SPD.	b. All developments should provide good safe access to the borough wide cycling and walking network including links to the Public Rights of Way network and leisure routes. c. All new development should provide easy and safe access for those who wish to use public transport. Accessibility is based on 80% or more of the site being within 400m walking distance of a bus stop.
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 701	Policy IN 2	Improving Access and Accessibility	Neutral	Healthy New Towns Design principles should be incorporated.	This integration will be provided in the next stage of the plan.	Healthy new towns principles diagram to be incorporated into the plan.
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1090	Policy IN 2	Improving Access and Accessibility	Object	Objection raised to the requirement for 80% of a development site being within 400m walking distance of a bus stop. It is suggested that 1 km would be more appropriate as suggested in IHT guidance 'Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot'. The policy should also recognise the fact that new development proposals will often improve	The 400m walking distance from a bus stop is derived from the Department of Environment Circular 82/73 (DOE, 1973) which gives 400 metres as the recommended maximum walking distance along the footpath system, this represents a 5-minute walk at about 5 kph (roughly the average walking speed in the National Travel Survey). The Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation (CIHT) in their most recent guidance 'Buses in Urban Developments' January 2018 (1) challenges the 400 meter criterion and	Policy IN 2 to be reworded to require 80% of major developments to be within 400m of a bus stop.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								access to public transportation through financial agreement and design of a proposal to incorporate access to new bus stops and sustainable modes of transportation as part of the development proposal.	<p>suggests a range of criteria between 500m and 250m in different locations would be more appropriate to acknowledge that a flexible approach is required in certain circumstances.</p> <p>As Darlington has a relatively compact main urban area and clearly defined larger villages it is not considered there is a clear need to go for a lower threshold for Town Centres etc. 400m remains towards the top end of the recommended scale of acceptable distances and there is flexibility within the policy as drafted that only 80% of a site has to be within a 400m radius of a bus stop. If developments cannot meet the requirement applicants are welcome to submit potential mitigation measures or explain any extenuating circumstances.</p> <p>(1) https://www.ciht.org.uk/media/4459/buses_ua_tp_full_version_v5.p</p>	
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1200	Policy IN 2	Improving Access and Accessibility	Object	c) of Policy IN 2 should be worded as such "All new developments should provide easy access for those who wish to use public transport. All new developments should aim for 80% of the site to be within 400m walking distance of a bus stop"	This point is to be reworded to read 'all new <u>major</u> development....' This will allow suitable flexibility for smaller developments.	Reword IN 2 (c): 'All new <u>major</u> development.....'
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Christopher Martin	WYG	DBDLP 1124	Policy IN 2	Improving Access and Accessibility	Object	Objection raised to the requirement for 80% of a development site being within 400m walking distance of a bus stop. it is considered this does not reflect development in rural areas and additional flexibility in wording should be considered.	The 400m walking distance from a bus stop is derived from the Department of Environment Circular 82/73 (DOE, 1973) which gives 400 metres as the recommended maximum walking distance along the footpath system, this represents a 5-minute walk at about 5 kph (roughly the average walking speed in the National Travel Survey).	Policy IN 2 to be reworded to require 80% of <u>major</u> developments to be within 400m of a bus stop.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p>The Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation (CIHT) in their most recent guidance 'Buses in Urban Developments' January 2018 (1) challenges the 400 meter criterion and suggests a range of criteria between 500m and 250m in different locations would be more appropriate to acknowledge that a flexible approach is required in certain circumstances.</p> <p>As Darlington has a relatively compact main urban area and clearly defined larger villages it is not considered there is a clear need to go for a lower threshold for Town Centres etc. 400m remains towards the top end of the recommended scale of acceptable distances and there is flexibility within the policy as drafted that only 80% of a site has to be within a 400m radius of a bus stop. If developments cannot meet the requirement applicants are welcome to submit potential mitigation measures or explain any extenuating circumstances.</p> <p>(1) https://www.ciht.org.uk/media/4459/buses_ua_tp_full_version_v5.pdf</p>	
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Steven Longstaff		DBDLP 1244	Policy IN 2	Improving Access and Accessibility	Object	<p>Objection raised to the requirement for 80% of a development site being within 400m walking distance of a bus stop. It is suggested that 1 km would be more appropriate as suggested in IHT guidance 'Guidelines for Providing Journeys on Foot'.</p>	<p>The 400m walking distance from a bus stop is derived from the Department of Environment Circular 82/73 (DOE, 1973) which gives 400 metres as the recommended maximum walking distance along the footpath system, this represents a 5-minute walk at about 5 kph (roughly the average walking speed in the National Travel Survey). The Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation (CIHT) in their most recent guidance 'Buses in Urban Developments' January 2018 (1)</p>	Policy IN 2 to be reworded to require 80% of major developments to be within 400m of a bus stop.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p>challenges the 400 meter criterion and suggests a range of criteria between 500m and 250m in different locations would be more appropriate to acknowledge that a flexible approach is required in certain circumstances.</p> <p>As Darlington has a relatively compact main urban area and clearly defined larger villages it is not considered there is a clear need to go for a lower threshold for Town Centres etc. 400m remains towards the top end of the recommended scale of acceptable distances and there is flexibility within the policy as drafted that only 80% of a site has to be within a 400m radius of a bus stop. If developments cannot meet the requirement applicants are welcome to submit potential mitigation measures or explain any extenuating circumstances.</p> <p>(1) https://www.ciht.org.uk/media/4459/buses_ua_tp_full_version_v5.pdf</p>	
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1320	Policy IN 2	Improving Access and Accessibility	Object	<p>Objection raised that policy lacks flexibility. Specifically objection is raised to the requirement for 80% of a development site being within 400m walking distance of a bus stop.</p> <p>The Institute of Highways and Transportation issued guidance for 'Providing for Journeys on Foot' in 2000. Table 3.2 of that document defines 'suggested acceptable walking distances', defining 400m as 'desirable', but also considering 'acceptable' and the 'preferred maximum' to be 800m and 1,200m respectively.</p>	<p>The 400m walking distance from a bus stop is derived from the Department of Environment Circular 82/73 (DOE, 1973) which gives 400 metres as the recommended maximum walking distance along the footpath system, this represents a 5-minute walk at about 5 kph (roughly the average walking speed in the National Travel Survey). The Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation (CIHT) in their most recent guidance 'Buses in Urban Developments' January 2018 (1) challenges the 400 meter criterion and suggests a range of criteria between 500m and 250m in different locations would be more appropriate to</p>	Policy IN 2 to be reworded to require 80% of major developments to be within 400m of a bus stop.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									<p>acknowledge that a flexible approach is required in certain circumstances.</p> <p>As Darlington has a relatively compact main urban area and clearly defined larger villages it is not considered there is a clear need to go for a lower threshold for Town Centres etc. 400m remains towards the top end of the recommended scale of acceptable distances and there is flexibility within the policy as drafted that only 80% of a site has to be within a 400m radius of a bus stop. If developments cannot meet the requirement applicants are welcome to submit potential mitigation measures or explain any extenuating circumstances.</p> <p>(1) https://www.ciht.org.uk/media/4459/buses_ua_tp_full_version_v5.p</p>	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 704	Policy IN 3	Transport Assessments and Travel Plans	Neutral	Confusion over wording of point c) relating to the statement 'contribute positively to congestion'.	Alternative wording recommended.	c. contribute positively to managing congestion, environmental and safety issues including managing car parking provision.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 705	Policy IN 4	Parking Provision including Electric Vehicle Charging	Neutral	Stronger policy wording suggested to require 'at least' one double charging point per 50 spaces.	Alternative wording to be included.	Wording to be changed to: 'For each additional 50 parking spaces at least one double charging point should be provided.'
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) -			DBDLP 706	10.4.4	Paragraph	Object	Objection is raised that the wording implies surface parking outside of the ring road will be protected solely for parking which	It is not the intention to restrict Town Centre Fringe regeneration so alternative wording is proposed.	Wording to be changed to: 'Outside of the ring road existing parking provision will generally be protected for long stay parking and

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
	Darlington Group							will restrict wider regeneration opportunities.		Residents Parking Zones, <u>unless part of a wider regeneration scheme</u> '.
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1207	Policy IN 5	Airport Safety	Object	Broadly support the policy but wish to see the safeguarding zones included on the policies map. Policy should also be reworded to include reference to specific circulars.	Safeguards can be included on the policies map and reference to circulars included in policy as opposed to the reasoned justification.	Revised Policy IN 5 Wording: <u>Within the established 13km (bird strike hazard area) and the 15km (radius of critical airspace) safeguarding areas surrounding the airport, as identified on the policies map, relevant development proposals will require consultation with the operator of the airport, and must consider the operational integrity of the airport, its surveillance systems, and the safety of air traffic services, in accordance with Government Circular 1/2003, or any successor guidance.</u> <u>Within the Public Safety Zones adjacent to the airport runway, as identified on the policies map, there is a general presumption against new development, unless the proposal accords with guidance in Government circular 1/2010 or any successor guidance.</u>
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1215	Policy IN 5	Airport Safety	Object	Wish to see DTVA specific policy as detailed in comment DBDLP1216. Separate Airport Policy requested to cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airport role • Masterplan • Strategic Growth Area • Safety with specific references in the policy to circulars and zones to be on policies map. 	It is not considered a standalone Airport Policy would offer significant benefits. Whilst the continued operation of the airport is supported by the council in planning terms there is little that can be done to secure this than isn't already factored into the suite of relevant policies within the plan. Airport safeguarding areas will be included on the policies map as opposed to an appendix.	Airport safeguarding areas will be included on the policies map.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) -			DBDLP 710	Policy IN 7	Telecommunication Masts	Object	Suggested minor amendment to wording to read 'It is not harmful.....'	This is a typo that will be rectified.	Change wording to e. 'It is not harmful.....'

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
	Darlington Group									
Dr Ellen Bekker	Lead Adviser Natural England			DBDLP 302	Policy IN9	Renewable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure	Object	Objection noted from statutory consultee. Advising that the policy should incorporate consideration of potential impact of renewable energy schemes on biodiversity and landscape (including cumulative impacts).	Agree this could be made a more prominent consideration of this policy although impact on biodiversity and landscaping are considered in separate policies.	<p><i>Policy IN9 suggested rewording:</i></p> <p><i>Renewable and low carbon energy development in appropriate locations will be supported. In determining planning applications for such projects significant weight will be given to the achievement of wider social, environmental and economic benefits.</i></p> <p><i>a. Wind energy development will be granted planning permission if the applicant can demonstrate that the proposal will not have unacceptable impact, either individually or cumulatively upon:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. shadow flicker;</i> <i>ii. visual dominance;</i> <i>iii. protected species and habitats;</i> <i>iv. landscape character and fabric;</i> <i>v. heritage assets;</i> <i>vi. communication links; and</i> <i>vii. aviation and radar.</i> <p><i>b. Solar Power developments will be granted planning permission if the applicant can demonstrate that the following considerations have been taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i. the importance of siting systems in situations where they can collect the most energy from the sun;</i> <i>ii. need for sufficient area of solar modules to produce the required energy output from the system;</i> <i>iii. the colour and appearance of the modules;</i> <i>iv. demonstrate effective use of land by focussing large scale solar farms on previously developed and non agricultural land;</i>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
										<p>v. where a proposal involves agricultural land it has been demonstrated that:</p> <p>1. the land has been shown to be poorer quality land in preference to higher quality agricultural land; and</p> <p>2. the proposal allows for continued agricultural use where applicable and/or encourages biodiversity improvements around solar arrays;</p> <p>vi. the proposal has adequately mitigated the visual impact on the landscape and the effect of glint and glare on neighbouring uses and aircraft safety.</p> <p>c. Hydro Power: Applications for hydropower should be accompanied by a detailed Flood Risk Assessment. Early engagement should take place with the local planning authority and the Environment Agency.</p> <p>d. District Heating: Required in major development over 300 houses to be enabled for district energy connection unless demonstrated not to be feasible or financially viable to do so.</p> <p>Where relevant, planning applications will also need to include a satisfactory scheme to restore the site to a quality of at least its original condition once operations have ceased.</p>
Mrs Rachel Allum	Senior Development Planner Banks Group			DBDLP 443	Policy IN 9	Renewable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure	Object	<p>Proposing the inclusion of an onshore wind generation policy. Suggested two Test criteria approach and model wording for policy.</p> <p>test 1) No map for suitability produced in Draft Local Plan and methodology important</p>	<p>Policy for onshore wind more suitable at Tees Valley level and should be looked at within the Tees Valley Infrastructure Plan 2019. Scope for Wind turbine parks currently only the West of the Borough but will have impact if planned on Large Turbine scale (plus 125m) as suggested.</p> <p>Criteria based issue to be included to demonstrate development will not have</p>	See IN 9 Rewording for Comment DBDLP302

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>test 2) Backing of local Community is open to interpretation</p> <p>Additional Test 3: Criteria based where it can be demonstrated that proposed development will not have unacceptable adverse impacts, individually or cumulatively to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. residential amenity as a result of noise, shadow flicker, visual dominance; 2. protected species or habitats; 3. landscape character and fabric; 4. heritage assets; 5. communication links; and 6. aviation and radar. 	<p>adverse impacts individually and or cumulatively.</p> <p>Onus will be put on the applicant to evidence.</p>	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 713	Policy IN 9	Renewable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure	Support	<p>General support for policy IN9. Solar panels should be encouraged on industrial buildings. Minor changes to referencing suggested.</p>	<p>Solar panels will be encouraged on industrial units under draft Policy DC 1. It would not be appropriate to impose additional requirements.</p>	<p>Across the plan we need consistency in numbering and referencing.</p>
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 714	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Object	<p>Seeking clarity of formatting of policies (use of bullet points not recommended).</p> <p>Paragraph in section on 'Protection of Existing Community Facilities' appears out of place.</p> <p>The 'Locational Strategy' should have a cross reference.</p>	<p>Bullet points have been used in certain circumstances so as to not indicate a priority order. It is acknowledged this may make referencing less precise. It may be and a,b,c, would be more beneficial.</p> <p>Agree that paragraph on 'Protection of Existing Community Facilities' does appear out of place and this will be rectified.</p>	<p>Numbering has been reviewed.</p> <p>Rename subsection 'Provision and protection of Community Facilities'</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								Clarification sought as to why affordable housing schemes are exempt from education contributions.	Cross reference to 'Locational Strategy' not required as plan should be read as a whole. DfE guidance issued in November 2019 states it is up to individual authorities to set an approach for seeking contributions from affordable housing.	
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 848	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Object	General support for policy as drafted but seeking additional exemptions to apply to one bedroom dwellings, one and two bedroom apartments and student accommodation.	Exceptions will be revisited. Student accommodation is a logical addition as are one bed properties but two bedroom apartments could be capable of providing family accommodation. This approach would be supported by the pupil yield factor being calculated on any new property of two or more bedrooms.	Exception to be made for one bedroom properties and Student accommodation (unless it specifically includes provision for families).
Mr Nigel Swinbank		Mr Andrew Moss	Ward Hadaway	DBDLP 44	12	GLOSSARY	Object	There should be a definition of 'infill development' which should include the filling of gaps and the rounding off of villages.	Comments noted. A definition for infill development will be added to the glossary. It is however considered that the rounding off of villages does not fall under the definition.	Text below to be added to the glossary: <u>Infill development - The development of a small area of vacant land between existing buildings.</u>
Nick McLellan	Story Homes			DBDLP 1045	APPENDIX A	HOUSING TRAJECTORY	Object	Comments relate to site 99 Maxgate Farm, MSG. Story Homes advise the Council of development timescales. First completions are anticipated to be delivered in the second quarter of 2020 and thereafter. The site can also accommodate a total yield of 260 units following the removal of the proposed school site (as outlined in comments related to H 2 Housing Allocations ref DBDLP1044). The housing trajectory should be updated accordingly.	Comments noted. Update yield accordingly. The anticipated rates of delivery in the housing trajectory are an estimate and are based on the most up to date information available. The trajectory does not restrict sites from coming forward sooner or delivering at a faster rate. As outline permission, s106 legal agreement and reserved matters approval are still required it is considered appropriate to leave the start date for this site later on in the trajectory.	Update table 6.3, appendix A and appendix B with new yield.
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1382	APPENDIX A	HOUSING TRAJECTORY	Neutral	Comment also recorded against Site 8 - Berrymede Farm (DBDLP1185)	Comments noted. As there will be a minimum of 2 volume house builders on site it is agreed that the delivery rate in the trajectory can be increased to 60 dwellings per annum.	Increase delivery rate for site 8 Berrymede Farm to 60 dwellings per annum in Appendix A Housing Trajectory.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>Support for the inclusion of Site 8 - Berrymead Farm however wish to see trajectory altered to indicate a more rapid rate of delivery. Start date is considered appropriate given necessity to secure reserved matters approval and associated lead in times.</p> <p>The site is jointly owned by Persimmon Homes, Taylor Wimpey and Northumbrian Land Ltd and as such will be constructed simultaneously by a minimum of 2 volume house builders across multiple sales outlets. As such we anticipate that the scheme will deliver 60 dwellings per annum and accordingly will be completed by 2026. The trajectory should be amended to reflect the above anticipated build out rates.</p>		
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephen Halliday	DBDLP 1312	APPENDIX A	HOUSING TRAJECTORY	Object	<p>Part of wider response logged against Policy H 2.</p> <p>Delivery rate is considered too ambitious due to no indication of a planning application or known developer backing. There is a discrepancy in figures between the trajectory at Appendix A and Policy H 2 for site 249 Coniscliffe Park, North.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Agreed to move site 249 back in the trajectory. Figures to be updated accordingly in policy H 2 and discrepancy rectified. Figures will also be updated in the housing allocation statement.</p>	<p>Agreed to move site 249 back in the trajectory. Figures to be updated accordingly in Appendix A Housing Trajectory, housing allocation statement and policy H 2 and discrepancy rectified.</p>
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephen Halliday	DBDLP 1314	APPENDIX A	HOUSING TRAJECTORY	Object	<p>Part of wider response logged against Policy H2.</p> <p>Discrepancy on the yield to be delivered over the plan period between Appendix A Housing Trajectory and policy H 2 Housing Allocations, for site 41 South Coniscliffe Park.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Discrepancy to be rectified.</p>	<p>Policy H 2 Housing Allocations to be amended to show correct yield during plan period for site 41 South Coniscliffe Park.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Steven Longstaff		DBDLP 1385	APPENDIX A	HOUSING TRAJECTORY	Object	<p>Extract of comment DBDLP1233.</p> <p>Comments that site 41 South Coniscliffe Park is anticipated to deliver first completions in 2020 and a rate of 42 dwellings per annum. Requested that Appendix A Housing Trajectory is updated to reflect this. Site will be completed we within plan period. Drafting error in table 6.3 with regards to site yield, suggesting a total of 590 dwellings rather than 535 in line with the pending planning application.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The anticipated rates of delivery in the housing trajectory are an estimate and are based on the most up to date information available. The trajectory does not restrict sites from coming forward sooner or delivering at a faster rate. As outline permission, s106 legal agreement and reserved matters approval are still required it is considered appropriate to leave the start date for this site later on in the trajectory. A standard delivery rate of 30 dwellings per annum has been applied to the site. No evidence has been provided to support an increased figure. As such no change is proposed.</p> <p>Discrepancy in site yield is to be amended in policy H 2 Housing Allocations.</p>	Yield discrepancy for site 41 South Coniscliffe Park is to be amended in policy H 2 Housing Allocations.
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1185		Site 8 - Berrymead Farm	Neutral	<p>Duplicate comment recorded against Appendix A Housing Trajectory.</p> <p>Support for the inclusion of Site 8 - Berrymead Farm however wish to see trajectory altered to indicate a more rapid rate of delivery. Start date is considered appropriate given necessity to secure reserved matters approval and associated lead in times.</p> <p>The site is jointly owned by Persimmon Homes, Taylor Wimpey and Northumbrian Land Ltd and as such will be constructed simultaneously by a minimum of 2 volume house builders across multiple sales outlets. As such we anticipate that the scheme will deliver 60 dwellings per annum and accordingly will be completed by 2026. The trajectory should be</p>	<p>Comments noted. As there will be a minimum of 2 volume house builders on site it is agreed that the delivery rate in the trajectory can be increased to 60 dwellings per annum.</p>	Increase delivery rate for site 8 Berrymead Farm to 60 dwellings per annum in Appendix A Housing Trajectory.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								amended to reflect the above anticipated build out rates.		
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1104		Site 20 - Great Burdon	Object	Potential harm to Haughton Conservation and the Scheduled WWII Bombing Decoy should be given greater consideration to provide a robust assessment of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting to inform the suitability of sites for development and to ensure appropriate mitigation measures to minimise harm.	The Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of this work have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.	Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of the Heritage Impact Assessment have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1027		Site 41 - South Coniscliffe Park	Object	<p>Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council consider there is no justification for the site.</p> <p>It is not considered a suitable location and will be physically detached by Baydale Beck from the existing urban area.</p> <p>It is considered that a site of this size should have a policy of its own similar to Skertingham and Greater Faverdale.</p>	<p>The need for sites are discussed in greater detail in officer response on housing requirement and standard method and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>The site allocation statement for this site and 249 (Coniscliffe Park North) will be amended to highlight the necessity to provide convenient and safe pedestrian/cycle connections into the existing urban area crossing Baydale Beck.</p>	<p>Additional criteria to be added to the allocation statement for this site and site 249 (Coniscliffe Park North).</p> <p><u>J. The development will provide convenient and safe pedestrian and cycle connections into the existing urban area crossing Baydale Beck.</u></p>
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Steven Longstaff		DBDLP 1233		Site 41 - South Coniscliffe Park	Support	<p>Supported for the proposed allocation is reiterated on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would supply high quality housing. • Accessible location. • Create construction jobs. • Support local services. 	<p>Support is noted for the promoted site and additional detailed consideration and assessment will take place throughout the planning process.</p> <p>WWTW reference to be incorporated.</p> <p>Trajectory modifications considered in comments on Appendix A. (See Comment Ref DBDLP1385)</p>	Change 'Sewage Works' to 'Waste Water Treatment Works'

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the provision of a link road between. Deliver publicly accessible open space other wider environmental benefits are also described. <p>Seeking change of reference to Sewage Works to be replaced with Waste Water Treatment Works.</p> <p>Trajectory modifications are also suggested.</p>		
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1028		Site 249 - Coniscliffe Park, North	Object	<p>Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council consider there is no justification for the site.</p> <p>It is not considered a suitable location and will be physically detached by Baydale Beck from the existing urban area.</p> <p>It is considered that a site of this size should have a policy of its own similar to Skerningham and Greater Faverdale.</p>	<p>The need for sites are discussed in greater detail in the officer response on housing requirement and standard method and the response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>The site allocation statement for this site and 41 (South Coniscliffe Park) will be amended to highlight the necessity to provide convenient and safe pedestrian/cycle connections into the existing urban area crossing Baydale Beck.</p>	<p>Additional criteria to be added to the allocation statement for this site and site 41 (South Coniscliffe Park).</p> <p><u>J. The development will provide convenient and safe pedestrian and cycle connections into the existing urban area crossing Baydale Beck.</u></p>
Ms Laura Gardner				DBDLP 955		Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm	Object	<p>The additional traffic along Sparrow Hall Drive and Whinfield Road will cause congestion, pollution, noise and affect road safety.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment and landscape, resulting in the loss of local wildlife and recreational opportunities. This will have an</p>	<p>Transport modelling work has been undertaken to test highway mitigation schemes and ensure developments do not have an unacceptable impact on local and strategic highway network.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<p>impact on resident's health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and local services (including doctors and schools).</p> <p>Development will devalue property in the area.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes.</p> <p>The town centre is diminishing.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land and use of empty properties.</p>		
Frances Nicholson	Bellway Homes Limited (Durham)			DBDLP 1172		Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm	Object	<p>Support for promoted site. Requesting some changes to housing statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farm buildings not special enough to justify retention. • The reference to 'historic track' may be misleading as it is the existing golf club access. • Reference to 'high landscape value' as this is not an identified designation. It is acknowledged that the landscape is attractive. 	<p>Support for the proposed allocation noted.</p> <p>Although the farm buildings hold no statutory protection it is good planning practice to retain and convert old buildings where appropriate. If there are structural or layout reasons why the buildings cannot be retained, this should be justified when a planning application is submitted.</p> <p>The historic track is the route along Green Lane, not the access to the golf club. This will be clarified with additional text in the statement.</p> <p>The statement outlines that the site is within an area of high landscape sensitivity, not high landscape value. It is considered appropriate to retain this wording.</p>	<p>Amend criteria c of housing allocation statement 392 Elm Tree Farm as below:</p> <p><u>A The Green Lane historic track crosses adjacent to the site. This should be protected and accommodated in an appropriate site layout.</u></p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mrs Veronica Harland				DBDLP 659		Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm	Object	<p>Objection is raised on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no need for 142 houses on the site. • Development will lead to an increase in traffic congestion, pollution and concerns over highway safety. Particular concerns are raised in relation to parked cars on Sparrowhall Drive Causing an obstruction and that Barmpton Lane is not wide enough to accommodate buses. • Concern is raised about accessing particular properties (This information is thought to be part of the developers pre-application consultation as it does not form part of the local plan). • The development plus the relocation of the golf course will lead to a significant increase in traffic and pollution. • Clarification is sought as to where the new green space will be created. • Developing vacant brownfield sites should be prioritised and there are a significant number of empty homes which should be brought back into use. 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Transport modelling work is ongoing to test highway mitigation schemes to ensure developments do not have an unacceptable impact on local and strategic highway network.</p> <p>Comment is noted regarding parking however this is not a matter for the local plan and restrictions and be implemented by the Highway Authority if they see fit.</p> <p>Should access be provided across Springfield Park it would be engineered to a standard to function as one of the primary access points to the Skerningham development. Further details of exact specifications will be developed as the scheme progresses.</p> <p>Consideration of Elm Tree Farm in previous plans and applications, a significant amount of time ago, has little relevance with wholesale changes to national planning policy having taken place since.</p>	See officer response paper on Skerningham comments.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that creating an access point over Springfield Park will create a 'Rat Run'. Elm Tree Farm was refused planning permission in 1997 for 75 dwellings. 		
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 911		Site 1 - Alderman Leach	Neutral	Highways England raises no concern with this site.	<p>Advanced discussions have been held with a developer for Site 1</p> <p>Alderman Leach however the yield proposed for the site has reduced to below 10 dwellings. This site is therefore to be removed from the proposed allocations.</p>	Remove site 1 Alderman Leach from policy H 2, Appendix A and Appendix B.
Michael Wilson				DBDLP 324		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds that the description of 'open space disused golf course' is misleading and development would be in conflict with the Archeo Environment Statement of Significance.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
MR MICHAEL GREEN				DBDLP 238		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	<p>Objection on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> loss of historic parkland, potential for archaeology conflict with the Archeo Environment Statement of Significance, loss of recreation loss of trees, 	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sensitivity of 'memorial trees' and areas used to scatter ashes. 		
MR MICHAEL GREEN				DBDLP 261		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	<p>Objection raised in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> sensitivity and ethical responsibility for 'memorial trees' and areas used to scatter ashes, impact on ecology and in particular newts. 	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Sophie Ward				DBDLP 269		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	<p>Objection on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> further loss of greenspace, loss of trees, impact on habitats, increased traffic congestion. 	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Sarah Railton				DBDLP 271		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Dr Ranjit Chatterjee				DBDLP 273		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of impact upon a key green corridor into Darlington and a perceived lack of need for 'high end' properties.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Barry Appleby				DBDLP 287		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of parkland/green space and impact on wildlife habitat.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Catherine Appleby				DBDLP 288		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of parkland/green space and impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Gillian Rickaby				DBDLP 289		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of parkland, • impact on heritage, • loss of trees and wildlife habitat, • loss of recreation space, • lack of need for 'high end' housing. 	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Samantha Rickaby				DBDLP 295		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of 'green belt', • character of the West End would be altered, • loss of greenery would result in more pollution, • increase in traffic, • no need for executive homes, • wildlife habitats have already been destroyed on the western side of Blackwell. 	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mrs A Dimelow				DBDLP 428		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees and increase in traffic.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mr Paul Hunter				DBDLP 431		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on grounds of loss of trees, wildlife habitat and parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mr Paul Harris				DBDLP 432		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Susan Taylor				DBDLP 435		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection is raised on the grounds of loss of green space and trees.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mrs Ruth Harmer				DBDLP 441		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland. Inconsistency with draft Policies ENV 1 and ENV 3 and need for executive/'high end' housing also questioned.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Carl Watson				DBDLP 446		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Richard Hurst				DBDLP 455		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of impact on a key gateway into Darlington.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Frank Peacock				DBDLP 458		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Parkland should be a protected local green space.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Carole Sobkowiak				DBDLP 467		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection is raised on the grounds of impact on a key green gateway to Darlington, impact on Listed Buildings and loss of trees.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
T Copping				DBDLP 471		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection is raised on the grounds of perceived loss of 'green belt'.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Moir Bradey				DBDLP 473		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of trees. Particular concern raised over 'memorial trees'.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Zoe Coltman				DBDLP 476		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Patricia Harris				DBDLP 478		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Christopher Green				DBDLP 489		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of parkland and trees.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Dr Elizabeth Elliott				DBDLP 490		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and trees and associated impact on health and wellbeing.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mrs J Shearn				DBDLP 494		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and trees. Statement requested about replacement of trees on site currently being developed but this is no longer a local plan matter so has not been included in comments.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Paul Hutchinson				DBDLP 495		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection is raised on the grounds of loss of trees.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Barry Holland				DBDLP 496		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection is raised to the principle of housing development on the site 9.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Kevin Winkworth				DBDLP 497		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection on the grounds of loss of parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Audrey Peacock				DBDLP 502		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Ty Hankinson				DBDLP 504		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of green field sites when brown field should be the priority.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Brian Tudor				DBDLP 513		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of trees.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Lynn Halland				DBDLP 518		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of impact on a key green gateway into Darlington.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Angela Gibson				DBDLP 532		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Debbie				DBDLP 538		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and green space.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Anna-Maria Thain				DBDLP 540		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of trees.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Christine Kent				DBDLP 544		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and trees. It is also considered there is not	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								enough information or sufficient time to allow thorough consultation.	site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
A H Berry				DBDLP 550		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection is raised on the grounds that development would conflict with the Archeo-Environment Statement of Significance.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
glenys drummond				DBDLP 454		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and a gateway feature to Darlington in the form of green avenues along Grange Road and Carmel Road.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
David Railton	All Saints' Church, Blackwell			DBDLP 549		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection on the grounds of loss of parkland/greenspace and increased traffic also adding to existing problems caused by Blackwell Meadows.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Sue Turnbull				DBDLP 477		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection on the grounds of loss of parkland and trees.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Angela Green				DBDLP 566		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, impact on ecology (including Great Crested Newts) as well as concern over potential disturbance of 'memorial trees'.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Alison Boddy				DBDLP 570		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and trees.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mr Peter Holt				DBDLP 571		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and trees. It is important to keep this area attractive to live and invest.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Ms Emma Easby				DBDLP 591		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, impact on wildlife habitats and increase in traffic.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
B Myers				DBDLP 610		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection is raised on the grounds of loss of greenspace and trees. The need for 'high end' housing is also questioned and development of brownfield sites would be preferable.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b and officer response on 'brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes'.
Clare Hedley				DBDLP 611		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Ms Claire Chapman				DBDLP 612		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
D Myers				DBDLP 616		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection is raised on the grounds of perceived loss of 'green belt', increase in traffic and that development of brownfield would be preferable.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b and officer response on 'brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes'.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Mrs Joanne Gilligan				DBDLP 617		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	<p>Objection raised on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> loss of green space for recreation lack of need for 'high end' properties, increased pressure on health services, impact of additional traffic. 	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Ms Eleanor Rees				DBDLP 622		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection is raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees and impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
K McCabe				DBDLP 643		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection is raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and impact of additional traffic.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Moir Rickaby				DBDLP 639		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Cally Howell				DBDLP 648		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
D Skilbeck				DBDLP 654		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of green space for recreation and dog walking.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	
Clive Rickaby	Blackwell Action Group			DBDLP 746		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	<p>Objection raised on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of historic parkland, • loss of trees, • traffic noise has increased since the removal of trees on the opposite side of Carmel Road South, • inconsistency with Archeo-Environment Statement of Significance, • increased traffic and it's effect on congestion and air quality. <p>Questions are also raised about the level of engagement with the community and the level of supporting evidence provided.</p>	<p>In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.</p> <p>The level of engagement and evidence provided to support the plan will ultimately be tested by an independent inspector during the plan's examination in public.</p>	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Miss Clare Storey				DBDLP 764		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Stephen Scaife				DBDLP 715		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and potential loss of the site for recreational purposes.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mr Simon				DBDLP 743		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the following grounds:	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Oxley								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope and impact of the proposed development has significantly extended from the original proposal. Conflict with the recommendations of the Archeo Environment Statement of Significance. Grade II* Listed Perimeter Wall under threat Scoring system used to select the parklands for development is flawed. Future opportunities exist to reintegrate the Grange with its historic parkland. 	revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Ms Janice Oxley				DBDLP 747		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees and impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mr Adam Mather				DBDLP 755		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	<p>Objection is raised on the grounds of:</p> <p>lack of need for housing,</p> <p>housing should not outweigh the harm it causes,</p> <p>loss of parkland for recreation,</p> <p>loss of tranquility,</p>	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								brownfield sites would be more preferable to greenfield.		
Mr David Newsome				DBDLP 761		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees and potential impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mrs Janet Bradshaw				DBDLP 763		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and potential harm to wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mr David Ridley				DBDLP 766		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mr Ray Sims				DBDLP 773		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees and impact of increased traffic.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Helen Sims				DBDLP 774		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees and impact of increased traffic.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Ms Helen Lawton				DBDLP 638		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees, impact of increased traffic on pollution. Development of the site would also have a negative impact on peoples health and wellbeing.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Ms Janet Land				DBDLP 621		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	<p>Objection raised on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of green space, • lack of housing need, • potential impact on public rights of way, • loss of trees, • potential impact on wildlife habitats, • perceived financial gain. 	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b and 'Housing Requirement & Standard Method'	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Ms Rebecca Urwin				DBDLP 620		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees which in turn could exacerbate flooding and potential impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Margaret Holiday				DBDLP 813		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
J Shearn				DBDLP 866		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees and potential impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mrs J Thorns				DBDLP 867		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection on the grounds of lack of need for 'high end' housing.	<p>In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.</p> <p>The housing allocation statement for the site does not specify that the</p>	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									allocation should be for executive style housing. However, given the context of the surrounding area a low density scheme would be more appropriate and this has therefore been reflected in the site yield.	
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 912		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	'Possible concern' on the basis of impact on the strategic road network despite limited scale of development proposed. Particular impacts on A66 a concern owing to close proximity.	The Council will continue to liaise with Highways England on transport matters and in particular impact on the strategic highway network. Transport modelling work is ongoing to test highway mitigation schemes to ensure developments do not have an unacceptable impact on local and strategic highway network.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Ms Joanne Ashwood				DBDLP 939		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland and inconsistency with Archeo-Environment Statement of Significance.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Ms Karen Storey				DBDLP 943		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, impact on wildlife habitats and lack of housing need.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b. and 'Housing Requirement & Standard Method'	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mr Matthew Davidson-Hall				DBDLP 970		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees and impact of increased traffic. It is considered there are better sites available within the borough.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mr Bill Burrows				DBDLP 999		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection is raised on the grounds o loss of open space, potential impact on listed buildings, loss of trees and that the development density appears too high.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Ms Claire Urwin				DBDLP 1002		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees which in turn could exacerbate flooding and potential impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Mr Phil Urwin				DBDLP 1005		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees which in turn could exacerbate flooding and potential impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Miss Poppy				DBDLP 1007		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees which in turn could exacerbate flooding and potential impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
I Nesbitt				DBDLP 1008		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection on the grounds of loss of green space.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Irma Hillary				DBDLP 1009		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of historic parkland, loss of trees, potential impact on wildlife habitats and there is not considered to be a need for executive/'high end' housing.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Michael Hedley				DBDLP 1030		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of open space and trees.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
L Beadle				DBDLP 1034		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of green space and impact from increased traffic.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
P Nesbitt				DBDLP 1038		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of green space.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Redacted				DBDLP 1040		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the following grounds: there is insufficient existing parking for South Park, loss of trees has already harmed a key green gateway, loss of green space, opportunity to create more accessible car parking for the park, Blackwell could be a tourism asset, Blackwell has a lack of facilities or a defined centre, lower speed limits should be in place on the A66. In summary reduce the number of houses on the site and enhance the offer of the parkland.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b. Highways England are responsible for the operation of the A66 and if speed limits need to be lowered for safety reasons they have the power to impose necessary changes. It is the intention for the parkland to be restored and have improved public access.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1113		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Potential harm to Grade II* listed Blackwell Grange Hotel, some Grade II assets and the South Park registered Park and Garden and the West End Conservation Area should be given greater consideration to provide a robust assessment of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting to inform the suitability of sites for development and to ensure appropriate	The Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
								mitigation measures to minimise harm.	identified as part of this work have been included within the policy and/or supporting text. In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	
George Davidson-Hall				DBDLP 1274		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of trees and impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Samuel Davidson-Hall				DBDLP 1277		Site 9 - Blackwell Grange East	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of trees and impact on wildlife habitats.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.	In response to representations that highlighted the sensitivity of Site 009 relative to the land to the south of the site, it is proposed to be replaced with revised site 403. A plan of this change is available in Appendix 2b.
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1116		Site 11 - Cattle Mart	Object	Potential harm to Grade II* listed Bank Top Station should be given greater consideration to provide a robust assessment of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting to inform the suitability of sites for development and to ensure appropriate mitigation measures to minimise harm.	The Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of this work have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.	Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of the Heritage Impact Assessment have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.
Ms Emily	Historic England			DBDLP 1139		Site 95 - Beech Crescent	Object	Potential harm to Heighington Conservation Area and it's various heritage assets should be given greater consideration to	The Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those	Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of the Heritage Impact Assessment have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
Hrycan						East, Heighington		provide a robust assessment of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting to inform the suitability of sites for development and to ensure appropriate mitigation measures to minimise harm.	elements that contribute to the significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures identified as part of this work have been included within the policy and/or supporting text.	
Mr A Macnab	Middleton St George Parish Council			DBDLP 819		Site 375 - South of High Stell, MSG	Object	Objection raised to Site 375 on the grounds that it will lead to increased traffic congestion and create a safety hazard.	An initial assessment by the Council's Highway Engineer has raised issues with vehicle accessibility to this site. As such it has been decided to remove the proposed allocation from the Local Plan. However, the site is a logical extension to the village and therefore the site will remain within the proposed development limits of the village. As such, if access issues can be resolved in the future the site can be brought forward for development.	Remove site 375 South of High Stell from policy H 2, Appendix A Housing Trajectory, Appendix B Housing Allocation Statements and policies maps.
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 924		Site 375 - South of High Stell, MSG	Object	Site of possible concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A66.	An initial assessment by the Council's Highway Engineer has raised issues with vehicle accessibility to this site. As such it has been decided to remove the proposed allocation from the Local Plan. However, the site is a logical extension to the village and therefore the site will remain within the proposed development limits of the village. As such, if access issues can be resolved in the future the site can be brought forward for development. The Council will continue to liaise with Highways England on transport matters and in particular impact on the strategic highway network. Transport modelling work is ongoing to test highway mitigation schemes to ensure developments do not have an	Remove site 375 South of High Stell from policy H 2, Appendix A Housing Trajectory, Appendix B Housing Allocation Statements and policies maps.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change Recommended
									unacceptable impact on local and strategic highway network.	
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1093		Site 375 - South of High Stell, MSG	Neutral	<p>Support for inclusion of promoted site however consider the quantum of development proposed at the site should be greater than the 100 units in the draft plan.</p> <p>It is also requested that the Housing Allocation Statement be amended to be less prescriptive about access arrangements.</p>	<p>An initial assessment by the Council's Highway Engineer has raised issues with vehicle accessibility to this site. As such it has been decided to remove the proposed allocation from the Local Plan. However, the site is a logical extension to the village and therefore the site will remain within the proposed development limits of the village. As such, if access issues can be resolved in the future the site can be brought forward for development.</p>	Remove site 375 South of High Stell from policy H 2, Appendix A Housing Trajectory, Appendix B Housing Allocation Statements and policies maps.