

Skerningham Design Code SPD Summary of Key Issues Raised
Additional Consultation: December 2022 – January 2023

Relevant Part of Design Code	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Suggested Change
Pg. 8	Currently reads “including sustainable transport”.	Sustainable transport as priority for Garden Village	Add “prioritising sustainable transport”.
Pg. 9 Flow Diagram	Explain certain phases of the flow diagram in more detail (Strategic policy / Skerningham Garden Village Design Code / Developers masterplan / Parcel Codes / infrastructure Phasing Plan / Planning Application.)	Enhance clarity of phases in the Skerningham design Code Context	Add additional notes to each relevant phase of flow diagram.
Pg. 17	Strengthen aim to biodiversity net gain under Header 02. Innovation	Local Plan Policy requires Biodiversity net gain as mandatory	Change “aim to” to “must achieve” a biodiversity net gain.
Pg. 31	Strengthen the 20 min neighbourhood also in regards of local facilities	Reinforcement of 20 min neighbourhood	Add “Located to encourage 20-minute neighbourhood”.
Pg. 38	Lack of mention of Salters Lane historic Salt route in heritage section.	Omission in heritage section	Add reference to Salters Lane historic route on Pg. 38. Consider adding to key features map.
Pg 45 – Bullet 2	Guiding Design Principle on Skerningham local Distributor Road Bullet 2: Re impact on Skerningham Wood	Ensure wording is clear and concise	The road will be aligned to avoid existing wooded areas where possible. The road shall be aligned to avoid being visible from the River Skerne where possible.
Pg 45 – Bullet 6	Remove reference to ‘compact’ roundabout.	Technical Clarity	Delete “compact”.
Pg 46 – Bullet 6	DBC Highways concerned SDC currently states “These routes will be a maximum width of 6.3 metres”.	Typo – Design Code should state “up to 7.3 metres”.	Increase to “up to 7.3 metres”. Ensure distances in Fig. 39 & 40 are consistent.
Pg 46 – Bullet 6	DBC Highways concerned over reference to 2-2.5m wide lanes. 2 metres is a minimum standard.	Technical dimension Clarity	Remove 2m. Add “reduced carriage widths may be acceptable”.
Pg 47 – Bullet 4	Up to 5.5m for Secondary Village Streets	Technical dimension requirement	Add “up to” and ensure consistent distances in in Fig. 39 & 40

APPENDIX 1

Relevant Part of Design Code	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Suggested Change
Pg. 49 – Bullet 1	Currently just says within 5 minutes walking distance of a bus stop.	400m Local Plan Policy technical dimension	Add “(400 metres)”.
Pg. 49	Remove “Measures to include:”	Consistency	Change subheading “Measures to include:” to “Guiding Design Principles”
Pg 52 – Para 6	“(due to be updated 2021/2022)”.	Out of date reference	Delete time period (2021/2022)”.
Pg. 54 – Bullet 4	Detail locally sourced and native sourced species	Include local planting types	Change to “Planting to be predominately native, and of locally sourced species wherever possible. This could include wildflowers and use a wildlife/pollinator friendly mix.
Pg. 59	Remove Key design	Consistency	Change heading “Key Design Principles” to “Guiding Design Principles”.
Pg. 65	Explain location of “Rurban Fringe in diagram”	Show location in diagram w	Add: a frame to explain location of the Rurban Fringe into diagram
Pg. 74		Consistency	Change name of section to “Homes & Buildings”.
Pg. 84 Character Area introduction and explanation	Clarify in introduction to Character areas how those have been identified and show which character areas will be developed	Enhance detail and clarify	Add” Within this large site some Character Areas will not be subject to physical development. 4 Character areas are unlikely to be developed at all; 3 are unlikely to be developed within the plan period; which leaves 3 Character Areas which will be subject to physical development in the short to medium term. Public engagement was also used to identify these Character Areas.
Pg. 94 – Map 6.2.	Inconsistencies in Skerningham Woods Character Area 6.2. boundaries.	Clarity and Consistency	Amend Skerningham Woods Character Area Boundaries:

APPENDIX 1

Relevant Part of Design Code	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Suggested Change
			<p>1) Amended boundary west and north different kind of yellow than rest.</p> <p>2) South-eastern end of Skerningham Woods Character Area has rogue area visible sticking out into Skerningham East Character Area.</p>
Pg. 94 - Nature	Reinforce potential burial sites with an own sentence under the nature section	Strengthen Burial sites sensitive consideration	At end of Nature Section add "Any burial sites that may be present should be sensitively considered"
Pg. 98 – Para. 2	Add the Historic Salters lane Route and add its heritage value in Movement section	Consistency and added detail	<p>Change to "...and the historic Salters Lane route runs along the southwest boundary of the site".</p> <p>Add "...and its heritage value".</p>
Pg 102 – Map 6.6.	Character Area 6.6. Skerningham Lane East boundary is not correct	Accuracy of boundaries needs to be ensured	Skerningham Lane East (the shown area overlaps with Skerningham Woods 6.2. North West boundary has to be shifted southwards to avoid Skerningham Woods.
Pg 103 – Para 8	Sentence cut off at "accessible to the existing..."	Document format needs altering to reveal following text.	Last paragraph missing end of sentence (layout mistake) should end as: initially be accessible to the existing "public transport provision
Pg. 104 – Para. 4.	Design Code does not acknowledge Barmpton Rural Gap	Consistency with local plan policy	Add "and maintain the Barmpton Rural Gap"
Pg. 106 – Para. 3.	Design Code does not acknowledge Barmpton Rural Gap	Consistency with local plan policy	Add "and partly within the Barmpton Rural Gap".
Pg. 108	6.8. Barmpton Lane Character Area needs to reflect 6.2 Skerningham Lane East wording on access	Correct inconsistency between Pg. 102 & 108	Adjust to "Bampton Lane and/or Bishopton Lane".

APPENDIX 1

Relevant Part of Design Code	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Suggested Change
Pg. 110 – Built Form	Lack of mention of Great Burdon Rural Gap.	Consistency with local plan policy	Add “Maintain the Great Burdon Rural Gap”.
Pg 118 Design Quality Coding Checklist (DQCC) Introduction	State the mandatory nature of development proposals fulfilling Guiding Design Principles	Stress the mandatory requirements of the Design Code	Add” The following DQCC is the summary assessment sheet of all the Guiding Design principles in the Skerningham Design Code. Development proposals that follow this checklist will help deliver the vision,”
Pg. 119- 129 – Design Quality Coding Checklist	Ensure that Checklist follows the Guiding Design principles from Section 4.0. Strategic Toolkit and amend wordings	Consistency	Change format of table and ensure Coding Checklist to match all Guiding Design Principles in Sect 4.0.
Pg. 169	Amend widths to follow Guiding Design principle	Consistency	Update road widths to be consistent with changes to pgs. 45 -46 47.

2) No changes considered:

Darlington Football Club Stadium	Inclusion of potential Darlington FC Stadium in Design Code	Not Relevant as location and feasibility is not confirmed	No
Ketton Bridge	Inclusion of Ketton Bridge in Design Code as an Heritage feature	Is outside the Local Plan allocation and therefore will not be impacted by the development.	No
Graves	Inclusion of location of graves in Design Code	Graves area is not affected by potential development.	No
Drive through Hot Food Takeaways	Exclusion of Drive Through Hot food takeaways in Design Code.	Policy is clear on Drive through Hot food takeaways	No
Barmpton Lane	Inclusion of Barmpton Lane as an access road	DBC Highway Local Planning Authority refers to detailed Local Plan Policy	No
Distributor Road Speed Limit	Requests that Distributor Road has a 30mph Speed Limit.	Transport requirement based on Highways Planning Authority	No