

APPENDIX 4

Comments Not 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
Hannah Bevens	Consultant Town Planner National Grid			DBDLP 129		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	No comment to the consultation after review.	No comments received	No change recommended
Gordon Pybus	Darlington Association on Disability			DBDLP 251		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Accessibility statement required for plan.	Will be included as part of the Equality Impact Assessment of the plan.	No change recommended
Mrs P Burlton				DBDLP 430		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Object	Object to the plan on numerous issues relating to Heritage and history of Darlington will be eroded.	General objection to the plan as a whole and its impact on heritage. Protection to heritage assets provided elsewhere in the plan and in national policy.	No changes recommended
Catrina Holland				DBDLP 436		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Support	Ticked box for support	Support noted	No change recommended
Mrs jane parsons				DBDLP 442		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation	Support	Support for Site 103 Roundhill Road East (Phase1) in Hurworth and the set limit for development in next 20 years	Support of the Plan in relation to 20 year impact in Hurworth noted	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
						Draft June 2018				
Mr Michael Burlton				DBDLP 521		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Object	Object to the plan and specified site not identified due to heritage and historical reasons	Objection to plan noted / Site mentioned not referenced in detail	No change recommended
Mr Neil Campling	Secretary Central Community Partnership			DBDLP 547		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	<p>Plan could be further enhanced by integrating a Neighbourhood Policy N1 to the Draft Plan:</p> <p>1. Identifying Urban neighbourhoods and purpose including a thresh hold of development</p> <p>"Development proposals, even if they are in accordance with other plan policies, will not be permitted if they cannot demonstrate that the neighbourhood within which the proposal is located is sustained or improved"</p>	<p>Suggestion for neighbourhood policy noted</p> <p>Neighbourhood plan background is included in Sec 1.7.1 and 1.7.2 Neighbourhoods are not defined in the Local Plan but should be taken into consideration in terms of Vision Aims and Objective 4.) Create Cohesive Proud & Healthy communities.</p>	No change recommended
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council			DBDLP 726		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Support	SBC is supportive of the Draft local plan and is committed to discuss other development issues further through the next steps of the LDS.	Support noted	No change recommended
Joanne Harding	Home Builders Federation			DBDLP 808		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Object	Draft Plan has not considered the whole plan Viability and infrastructure requirement so is lacking evidence.	The Draft Plan stage is not the time to produce all evidence. The Submission Stage will include those documents.	No change recommended
Miss Jennifer	Project Secretary			DBDLP 869		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan	Support	Complete representation on different subjects attached as original response	Noted	No changes recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Earnshaw	Banks Property					2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018				
Amy ward	Planning Manager Barratt Homes			DBDLP 1016		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Whole plan viability missing at this stage	Will be included with Submission Plan	No change recommended
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1036		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Figures used in the Draft Local Plan are illegible.	Images are compressed in some PDF download versions.	No change recommended
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1037		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Hope that comments will be taken up by Council to amend Draft Local Plan. Offer to discuss any representation of the LCMPC	Comments made on specific areas of the plan have been considered.	No change recommended
Nick McLellan	Story Homes			DBDLP 1042		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Support	Support of the Draft local Plan.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1047		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Welcomes opportunity to comment at this stage but: In setting out comments below, Durham County Council would welcome further discussions on the issues raised as our evidence base develops and prior to the next stage of policy development.	Durham Council will continue to be actively engaged in the plan development process as a duty to cooperate body.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Derek Dodwell	Darlington Association of Parish Councils			DBDLP 1063		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	DAPC submitted a host of comments on the Settlement Hierarchy and individual PC will address local issues	Specific comments dealt with in relevant areas.	No change recommended
Ms Michelle Saunders	North Yorkshire County Council			DBDLP 1069		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	The County Council welcomes the opportunity to provide comments on the document and considers this part of the duty to cooperate. As a neighbouring authority our principle interests related to strategic cross boundary issues, as an upper tier authority, principally infrastructure.	Seen as duty to co-operate / Most issues are related to infrastructure	No change recommended
Ms Michelle Saunders	North Yorkshire County Council			DBDLP 1072		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Future discussions with NYCC welcome	Noted	No change recommended
Ms Melanie Lindsley	The Coal Authority			DBDLP 1073		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Darlington Council area contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. These resources cover an area amounting to approximately 2.33% of the Darlington area. Within the Darlington Council area there are approximately 11 recorded mine entries. However, it is important to note that land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on new development; rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable. <u>As The Coal Authority owns the coal and coal mine entries on behalf of the</u>	Comments noted and a minor impact on Darlington Borough. Land stability issues are also considered in greater detail at application stage.	No Change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>state, if a development is to intersect <u>the ground then specific written permission of The Coal Authority may be required.</u></p> <p>Discussions on individual development sites welcome.</p>		
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1076		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	General introduction to overall submission of Gladmans	Specific submission are further dealt with in detailed sections responses.	No change recommended
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1175		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Full representation of Persimmon Homes attached	Subject matters divided up to relevance to different consultation points	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 1236		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Summary of FOE comments submitted individually on Objective by David Phillips	Summary noted and taken up on individual subjects of the plan	No change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 1234		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Summary paper of Dr Holroyd	Comments considered in detailed sections	No change recommended
Mr G Raistrick		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1237		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Object	Summary of Mr G Raistrick submission: Each Section of the Draft Local Plan will be considered in turn and all paragraph numbers referred to relate to paragraphs of that document, unless otherwise stated.	All representations are allocated to detailed sections in plan	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1201		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Object	<p>Importance of DTVA as an economic Driver requires a separate chapter in Vision inclusion in key diagram and Policy map. In light of the above, to ensure the draft Plan, is sound DTVAL considers that the following broad modifications are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Chapter 2: Vision, Aims, and Objections’ should be revised and a specific reference should be added to highlight the importance of DTVA and the role that it plays as an economic driver for the sub-region, and how draft Plan should seek to support the growth of the Airport and its employment generating uses. • The draft Key Diagram should be revised to identify the Airport ‘key strategic location’ for growth during the Plan period. • The draft Plan should include a specific Airport policy, which will promote employment generating uses at the Airport during the Plan period – see Matter 4 for further detail on the scope of this policy. This will include outlining the Airport as a Strategic Growth Location (see Appendix 1) on Policies Map. 	The Airport has only recently being acquired by the Tees valley Combined Authority. The Local Authority will continue to work with the airport to explore its economical aspirations. The Plan does recognise the economic growth of the airport with employment land to the north and an employment allocation to the south.	No change recommended
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1189		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation	Neutral	Summary of responses by Turley Associates for DTVA and Peel Holding	Overall neutral on the Plan detailed issues are allocated to distinct chapters	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
						Draft June 2018				
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1299		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Government has published its updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) during the consultation period on the emerging Local Plan. For the avoidance of doubt, all references to the Framework in these representations relate to the July 2018 Framework, unless specifically stated otherwise.	Comments noted	No change recommended
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1300		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Object	Raise concerns with the Local Plan viability, ability to deliver the predicted housing numbers from the proposed allocations, and consequently the need to allocate further land over the plan period. Without these matters being addressed, the Local Plan is not based on an 'appropriate strategy' to deliver the proposed Vision.	Viability for the whole plan is part of the submission draft	No change recommended
Thoroton and Croft Estate		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1252		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Support	Strong overall support for the whole plan / notes of issues with interpretation of Plan with the new NPPF 2018 and submission date.	Support noted	No change recommended
	Church Commissioners for England (CCE)	Ms Lucie Jowett	Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1152		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Reasons for Barton Willmore to act for Church Commission for England on a Site specific issue	General Comments noted and Site specific issues considered for Site 100 later in sections.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1324		Darlington Borough Draft Local Plan 2016-2036 Consultation Draft June 2018	Neutral	Summary of representation attached and taken over into detailed section based comments.	Comments noted	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 882	1	INTRODUCTION	Neutral	Summary of purpose of Introduction	Noted	No change recommended.
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1302	1	INTRODUCTION	Neutral	Various documents is supported in the preparation of the emerging Local Plan, however, the Council must be careful not to place too much reliance on the delivery of strategic sites	Comments noted	No change recommended
Dr.- Ing. Jochen Werres				DBDLP 20	1.0.1	Paragraph	Neutral	What is the relevance of the Core Strategy 2011?	Some points of core strategy have been updated but this is new plan and would replace the core strategy and any saved policies from the previous local plan.	No change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 767	1.0.3	Paragraph	Object	statement as it defies logic / economic growth and sustainability don't go together	Growth can be developed in a sustainable manner which for example reduces the need for motorised travel. The Plan needs to be supported by a Sustainability Appraisal which questions the sustainability of sites and policies. It is accepted that not every proposal or allocation would be sustainable but it is about providing a balance.	No change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 778	1.0.3	Paragraph	Neutral	How do you measure sustainable carrying capacity calculated for the Darlington area Growth is not sustainable: what is the maximum planned size of Darlington above which the town must not grow in order to be able to have enough local resources to supply the population of the Borough	Sustainable capacity not mentioned in text. I refer to sustainability appraisal. We believe the sustainability appraisal is robust and can be defended at Examination.	No change recommended
Gerald Lee	Heighington and Coniscliffe Councillor			DBDLP 259	Figure 1.2	Stages of Preparation of of the Local Plan	Object	Village Engagement 2017 in Heighington was not consultation in the true sense of the word. Meeting for vision of village mainly constituted of professionals and the developers. Consultation therefore with the people that matter i.e. local Heighington residents and their Parish Council was non-existent.	Although not part of the formal consultation process these events were additional targeted events to enable village communities the opportunity to contribute to the Draft Plan before it's formal consultation.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Andrew Ward				DBDLP 194	1.0.4	Paragraph	Object	Policy Plan should cover Flood zones from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	SFRA is evidence produced for the submission Plan. Flood risk and findings from the SFRA have been taken account of in the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal for each of the individual allocated sites of the Draft Plan	No change recommended
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 503	1.0.4	Paragraph	Object	The OS Policy map should be overlaid with recent evidence of flooding.	Flood zones will not be overlaid on the policies map as this is a planning constraint. Flood zones have been considered in the allocation of sites via the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. Flood zone data will be available in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which will be available with the Submission Draft.	No change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 768	1.0.4	Paragraph	Object	Draft Local Plan site maps must be overlaid with evidence flood risk from rivers, reservoirs and surface water flooding. Proper consultation cannot be achieved, until the relevant flood maps are produced and supplied.	Flood zones will not be overlaid on the policies map as this is a planning constraint and not a policy proposal. Flood zones have been considered in the allocation of sites via the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal. Flood zone data will be available in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which will be available with the Submission Draft.	No change recommended
Mr Geoffrey Crute	Councillor Neasham Parish Council			DBDLP 377	1.0.6	Paragraph	Support	Explanation of background of Neasham Parish Councils response and that individuals will respond individually.	Comment noted	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 883		Context	Neutral	Summary of Context of Draft Local Plan and remit of HE to comment on SRN	Comments Noted	No change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 769	1.2.2	Paragraph	Neutral	It should always be weighed up whether growth is a positive for the town and what the potential impact is on existing residents particularly in relation to loss of green space, traffic congestion etc.	The Community Strategy advocates positive growth for Darlington and it is a key aim of the plan to keep Darlington as an attractive place to live, work and invest. A range of policies are proposed within the plan to afford environmental protection.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Miss Lucy Blakemore				DBDLP 10	1.2.4	Paragraph	Neutral	What are the links between Community Strategy objectives to the Local Plan / A place designed to thrive	Identifies areas to grow revive and regenerate	No change recommended
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 174	1.2.4	Paragraph	Object	To give children the best start in life It is difficult to see how the council is supporting this objective	This is an aim of the Community Strategy and will be achieved through numerous interventions throughout the councils activities. A lot of sites proposed for development are not publicly accessible anyway and most will provide new accessible greenspaces, walking routes, cycleways etc.	No change recommended
b everington				DBDLP 270	1.2.4	Paragraph	Object	Fail to see how this statement can possibly be fulfilled when allowing building on greenfield sites and parkland which is what creates a "healthy and independent" population.	This is an aim of the Community Strategy and will be achieved through numerous interventions throughout the councils activities. A lot of sites proposed for development are not publicly accessible anyway and most will provide new accessible greenspaces, walking routes, cycleways etc.	No change recommended
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 239	1.2.4	Paragraph	Object	Re Objective: more people to care for the environment Community Plan priority not followed in Local Plan allocations	This is an aim of the Community Strategy and will be achieved through numerous interventions throughout the councils activities. A lot of sites proposed for development are not publicly accessible anyway and most will provide new accessible greenspaces, walking routes, cycleways etc.	No change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 770	1.2.4	Paragraph	Neutral	Some outcomes from Community Strategy questioned (Health and Environment)	Comments noted but Community Strategy outcomes remain valid as a document.	No change recommended
Dr Andrew Newens				DBDLP 160	1.2.5	Paragraph	Support	Re-Use of Brownfield sites in Town Centre Fringe and Town Centre before Greenfield sites at edge of the town.	Comments noted	No change recommended
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 175	1.2.5	Paragraph	Support	Brown field areas should be used before considering the use of green belt areas.	Support noted	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 505	1.2.5	Paragraph	Object	The plan should provide a 'brown field only' solution proposal, one which would allow the existing greenbelt to remain intact and instead promote the development of existing sites only.	The plan consists of approaches to both greenfield and brownfield solutions. Some Brownfield sites are deemed currently unviable.	No change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 771	1.2.5	Paragraph	Neutral	Agreement with the redevelopment of brownfield sites - this development must be carried out first to provide high-quality and high density eco-home car-free developments close to town with good walking, cycle and public transport links	Comments noted	No change recommended
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 831	1.2.5	Paragraph	Support	Support of Growth Strategy for Darlington locations in 1.2.5.	Support noted	No change recommended
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1303		Sustainable Economic Growth	Support	Target of sustainable growth with target of 7000 jobs supported	Support noted	No change recommended
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 784	1.3.1	Paragraph	Support	Hellens support ambition to economic growth via the Local Plan and its relevant Economic Strategies	Support noted	No change recommended
Miss Lucy Blakemore				DBDLP 11	1.3.2	Paragraph	Neutral	Are new houses really needed / Can quality of life be increased by regeneration of existing areas	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 53	1.3.2	Paragraph	Object	Housing need questioned	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended in this section
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 506	1.3.2	Paragraph	Object	Demand for houses to high as documented by falling school figures and low birth rates.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mrs Laura Roberts	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 724	1.3.2	Paragraph	Neutral	No opinion growth rates	Comments noted	No change recommended
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 785	1.3.2	Paragraph	Support	Support for house building as well as a source for jobs. Support for the Darlington Employment Needs Report Sep 2017.	Support noted	No change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 775	1.3.2	Paragraph	Object	Housing need disputed. Social, economic and environmental damage.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. Environmental, economic and social impacts of development have been considered via the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.	No change recommended
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1176	1.3.2	Paragraph	Support	Support of 10000 new homes over plan period	Support noted	No change recommended
Dr Andrew Newens				DBDLP 161	1.3.3	Paragraph	Support	Brownfield sites in Town Centre near locations favoured	Support noted	No change recommended
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 786	1.3.3	Paragraph	Support	Hellens Land fully supports the Local Plan's recognition of <i>the "contribution that housebuilding makes to the local economy"</i> and <i>the 7000 jobs</i>	Support noted	No change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 777	1.3.3	Paragraph	Object	Evidence that building more homes will support 7000 jobs creates	The evidence that supports the 7,000 is found in the Employment Land review, published as background evidence. It must be remembered that 500 young people remain in NETS so any employment could be considered better than none, whilst we would always want to attract good quality employers.	No change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 780	1.3.4	Paragraph	Neutral	Town Centre facilities and amenities such as library should be included	Heritage assets are protected by national legislation and other policies within the Local Plan. The council has announced it's intention to retain the library function at Crown Street.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 873	1.3.4	Paragraph	Neutral	Assembled ideas to support and enhance Town Centre	The measures identified are all supportable but are not Local Plan matters but more an issue for Council investment opportunities or a Town Centre Strategy. It must be remembered the Local Plan is a land use document and cannot solve all the ills.	No change recommended
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 176	1.3.5	Paragraph	Object	Need for improvement of A1155 Harrowgate Hill / Whinfield	Not relevant for this section but concerns noted and the Submission Draft of the local plan will be supported by detailed highway modeling work.	No change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 874	1.4.1	Paragraph	Object	Covenant of Mayors requirements not taken up	It is not a policy or a plan and should not focus here as a key document for the Local Plan preparation it is taking into account in other sections in terms of outcome and ambitions (Physical Infrastructure IN 9 / ENV 7 / DC 1)	No change recommended
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1062		Duty to Co-operate	Neutral	Both councils can successfully demonstrate to the Planning Inspectorate that the duty to co-operate test has been met.	Comment noted	No change recommended
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1209		Duty to Co-operate	Object	<p>Consistency of approach for DTVA with Stockton Borough Council.</p> <p>To address this issue, DTVAL would like to work with the Councils to agree a specific Airport-related policy, which is broadly similar to the one included within emerging Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan.</p>	<p>Stockton-on-Tees and Darlington Boroughs both signed a statement of common ground in advance of the examination into the draft Stockton on Tees Local Plan that agreed that; 'both Local Plans should;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the ongoing use of the regional airport and related uses; • Recognise the employment allocations at the airport in line with planning permissions and the airports masterplan.' <p>Both plans including the DBC Draft Plan in our view follow this set out aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the ongoing use of the regional airport and related uses; • Recognise the employment allocations at the airport in line with 	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>planning permissions and the airports masterplan.</p> <p>The airport has recently been acquired by the Tees Valley Combined Authority and the future plans are at present uncertain but the Plan does support the employment opportunities at the airport</p>	
Dr Andrew Newens				DBDLP 162	1.5.2	Paragraph	Support	Duty to Cooperate with County Durham rather than TVCA	Support noted and Durham key partner	No change recommended
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 54	1.6.1	Paragraph	Object	Too many greenspaces included in allocations.	Please see officer response on Housing matters relating to 'Brownfield Sites, Urban Sprawl and Empty Homes'.	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 202	1.6.1	Paragraph	Neutral	<p>Darlington Friends of the Earth is pleased that the Council's Local Plan recognises that greenspace is good for our well-being, yet many of these green spaces are being developed or are earmarked for development.</p> <p>Darlington Friends of the Earth would like the council to develop brownfield sites before green field sites.</p>	Please see officer response on Housing matters relating to 'Brownfield Sites, Urban Sprawl and Empty Homes'.	No change recommended
Mr Royston Mann				DBDLP 304	1.6.1	Paragraph	Support	Green spaces have great benefit for health and wellbeing	Support for greenspaces noted	No change recommended
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 510	1.6.1	Paragraph	Object	Plan Proposals ignore natural Green spaces and aims set out in 1.6.1.	Please see officer response on Housing matters relating to 'Brownfield Sites, Urban Sprawl and Empty Homes'.	No change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony				DBDLP 876	1.6.1	Paragraph	Support	Green space and tree impact on health and wellbeing	Support noted	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Holroyd										
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 877	1.6.2	Paragraph	Support	Slow and sustainable transport should be a preference and also an approach for health and wellbeing.	Support noted and predominantly reflected in the approach to sustainable transport in Section 10.	No change recommended
Canon Chris Beales				DBDLP 343	1.6.3	Paragraph	Support	Support of Healthy New Towns principles in Plan	Support Noted	No change recommended
Dr Andrew Newens				DBDLP 163		Neighbourhood Planning	Object	<p>Attempts to increase sustainable transport solutions have been limited. Disappointed with the lack of cycling schemes and the bias shown towards the private car.</p> <p>The replacement traffic light junction at St Cuthberts Way is not safe for cyclists (turning left onto Parkgate).</p> <p>The ring road acts as a concrete noose on the town and should be addressed.</p> <p>Surface car parks should be removed with fewer multi story car parks.</p>	<p>Cycling provision is encouraged in all developments as part of the plan including provision of new routes, enhancement of existing and providing improved connections.</p> <p>Safety concerns with existing highway layouts are considered outside of the Local Plan by the Highway Authority.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the inner ring road does create a substantial barrier. The Town Centre Fringe Masterplan has looked opportunities to lessen the effect.</p> <p>Convenient Town Centre Parking remains a key part of the Town Centre Strategy however a number of surface car parks have been removed to make better use of the land.</p>	No change recommended
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1017		Neighbourhood Planning	Neutral	When developing the Local Plan the Council should fully consider the emerging neighbourhood plans, where they are suitably advanced, including the Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Neighbourhood Plan.	The status of the Coniscliffe and Merrybent Neighbourhood Plan is noted.	No change recommended.
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1018		Neighbourhood Planning	Object	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council consider the that the Local Plan should give more recognition of the role of neighbourhood plans as part of the development plan.	Neighbourhood Plans will be given appropriate recognition as specified by the National Planning Policy Framework.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mrs/Dr Bryony Holroyd				DBDLP 878	1.8.1	Paragraph	Object	The presumption is only in favour of sustainable development: If the development would not be sustainable without the necessary restrictions / obligations then the development must not take place, and it is therefore correct that it should not be viable.	As noted, it must be demonstrated that a development proposal is sustainable, under the terms set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, in order for the presumption to apply. as stated the presumption. However, viability in this section of the Local plan refers to development being financially viable and thereby deliverable from a commercial point of view.	No change recommended.
Canon Chris Beales				DBDLP 355	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Support	Broad vision for Darlington welcomed. It is essential to be equipping young people with skills which will become relevant to "tomorrow". Community building will be important - education and healthcare should be integrated into new communities and not just left as separately provided, often in existing locations which are not integral to a new community.	Support and comments noted.	No change recommended.
Mrs Laura Roberts	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 725	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Support	We support the overarching aims and objectives of Darlington Borough Council contained within the draft plan, and we will look to work with the council any way in which we can to help support the delivery of the vision for the Borough. We are particularly pleased to note objective 5, which aims to protect and enhance the natural environment. We believe that any planning document spanning a considerable length of time should aim to mitigate and reduce the potential flood risk, particularly as the effects of climate change will be realised within the duration of the plan.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Christopher	Highways England			DBDLP 884	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Neutral	Highways England's primary interest in this document will be how DBC will meet its housing needs of providing at least 10,000 new homes and the	Comments noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Bell								economic growth of 7,000 jobs and how this affects the potential for impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN). Our concern remains the safe and functional operation of the SRN and therefore an assessment of the proposed sites for housing allocation will be undertaken within this note.		
Amy ward	Planning Manager Barratt Homes			DBDLP 1001	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Support	Support the aims of the local plan to meet housing needs, maintain a five year land supply and have a portfolio of sites. Support the aspiration to identify a range of previously developed land and greenfield sites.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1020	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Object	The vision of the draft DBLP is supported, as is the specific recognition within paragraph 4.0.9 that: 'the Borough's villages and countryside are an integral part of what makes Darlington an attractive place to live. Their vitality and viability need to be safeguarded and strengthened'. However, LCMPC submit that a number of policies and proposals within the plan will not support the delivery of the vision. LCMPC object to the level of housing development proposed and the two strategic housing proposals at Coniscliffe Park. LCMPC consider these proposals will result in a loss of identity of the villages of Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent and have a significant impact on the natural environment.	Support for the vision noted. Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1210	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Object	Modify Objective 1c to include DTVA as an example of a key economic driver.	It is not considered necessary to include specific examples of economic drivers in Objective 1c.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1177	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Support	<p>Persimmon Homes are generally supportive of Local Plan vision, along with the aims of delivering at least 10,000 new homes and maintaining a 5 year land supply.</p> <p>The council is commended for seeking to achieve housing growth in excess of the OAN generated by the Standard Methodology which Persimmon Homes agrees generates an OAN far too low to support the economic growth ambitions of the council.</p>	Support noted and agreed. Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1128	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Support	<p>Generally support the vision and strongly support the aim to meet housing needs for the Borough.</p> <p>Also support the need for “A Well Connected Borough” with development located in sustainable locations with good access to services and facilities, helping to “Create Cohesive, Proud & Healthy Communities”.</p>	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr G Raistrick		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1238	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Support	The Local Plan Vision is generally supported. Strongly support the aims and objectives relating to meeting housing needs, having a portfolio of sites, creating a well connected borough and creating cohesive, proud and healthy communities.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Steven Longstaff		DBDLP 1229	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Support	Taylor Wimpey is supportive of Aims and Objectives	Support noted.	No change recommended
Thoroton and Croft Estate		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1254	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Support	The Local Plan Vision is generally supported. Strongly support the aims and objectives relating to meeting housing needs, having a portfolio of sites and creating cohesive, proud and healthy communities.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
	Church Commissioner	Ms Lucie	Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1153	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Support	General support for the proposed vision, however, further emphasis should be placed on the commitment to	General support for the vision and aims noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
	s for England (CCE)	Jowett						<p>provide a variety of house types and sizes through the delivery of much needed new homes in sustainable locations. This is particularly important given the past undersupply of housing that has been recorded in the Borough.</p> <p>In light of this we advocate the following points added to the vision which state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan will seek to boost significantly the supply of housing within the Borough; ensuring that housing need can be sufficiently met over the plan period and that an appropriate balance between jobs and new homes is achieved. • That growth is focussed on sustainable locations within the Borough including logical extensions to the existing urban area. <p>Most recent data shows that the Council has issues of previous low levels of housing supply. Therefore, to realise this objective throughout the new plan period, the Council must tackle these issues. Without a consistent and robust approach, the objectives can be regarded as unsound for being ineffective and inconsistent with national policy as the Local Plan will be in direct conflict with the clear aspirations of national policy and will undermine the delivery of the overarching vision.</p> <p>The aims do not specifically refer to the delivery of housing and as a result, these are considered to be unsound for being ineffective and not consistent with national policy.</p>	<p>It is considered that Aim 2 and its associated objectives sufficiently cover the points raised.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>The first overarching aim refers to the delivery of sustainable development to meet the Borough's needs, this statement incorporates housing needs along with other land use requirements over the plan period.</p>	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
	Godolphin Developments Ltd	Ms Jennifer Nye	Lichfields	DBDLP 1260	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Neutral	<p>Support the vision for the Local Plan.</p> <p>The objective to diversify the rural economy to support businesses and existing communities, while also protecting the Borough's valued open countryside is supported.</p> <p>An objective which specifically refers to housing in rural areas to meet identified local needs should be included.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Aim 2: Meeting Housing Needs, and its associated objectives, also encompasses the needs of rural areas.</p>	No change recommended.
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1304	2	VISIONS, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	Support	<p>The Local Plan vision and aims are appropriately ambitious and are supported.</p> <p>The first aim refers to the realisation of 6,000 new jobs over the plan period. In accordance with the introduction, and later policies in the plan, this figure should be clarified as 7,000 net additional jobs over the plan period.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The first Local Plan aim refers to the target of 7,000 new jobs.</p>	No change recommended.
Simon Bainbridge				DBDLP 397	2.0.1	Paragraph	Support	I support the production of a Local Plan as it is important for the town to have formal planning to prevent speculative, unplanned detrimental development.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Miss Madeleine Sutcliffe				DBDLP 394	2.0.1	Paragraph	Support	<p>The council isn't moving in the right direction to preserve the best aspects of Darlington and to enhance its infrastructure to make the town a pleasant place in which to live, work and play. The town centre is in desperate need of revival.</p> <p>Convert upper storeys of larger and historic ex-stores buildings into apartments, and divide up larger buildings into smaller, unique retail units of the kind people want to browse and buy from.</p>	<p>Town centres around the country are facing a number of challenges such as the growth of online shopping, pressure from out of centre retailing and supermarkets, and reduced town centre footfall. However, the nature of town centres are changing and adapting to these pressures becoming more of a mixed shopping and leisure destination, with an increase in other land uses including residential and office use increasing activity in centres throughout the day.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan has been prepared to support the Local Plan that identifies</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									infrastructure required to support new development. Policy IN 10 provides protection to existing community facilities in the borough.	
Canon Chris Beales				DBDLP 344	2.0.1	Paragraph	Support	Support the Local Plan Vision. Aims 4 and 6 need linking more. Objective 4g talks about healthier houses but 6 does not mention designing them in ways which are eco-friendly. New schools built in new communities can serve as more than just places to educate children. They can serve as community hubs and create healthier communities. Developments should not just be left to housebuilders who produce, in many cases across the country, similar (cramped and often unattractive) new estates with no community facilities and not enough green space.	Support and comments noted. Aim 6 encourages energy and water efficient design in new development, this includes housing.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 578	2.0.1	Paragraph	Support	CPRE supports the vision but questions if the council can deliver the vision and its objectives. The underlying vision for the Plan is that Darlington should be “perfectly placed” given its transport connections, character as a market town, railway and Quaker heritage.	Support and comments noted.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 579	2.0.1	Paragraph	Object	Concerned that the scale of housing growth proposed as urban extensions to Darlington will destroy its attractive and distinctive market town character.	Objection noted. In line with the NPPF, the Council has sought to make effective use of land in prioritising the development of previously developed land where it is suitable and viable to do so. In selecting allocation sites on the urban edge, the Council has sought to avoid areas of highest landscape, environmental and agricultural value as considered in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal. Policies contained in the emerging Local Plan will	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									minimise the impact of new development on the market town character of Darlington.	
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 350	2.0.1	Paragraph	Support	We recognise there needs to be ordered development within the town.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 661	2.0.1	Paragraph	Neutral	Some reference to health outcomes and narrowing the gap would be a useful adjunct to the Local Plan Vision.	Comment noted. Aim 4 of the Local Plan relates to creating cohesive, proud and healthy communities with a number of associated objectives aimed at improving health and reducing inequalities.	No change recommended.
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 832	2.0.1	Paragraph	Support	Support the vision for the Local Plan and role Skerningham plays in its delivery.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 850	2.0.1	Paragraph	Support	Welcome and support the vision for the Local Plan including that development be supported by new and improved infrastructure and community facilities.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Irene Ord	Listed Property Owner			DBDLP 863	2.0.1	Paragraph	Neutral	<p>Planning conditions must be robustly used and carefully monitored to protect and sustain conservation areas, designated assets and their supportive settings.</p> <p>Can the public have confidence that the local authority has the capacity, expertise and resources to scrutinise and monitor all of the projects they are proposing to move forward?</p> <p>Where is the evidence that Historic England's Best Practice Advice &</p>	<p>Comments and concerns noted.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan contains a range of local planning policies that will guide the type, location and design of new developments across the borough, including controlling the impact of development on heritage assets and their setting. Planning conditions will be used, where necessary, enhance the quality of developments and mitigate potential adverse impacts.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken an evaluation of the likely impact of proposed allocation sites on those elements that contribute to the</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								Guidance will be robustly used to assess the potential impact of developments on heritage assets? The proposed for a local asset record (Appendix C) is commendable but will the system be adequately supported?	significance of heritage assets, including their settings, as part of a heritage impact assessment.	
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1101	2.0.1	Paragraph	Support	We welcome the inclusion of the historic environment in the vision for Darlington Borough.	Support noted.	No Change recommended.
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1325	2.0.1	Paragraph	Neutral	General support for the proposed vision, however, further emphasis should be placed on the commitment to provide a variety of house types and sizes through the delivery of much needed new homes in sustainable locations. This is particularly important given the past undersupply of housing that has been recorded in the Borough. In light of this we advocate the following points added to the vision which state: • The Local Plan will seek to boost significantly the supply of housing within the Borough; ensuring that housing need can be sufficiently met over the plan period and that an appropriate balance between jobs and new homes is achieved. • That growth is focussed on sustainable locations within the Borough including logical extensions to the existing urban area.	Support for the vision noted. It is considered that Aim 2 and its associated objectives sufficiently cover the points raised. Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Miss Lucy Blakemore				DBDLP 12	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	Support the Local Plan aims. However, how will you balance the retention of Darlington as a historic market town and the creation of modern centre?	Comment noted. It is the aim of the Local Plan and planning system to find an appropriate balance. The Local Plan includes a range of local policies aimed at both preserving the historic and natural environment within the borough and delivering new development to	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									provide for the needs of residents and grow the local economy. Each decision on development proposals and projects will need to carefully balance these different aspirations, guided by these local policies and national legislation.	
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 55	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>Totally disagree and object to the Local Plans housing figure when the government own figure for the town is around 177 new homes per annum.</p> <p>Object to the use of greenfield land. Enough Brownfield sites exist within the towns boundaries. Greenfield areas contribute to residents mental and physical health, and local wildlife.</p> <p>Redevelopment results in more people coming to the area, which helps local businesses. Building on greenfield sites harms the town centre.</p>	<p>Objections to Aim 2 noted. Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>In line with the NPPF, the Council has sought to make effective use of land in prioritising the development of previously developed land where it is suitable and viable to do so. In selecting allocation sites on the urban edge, the Council has sought to avoid areas of highest landscape, environmental and agricultural value as considered in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Growth around the town will generate increased expenditure in the town centre that will help to support local employment and the vitality and viability of the centre.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 58	2.0.2	Paragraph	Neutral	<p>Support objective 4f to improve access to green spaces for leisure and recreation which contribute to residents mental and physical health but question if the suggested long term development on green spaces as part of urban extensions will be counter productive to this aim.</p>	<p>Support for objective 4f and associated concerns noted. Whilst development of sites on the urban edge will inevitably change the nature of the landscape of the area, it will maintain opportunities for recreation by new and existing residents, with access via public rights of way retained, and with additional green infrastructure provided as part of the development as required by Policies ENV 4 and ENV 5. Policy ENV 5 of the Local Plan prioritises the provision of wildlife friendly green space as part of on-site provision.</p>	No change recommended
Simon Bainbridge				DBDLP 399	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>Objective 1 - the figure of 7000 new jobs is aspirational and not based on evidence. There is also a significant contraction of the town centre including the closure of two major retailers (and employers) making this figure even less likely.</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</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>Report (September 2017) produced as part of the Local Plan evidence base.</p> <p>Town centres around the country are facing a number of challenges such as the growth of online shopping, pressure from out of centre retailing and supermarkets, and reduced town centre footfall. However, the nature of town centres are changing and adapting to these pressures becoming more of a mixed shopping and leisure destination, with an increase in other land uses including residential and office use increasing activity in centres throughout the day. Growth proposed in the Local Plan around the town will generate increased expenditure in the town centre that will help to support local employment and the vitality and viability of the centre.</p>	
b everington				DBDLP 272	2.0.2	Paragraph	Neutral	Doubt that 7000 new jobs can be achieved during the plan period, and how job losses will be accounted for.	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.	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 204	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	Welcome the conservation and enhancement of the natural and historical environment and landscapes as a key outcome or overarching aim.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 205	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	The objectives/environmental outputs are welcome, together with resilience to climate change.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 240	2.0.2	Paragraph	Neutral	If DBC is to support aim 5 to protect the environment and countryside, why are DBC supporting the building on so much greenbelt areas.	Comments noted. In line with the NPPF, the Council has sought to make effective use of land in prioritising the development of previously developed land where it is suitable and viable to do so. In selecting allocation sites on the urban edge, the Council has sought to avoid areas of highest landscape, environmental	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								DBC proposal to build 10000 houses is well above the government recommendation.	and agricultural value as considered in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal. Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	
Kieron Warren				DBDLP 281	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	Aim 3 - This aim should cover the development of public transport and cycling links in existing built-up areas of the borough and not just new developments. Some areas of the town lack adequate cycling infrastructure and, as such, the network is fragmented.	New development can facilitate improvements to public transport and cycling infrastructure in existing built-up areas where improvements meet the conditions for planning obligations, namely that they are: necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.	No change recommended.
Mr Royston Mann				DBDLP 306	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	Aim 2 - Totally disagree with the need for 10000 new homes when the governments own figures state that around 177 per annum are needed. If Local Plan Aim 5 is promising to protect and enhance countryside and the natural environment why are DBC supporting building on greenbelt area.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 353	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	Reasonable aims and objectives.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Canon Chris Beales				DBDLP 360	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	There is no mention of the need for spiritual and emotional needs of people moving into and living in the new communities being created.	Support and comment noted. It is considered that Aim 4, and its associated objectives, sufficiently covers the factors that the Local Plan can influence to create the environment for communities to develop.	No change recommended
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 511	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	The Aims and Objectives of the plan are aspirational and do not reflect the real world.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>Why should there now be a clamour to bring business to Darlington when, over the past 10 years we have seen a systemic decline in businesses, shops, facilities and council provisions.</p> <p>The town centre is being left behind by the current council approach.</p> <p>The plan should seek to address the existing fundamental issues of how to make Darlington an attractive place to come to first.</p>	<p>The jobs growth factored into the plan is realistic as it is based on past trends of employment growth in the borough.</p> <p>Town centres around the country are facing a number of challenges such as the growth of online shopping, pressure from out of centre retailing and supermarkets, and reduced town centre footfall. However, the nature of town centres are changing and adapting to these pressures becoming more of a mixed shopping and leisure destination, with an increase in other land uses including residential and office use increasing activity in centres throughout the day. Growth proposed in the Local Plan around the town will generate increased expenditure in the town centre that will help to support local employment and the vitality and viability of the centre.</p> <p>The Local Plan contains a range of local policies and proposals aimed at making the borough an attractive place to live, work and invest.</p>	
Mr Colin Raine				DBDLP 632	2.0.2	Paragraph	Neutral	Agree that Darlington Borough should have an identity as an historic market town situated amongst countryside & villages but fail to see how this can be achieved by building thousands of houses in the surrounding countryside and over developing the villages. How is Darlington's natural & historic environment being cherished & protected by the local plan?	Local Plan aims 4 and 5 contain objectives to mitigate these concerns, and are reflected in the draft policies on the plan, notably those in the Environment chapter of the plan (section 9).	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 585	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	CPRE supports Objectives 3a and 3e.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) -			DBDLP 580	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	Overarching aims supported.	Support noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
	Darlington Group									
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 581	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	Aim 1 - question whether 7000 jobs is achievable or sustainable.	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.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 582	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	The number of houses Darlington Borough Council aspires to are totally excessive and unnecessary. Support for Aim 2, Objectives a, b, c and d.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. Support for objectives noted.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 583	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	CPRE is concerned at Objectives 3b, 3c, and 3d as the transport links are not listed so it is not possible to be certain whether any are proposals for roads in the Borough to which CPRE strongly objects, such as the Darlington Northern Link Road.	Proposals for new road infrastructure are summarised in Section 10 of the Local Plan, and specifically Policies IN 1 - 4.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 588	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	CPRE Supports these Aims 4 - 6 and their associated objectives.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Joanne Harding	Home Builders Federation			DBDLP 782	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	Generally supportive of Local Plan Aim 2, and the objectives to achieve and maintain a five-year supply of housing land, and to have a portfolio of sites.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 787	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	Support Aim 1 of the Local Plan. The allocation at Greater Faverdale is a key part of the Local Plan's economic and employment objectives in particular, objective 1c. Support the Council's recognition of the strategic importance of housing	Support and comments noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								supply to the local economy. The proposals at Greater Faverdale will facilitate the delivery of a high quality mixed use community.		
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 788	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	Hellens Land supports the approach taken to identifying and meeting the objectively assessed housing need in Darlington Borough Council. 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.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Matthew Snedker				DBDLP 749	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>Aim 2: The aim of 10000 new homes is excessive.</p> <p>Aim 3 a and Aim 4 h, i and j: The Borough could adopt higher standard Interim Advice Note 195/16 Cycle Traffic and the Strategic Road Network. The basic principles for all residential areas in the Borough should follow these broad points;</p> <p>1) Default 20mph limits</p> <p>2) Filter through traffic to stop 'rat-running'</p> <p>3) Continuous footways and cycleways across side roads</p> <p>4) Direct, segregated and continuous walking and cycling routes along distributor roads.</p> <p>Aim 3 d - If this means that the plans to manage demands down wards then I support this point. However, if this means building more roads and widening existing roads and junctions to handle peak motor traffic demands then I oppose this point. The capital and revenue demands from the flawed 'predict and provide' policy is</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>New developments will have to meet the minimum highway standards set out in the Tees Valley Design Guide & Specification. This document sets out approaches and methods to reduce vehicle speeds. Speed limits are a highways matter and can be altered where there are justified concerns over safety.</p> <p>Additional roads are proposed as part of the mitigation but the future design process will involve factoring sufficient and safe permeability for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Since 2015 there has been significant change in Government policy on climate change, renewable energy and energy efficiency standards. Ministerial Statements have been made on the subject, including a restriction on the standards authorities can place on domestic dwellings, however legislation is still to be passed on these issues creating some uncertainty. As such the Council is looking to undertake a joint approach with the other Tees Valley authorities on these matters. This is likely to be dealt with in a separate document such as a supplementary planning document.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>unsustainable and damaging to the towns social and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Aim 4 g - The ability to cut domestic energy demand (heating, cooling and power) by c. 80% is offered by following the Passiv Haus standard. The marginal increase in costs are far outweighed by the reduction in energy demand for the lifetime of the dwelling.</p> <p>Aim 5 - The unsustainable and unnecessary expansion of the town by building 10,000 new homes will prevent this goal being achieved.</p> <p>Aim 6 b - There is no land set aside in the plan expressly for the generation of renewable energy.</p>	<p>In relation to Aim 5 this needs to be considered on a borough wide scale. It is acknowledged there will be some localised impacts but thorough mitigation will be key along with enhancing quality and accessibility to greenspace over quantity.</p> <p>Changes are proposed to Policy IN9 Renewable and</p> <p>Energy Efficient Infrastructure. Although this does not specifically identify sites for renewable energy developments as this can prove restrictive. Instead a criteria based approach is proposed in the Proposed Submission Draft Plan.</p>	
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 833	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	<p>The aims insofar as they relate to Skerningham Estates Ltd's land interest at Skerningham are generally supported.</p> <p>Aims 2 and 3 supported.</p>	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Tom Clarke	National Planning Adviser Theatres Trust			DBDLP 814	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	<p>The Theatre Trust supports Aim 4, and the Council's aspiration to maintain Darlington's identity as a historic market town and to maintain a vibrant, attractive and safe town centre offering retail, cultural, leisure, tourism and employment opportunities.</p> <p>We recommend that the plan's town centre policies are flexible in supporting permanent change of use to non-retail uses where A1 can be demonstrated to be non-viable, and actively supports temporary uses which help activate vacant units.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Town centres around the country are facing a number of challenges such as the growth of online shopping, pressure from out of centre retailing and supermarkets, and reduced town centre footfall. However, the nature of town centres are changing and adapting to these pressures becoming more of a mixed shopping and leisure destination, with an increase in other land uses including residential and office use increasing activity in centres throughout the day.</p> <p>Policy TC 2 provides some flexibility within the towns Primary Shopping Area for change of uses away from A1 (shops) in order to maintain</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								More fundamentally, the plan must ensure that it provides robust protection against the loss of valued community and cultural facilities such as theatres, cinemas, music venues, pubs and community halls.	the continuing vitality and viability of the centre. The policy also acknowledges the role that housing can play in revitalising a centre and the use of vacant spaces on the upper floors of buildings. Policy IN 10 provides protection to existing community facilities in the borough.	
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1102	2.0.2	Paragraph	Support	We welcome the overarching aim which will protect and enhance the quality of Darlington's historic environment.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1326	2.0.2	Paragraph	Object	The overarching aims do not specifically refer to the delivery of housing and as a result, these are considered to be unsound for being ineffective and not consistent with national policy. Generally supportive of the Local Plan objectives, in particular the aim to develop at least 10000 new homes. The Council has issues of previous low levels of housing supply which need to be tackled with a consistent robust approach.	The first overarching aim refers to the delivery of sustainable development to meet the Borough's needs, this statement incorporates housing needs along with other land use requirements over the plan period. Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. The Local Plan sets out a consistent and robust approach to tackle previous low housing supply and a robust 5 year pipeline.	No change recommended.
Mr Colin Raine				DBDLP 633		Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment	Neutral	To adequately mitigate flood risk developers should be asked to provide permeable driveways and asked to follow government guidance on Sustainable Drainage.	Integration of SUDS into developments is covered in detail in Policy DC4 of the plan. Whilst this does not specifically mention permeable driveways this could be one option to manage surface water. These are discussed in more detail in paragraph 5.4.7 of the draft plan.	No change recommended
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 356	2.1.1	Paragraph	Support	Habitats Regulation Assessment needs to be subject to consultation and to be available before any examination in public.	The Habitats Regulation Screening Assessment will be published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan, in advance of the examination in public.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England			DBDLP 589	2.1.1	Paragraph	Object	Habitats Regulation Assessment needs to be subject to consultation and to be	The Habitats Regulation Screening Assessment will be published alongside the Proposed	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
	(CPRE) - Darlington Group							available before any examination in public.	Submission Local Plan, in advance of the examination in public.	
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 197	2.1.2	Paragraph	Support	<p>Habitats Regulation Assessment needs to be subject to consultation and to be available before any examination in public.</p> <p>Darlington Friends of the Earth do not believe there are any sites within Darlington itself that will require a Habitats Assessment but developments in Darlington may impact on such sites elsewhere (particularly Teesmouth and Cumbria). The council should make it clear that it will be looking at such impacts.</p>	The Habitats Regulation Screening Assessment will be published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan, in advance of the examination in public.	No change recommended.
Ms Julie Nixon				DBDLP 332	3	SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	Object	The plan should be more ambitious and promote stronger garden town principles and significantly increased standards for things such as cavity wall insulation, lighting, glazing, green roofs etc. Also doing more to encourage a greater diversity in garden planting is suggested to make areas more attractive to flora and fauna. Treatment of highway verges is also discussed.	Construction methods and standards are considered by Building Regulations. The plan would be supportive of developments that provide additional energy saving features. The other matters including treatment of private gardens and highway verges are something the Local Plan has no control over.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 886	3	SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	Support	Support of policy in line with national policy and agreement to monitor policy implementation.	Support noted	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 113	Policy SD 1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Support	Welcome inclusion of neighbourhood plans.	Once a neighbourhood plan or order is formally adopted by the Council, it becomes part of the statutory planning framework for the area.	No change recommended
Mrs Laura Roberts	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 728	Policy SD 1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Support	Full support for policy.	Support noted	No change recommended

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 1077	Policy SD 1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Support	In principle Gladman fully supportive of the direction taken in policy SD1 Gladman consider that SD1 could go further in its approach to ensuring the delivery of sustainable development.	Comments noted. Delivery will be monitored throughout the plan period and appropriate action taken if necessary which may include plan review.	No change recommended
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1178	Policy SD 1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Support	Support for Policy SD1.	Support noted	No change recommended
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Christopher Martin	WYG	DBDLP 1109	Policy SD 1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Neutral	Policy should be deleted as already covered elsewhere.	This follows a model policy suggested by the Planning Advisory Service that should be included in all Local Plans.	No change recommended
	Church Commissioners for England (CCE)	Ms Lucie Jowett	Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1154	Policy SD 1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Support	General support for Policy SD1.	Support noted	No change recommended
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1305	Policy SD 1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Support	Support for principles but necessity of policy only question.	This follows a model policy suggested by the Planning Advisory Service that should be included in all Local Plans.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1327	Policy SD 1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Support	Support of Policy SD1	Support noted	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 887	4	THE SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY	Support	General support. It is noted that there is a good geographical spread of sites allocated for proposed development.	Support noted	No change recommended
Mr Alastair	Clerk			DBDLP 1224	4	THE SETTLEMENT	Support	Support of policy applying to Sadberge	Support noted	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mackenzie	Sadberge Parish Council					T HIERARCHY				
Miss Lucy Blakemore				DBDLP 13	4.0.1	Paragraph	Support	Spatial choices are important to reduce the potential negative impacts- loss of character, loss of environment quality and reduced economic prosperity as well as conflict with existing residents.	This process of considering appropriate options has been undertaken throughout the development of the plan. Additional information on site selection is available in the 'Officer Response Paper to Housing Matters' and the Sustainability Appraisal.	No change recommended
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 512	4.0.1	Paragraph	Object	Spatial choices are the most important consideration for the plan. Concern that the plan will damage the core essence of the area for short term financial gains.	The locational strategy of the plan is to focus new development within the main urban area, as urban extensions and at the larger service villages, as it is considered that these are the most sustainable locations. This is reflected in the settlement hierarchy. Site selection has been informed by detailed site assessments within the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal (available on the Council's website). Development in some of the areas proposed does inevitably result in the loss of largely agricultural land adjacent to the main urban area and service villages, however sites have been selected wherever possible that will minimise the impact on surrounding rural areas. The Council has sought to avoid areas of highest landscape, environmental and agricultural value. Financial gains for organisations or individuals is not a consideration when determining an appropriate locational strategy or through the site selection process.	No change recommended
Mr Peter Hughes				DBDLP 47	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Support	Support of Hurworth being classified as a service village, provided it remains as a separate entity from the south of Darlington.	Support noted. Development limits proposed prevent the coalescence of Hurwoth with the main urban area of Darlington.	No change recommended
Mr Geoffrey Crute	Councillor Neasham Parish Council			DBDLP 376	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Support	Clarity over the status of the various "settlements" is fundamental to understanding the Plan, and the relevance of both policy and detailed discussion to the various parts of the Borough.	Support noted	No change recommended
Mrs	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 732	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Support	As a statutory undertaker in the provision of water and waste water	Support noted	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Laura Roberts								<p>services we are a formal consultee on all emerging planning policy. Our New Development department provides a planning service which seeks to protect our assets and supports new development through ensuring our network and facilities have capacity to accommodate sustainable growth. Separately, our Estates department is responsible for land and estate issues associated with our operational , non operational and surplus land (safeguarding and releasing land). Consequently two separate responses have been submitted to the consultation and should be read individually.</p> <p>We support the principle of the local plan following the hierarchy of settlements set out in Policy SH1. Generally, as a stakeholder in the region there are no major issues anticipated with facilitating development in any of the named rural villages.</p>		
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 834	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	<p>Support of paragraph 4.0.8 which identifies the urban fringe as a suitable etc area for development.</p> <p>Policy SH1(a) should however be amended to reflect this and refer to Darlington Urban Area <i>and adjoining land</i>. This change would be in line with the accompanying key diagram at Figure 4.1.</p>	Strategic Housing locations will be part of the Darlington Urban Area and will be within development limits. As such it is not considered necessary to make the change proposed.	No change recommended
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 852	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	<p>The settlement hierarchy does not allow for development in “rural villages” or the countryside except within defined development limits.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural</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 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	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>communities and NPPG recognises that rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of local facilities. This is reflected in para 4.0.9 of the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy SH1 should have a more positive approach to development in rural areas and any settlement hierarchy included within the plan should not restrict development to within development limits. Instead, it should simply identify specific locations where development is supported.</p>	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. Such development will assist in maintaining and enhancing the vitality of rural communities.	
Miss Jennifer Earnshaw	Project Secretary Banks Property			DBDLP 871	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	<p>Banks Property consider that due to being an established residential area, the number of facilities and amenities in the local area and its close proximity to Newton Aycliffe, School Aycliffe should be classified as a service village with defined development limits also added to the proposals map. School Aycliffe should also be added to the list of service villages in policy SH 1.</p>	Part of School Aycliffe is within Darlington Borough boundary. Although it is an established residential area there are very limited services and facilities within School Aycliffe when considered as a whole. Newton Aycliffe is in close proximity within County Durham however there would still be a reliance on private vehicles to travel to this larger settlement. In view of this it is considered that there are more sustainable locations for development within Darlington and as such School Aycliffe has not been defined as a service village and does not have defined development limits.	No change recommended
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1081	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	<p>Support of the development strategy contained in Policy SH1 seeks to meet development needs of the borough by promoting an urban focused approach to development supplement with additional large strategic development sites in greenfield locations. Support for directing growth to the most sustainable villages.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Gladman are concerned with the reference made to development limits within this policy as this is sufficiently covered by emerging Policy H 3.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The reference to development limits simply provides further clarification with regards to defined settlements and how areas outside of the limits are to be considered.</p>	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1179	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Support	The settlement hierarchy is focused upon the urban area and surrounded by villages of varying sizes and sustainability. Policy SH1 is reflective of this and establishes a logical framework for development distribution focusing the majority of development to the urban core whilst allowing rural settlements to grow naturally corresponding to their overall sustainability. Support given to the policy and Urban Fringe as the most sustainable and suitable location for growth.	Support noted	No change recommended
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1129	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Support	Support of Policy SH1.	Support noted	No change recommended
Mr G Raistrick		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1248	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	Object to distribution of housing development between the three Service Villages, Heighington, Hurworth and Middleton St George, identified in Policy SH1. A more equitable distribution of housing numbers between the villages would ensure a more sustainable form of development and ensure that the Plan is consistent with national policy. The current proposed distribution places too much emphasis on Middleton St George.	The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been informed by detailed site assessments within the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal (available on the Council's website). Across the service villages more housing development is proposed at Middleton St George simply because the evidence base identified more sites which were available for development and had less physical constraints.	No change recommended
Mr G Raistrick		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1240	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	Policy SH1 and the identification of Heighington as a 'Service Village' strongly supported. Support for Statement 1 – Service Villages, which recognises that	Support noted With regards to the alternative site proposed please see officer response to comment DBDLP1245 to policy H 2 Housing Allocations.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>development is needed to meet local needs.</p> <p>As the service villages have been identified as the next most favourable location for housing development after the main urban area, the land at Heighcroft House, Heighington is considered a prime site to accommodate future residential development to meet the identified need of the village and wider local area.</p>		
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1212	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	<p>Modify policy text to make clear the Airport is not classified as countryside.</p> <p>Modify the Policy Map to identify the Airport as a Strategic Growth Location (see Appendix 1) (see file attached 1189) as a Development Limit.</p>	Please see officer response to comment DBDLP1202.	No change recommended
Thoroton and Croft Estate		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1255	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Support	Policy SH1 is strongly supported, especially the identification of the Darlington Urban Area as the priority area for development.	Support noted.	No change recommended
	Church Commissioners for England (CCE)	Ms Lucie Jowett	Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1155	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Support	<p>Support for policy SH 1.</p> <p>Our Client (CCE) acknowledges the need for a policy that sets out the spatial approach to delivering sustainable development and meeting the objectives of the local plan. Policy SH 1 enables this by setting out a settlement hierarchy for delivering growth.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy identifies that the majority of new housing and employment growth is proposed within the main urban area. As the largest and most sustainable settlements within the District, the main urban areas should be the focus for a largest percentage of</p>	Support noted for both the policy and proposed allocation, site ref 100 Hall Farm, Branksome.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>growth. The overall approach is supported.</p> <p>Our Clients land (site ref 100 Hall Farm, Branksome) provides a site which can be delivered in the next 5 years and therefore should be continued to be allocated and given priority for development early in the plan period.</p>		
Mr Mark Walton		Mr Ian Lyle		DBDLP 1223	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	<p>Our client supports the proposed Settlement Hierarchy detailed in Draft Policy SH 1 and the classification of Hurworth as a Service Village.</p> <p>The village has the capacity, and indeed needs, to be the focus for further housing development, over and above existing commitments, to support the long term vitality and viability of the services in the village. Land West Of Roundhill Road should be included in the amended development limits for Hurworth.</p>	<p>Support for policy SH 1 noted.</p> <p>With regards to the alternative site promoted please see response to policy H 2 comment ref DBDLP1219.</p>	No change recommended
	Godolphin Developments Ltd	Ms Jennifer Nye	Lichfields	DBDLP 1263	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	<p>The settlement hierarchy does not allow for development in “Rural Villages” or the countryside except within defined development limits.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and NPPG recognises that rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of local facilities. This is also reflected in para 4.0.9 of the Draft Local Plan.</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 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. Also, other economic development will be able to come forward in rural areas providing it meets the criteria within policy E 4: Economic Development in the Countryside.</p>	No change recommended

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) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1306	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	<p>The Settlement Hierarchy and position of Hurworth as a service village is supported.</p> <p>The draft policy discusses the 'objectives' for each level of settlement. It states:</p> <p>“...development should not compromise the ability to meet the objectives for other tiers in the hierarchy”</p> <p>It is not explicitly clear what is meant by the 'objectives' for each tier of the hierarchy, although if this relates to Statement 1 (Service Villages) and Statement 2 (Rural Villages), or the Spatial Distribution contained at Table 6.2, then there must be an allowance for the sustainable Service Villages to accommodate a greater level of growth over the plan period in the event that other aspects and allocations in the Local Plan fail to deliver at the rate anticipated. This should be clarified to ensure there is sufficient flexibility in the plan to adapt to rapid change, as set out at paragraph 11 of the Framework.</p> <p>It is further recommended, to ensure there is clarity in situations where there is a lack of 5 year housing land supply, and the plan is able to respond to such situations, that the following wording is inserted in the policy:</p> <p>“At any point in the Local Plan period where there is no longer a demonstrable supply of sites to fully meet the five year land requirement, sustainable sites that would both make a positive contribution to the five year supply of housing land and be well related to the development limits of the main urban</p>	The fall back position referred to is set out within policy H 1: Housing Requirement. The plan should be read as a whole and duplication of policies does not add any benefit.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								area or service villages (as defined in this Policy) will be supported”		
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1328	Policy SH 1	Settlement Hierarchy	Object	<p>SH 1 supported. The settlement hierarchy identifies that the majority of new housing and employment growth is proposed within the main urban area of Darlington. As the largest and most sustainable settlement, the main urban areas should be the focus for a largest percentage of growth.</p> <p>Whilst this overall approach is supported by our Client, it is considered that sustainable growth should also be supported throughout the Borough on suitable sites. This is particularly important given the persistent under delivery experienced within the borough. Alternative site proposed for allocation at Burtree Lane.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The Council will be supportive of sites which are located within the development limits, are sustainable, suitable for housing and are consistent with relevant national and local policies. With regards to the alternative site proposed for allocation please see the officer response to comment DBDLP1335 linked to policy H 2 Housing Allocations.</p>	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 219	4.0.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>Objections and concerns raised with regards to four strategic sites.</p> <p>Skerneingham</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not sustainable. Increase in traffic congestion and degradation of air quality. Should not build on the flood plain. Green policy and outputs are not clear. Green Infrastructure buffer zone should be at least 100m from the river Skerne. Not clear if traffic modelling justifies the housing allocation or the provision of new roads. 	<p>The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been 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>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>Impacts of air pollution have been considered via the sustainability appraisal process. There are a number of planning policies in the Draft Local Plan which aim to prevent new development from contributing to unacceptable levels of air pollution. For example DC 1</p>	No change recommended

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"> New roads should have a 100m green infrastructure buffer on either side. <p>Coniscliffe Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not sustainable Increase in traffic congestion and degradation of air quality. Should not build on the flood plain. Green policy and outputs are not clear. Green Infrastructure buffer zone should be at least 100m from Baydale Beck. Not clear if traffic modelling justifies the housing allocation or the provision of new roads. <p>Great Burdon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in traffic congestion and degradation of air quality. Should not build on the flood plain. Green policy and outputs are not clear. Green Infrastructure buffer zone should be at least 100m from the river Skerne. Not clear if traffic modelling justifies the housing allocation or the provision of new roads. <p>West Park Garden Village</p>	<p>(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 efficient thereby reducing carbon emissions. The locational strategy of Draft Local Plan also looks to locate development in sustainable locations reducing the need to travel to access services, facilities and employment, maximising opportunities for people to use sustainable methods of travel, consequently reducing emissions from private vehicles.</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). Site statements within Appendix B also set out where sites lie within flood zones 2 and 3 and that development should be directed away from these areas. The layout of the Skerningham Masterplan Framework also ensures that areas at risk to flooding are avoided.</p> <p>The site statements in Appendix B for Coniscliffe Park (North and South) and Great Burdon set out that Baydale Beck and the river Skerne should be protected and green infrastructure enhanced. 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>Principles within the Draft Local Plan encourage suitable landscaping to new elements of road network where appropriate, however there is no evidence to support a 100m buffer zone. This would also significantly impact upon site viability.</p> <p>West Park Garden Village does have outline planning permission, issues raised will have been considered through the process of the</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"> • Increase in traffic congestion and degradation of air quality. • Green policy and outputs are not clear. • Not clear if traffic modelling justifies the housing allocation or the provision of new roads. • Any new road should have a 100m green infrastructure buffer zone. <p>Development limits should be drawn to include only the proposed housing areas and not elements of green infrastructure. Developers will assume they can build to the development limit without providing the green infrastructure.</p>	<p>application e.g. impact on highways, traffic, the environment etc.</p> <p>The development limit has been drawn around the entire extent of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site in the 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 will be 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>	
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 357	4.0.2	Paragraph	Object	We strongly object to the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (Policy H2). Our reasoning is set out in further sections.	Objection noted.	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 198	Figure 4.1	Key Diagram	Object	<p>Objections and concerns raised with regards to four strategic sites.</p> <p>Skerningham</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sustainable. • Increase in traffic congestion and degradation of air quality. • Should not build on the flood plain. • Green policy and outputs are not clear. • Green Infrastructure buffer zone should be at least 100m from the river Skerne. 	<p>The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been 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>Transport modelling work is ongoing to test highway mitigation schemes to ensure</p>	No change recommended

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"> Not clear if traffic modelling justifies the housing allocation or the provision of new roads. New roads should have a 100m green infrastructure buffer on either side. <p>Coniscliffe Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not sustainable Increase in traffic congestion and degradation of air quality. Should not build on the flood plain. Green policy and outputs are not clear. Green Infrastructure buffer zone should be at least 100m from Baydale Beck. Not clear if traffic modelling justifies the housing allocation or the provision of new roads. <p>Great Burdon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in traffic congestion and degradation of air quality. Should not build on the flood plain. Green policy and outputs are not clear. Green Infrastructure buffer zone should be at least 100m from the river Skerne. Not clear if traffic modelling justifies the housing 	<p>developments do not have an unacceptable impact on local and strategic highway network.</p> <p>Impacts of air pollution have been considered via the sustainability appraisal process. There are a number of planning policies in the Draft Local Plan which aim to prevent new development from contributing to unacceptable levels of air pollution. For example 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 efficient thereby reducing carbon emissions. The locational strategy of Draft Local Plan also looks to locate development in sustainable locations reducing the need to travel to access services, facilities and employment, maximising opportunities for people to use sustainable methods of travel, consequently reducing emissions from private vehicles.</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). Site statements within Appendix B also set out where sites lie within flood zones 2 and 3 and that development should be directed away from these areas. The layout of the Skerningham Masterplan Framework also ensures that areas at risk to flooding are avoided.</p> <p>The site statements in Appendix B for Coniscliffe Park (North and South) and Great Burdon set out that Baydale Beck and the river Skerne should be protected and green infrastructure enhanced. 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>	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>allocation or the provision of new roads.</p> <p>West Park Garden Village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in traffic congestion and degradation of air quality. • Green policy and outputs are not clear. • Not clear if traffic modelling justifies the housing allocation or the provision of new roads. • Any new road should have a 100m green infrastructure buffer zone. <p>Development limits should be drawn to include only the proposed housing areas and not elements of green infrastructure. Developers will assume they can build to the development limit without providing the green infrastructure.</p>	<p>Principles within the Draft Local Plan encourage suitable landscaping to new elements of road network where appropriate, however there is no evidence to support a 100m buffer zone. This would also significantly impact upon site viability.</p> <p>West Park Garden Village does have outline planning permission, issues raised will have been considered through the process of the application e.g. impact on highways, traffic, the environment etc.</p> <p>The development limit has been drawn around the entire extent of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site in the 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 will be 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>	
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 460	Figure 4.1	Key Diagram	Object	Concerns regarding the visual legibility of the key diagram. The highlighting splits/blurs into other areas.	The purpose of the key diagram is to provide a strategic overview of the borough including the settlement hierarchy, strategic development allocations proposed, key transport routes/links and potential future infrastructure. Some of the allocations (shading) deliberately overlap to indicate integration with existing areas.	No change recommended
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1021	Figure 4.1	Key Diagram	Object	LCMPC agree that the majority of new development should be located within the Darlington urban area and within settlement limits (policy SH1). However, it is noted that on the key diagram, the proposed strategic housing location at Coniscliffe Park, lies outside	The purpose of the key diagram is to provide a strategic overview of the borough including the settlement hierarchy, strategic development allocations proposed, key transport routes/links and potential future infrastructure. The development limits are not shown on the key diagram. However the strategic sites, including	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								the identified urban area. LCMPC therefore object to the key diagram, as it does not reflect the intention of policy SH1.	Coniscliffe Park, are within the limits on the draft policies map and therefore within the main urban area, according with policy SH 1.	
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1211	Figure 4.1	Key Diagram	Object	Modify the Key Diagram to identify the Airport as 'key strategic location' for growth during the Plan period.	It is not considered appropriate at this time to identify the airport as a Strategic Growth Location, this will however be kept under review.	No change recommended
Mr Neil Minto				DBDLP 772	4.0.3	Paragraph	Object	Objection that the paragraph states that we are near to an international airport. There is a small number of flights to Amsterdam and some holiday destinations. The airport is also earmarked for housing.	Concerns noted however the airport has recently been purchased by Tees Valley Combined Authority and a new operator appointed. The intention is for the airport to offer additional flights in the future and to enhance this important national transport link. The airport did have planning permission for residential development on land which did not affect its operations. However this permission has lapsed and Tees Valley Combined Authority have indicated that they have no intention of pursuing housing development at the airport.	No change recommended
Kieron Warren				DBDLP 282	4.0.4	Paragraph	Neutral	This paragraph establishes Darlington as a "strategic public transport hub". In order to fulfill this as part of the settlement hierarchy, consideration could be made for improving links between Darlington Railway Station and the rest of the town, perhaps through a transport interchange. This could improve access to employment opportunities and highlight good connectivity to employers / businesses.	The Council is working with the Tees Valley Combined Authority on a masterplan for Bank Top station. One of this issues being looked at includes linkages with the town centre and how connectivity can be improved including improved interchange facilities. Since consultation took place a new pedestrian footbridge has also been installed to provide improved access between the station and central park.	No change recommended
b everington				DBDLP 275	4.0.5	Paragraph	Object	This statement is completely at odds with the local plan, the priorities seem to be given to development of green land that is inaccessible , and destroys heritage,nature conservation and and land extensively used for recreation by the darlington population at large.	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended
Mrs				DBDLP 517	4.0.5	Paragraph	Object	This statement is contrary to the local plan which proposes development on	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Lisa Bramfitt								greenfield sites which are inaccessible and require new transport routes. Development of these sites destroy heritage and nature conservation, increase the risk of flooding and remove land extensively used for recreation by existing residents.		
Kieron Warren				DBDLP 283	4.0.7	Paragraph	Neutral	In relation to improving links between the Town Centre Fringe, the Town Centre, Central Park and the main Railway Station; consideration and importance should be given to developing efficient and effective public transport and cycle links. This could be done in order to encourage sustainable transport and reduce car usage in Darlington.	Comments noted. These issues of public transport, cycle and walking links will be a key consideration in new development and regeneration in the Town Centre Fringe. These principles are also set out within policy IN 2: Improving Access and Accessibility and will be expected of new development.	No change recommended
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 790	4.0.8	Paragraph	Support	Support for the Council's approach to selecting broad locations for new housing and in particular the recognition that "the urban fringe has been identified as the most sustainable, suitable, available and developable" location for growth. Support for the identification of Greater Faverdale as a proposed allocation and the Council's conclusions that it is a sustainable location for future economic and housing growth in the borough.	Support noted	No change recommended
Thoroton and Croft Estate		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1256	4.0.8	Paragraph	Support	Support of paragraph 4.0.8, identifying "the urban fringe has been identified as the most sustainable, suitable, available and developable" location for new housing development.	Support noted	No change recommended
Mr Nigel Swinbank		Mr Andrew Moss	Ward Hadaway	DBDLP 37	4.0.9	Paragraph	Object	There are other villages which are well placed to accommodate some development which would assist in providing a range of sites. An example is Neasham which has some services and a community which future residents can support and benefit from.	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 be able to provide) the level of services, facilities and employment opportunities that are required to	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									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.	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 592	Statement 1	Service Villages	Support	CPRE supports this policy.	Support noted	No change recommended
Ms Nicole McLaren				DBDLP 625	Statement 1	Service Villages	Object	Comments submitted regarding Hurworth. Primarily commenting on poor design and lack of variety in the committed developments on Roundhill Road. Lack of recreation space and play equipment within the village. Road safety and in particular speeding.	<p>No further development is proposed around Hurworth or Hurworth Place other than the committed sites on Roundhill Road (Sites 103 and 333). Matters relating to the existing permissions cannot be revisited in the local plan.</p> <p>The perceived lack of recreational space in the village is noted but there are significant areas of accessible informal greenspace around Hurworth and Hurworth Place including the Village Green and the Banks of the River Tees at Hurworth Place.</p> <p>Speed limits are a highways matter and can be altered where there are justified concerns over safety.</p> <p>Provision of a new cycle route is a long term aspiration of the council should funding be made available. It is raised in paragraph 10.1.21 of the Draft Plan and is supported by Policy IN1.</p>	No change recommended
Mr A Macnab	Middleton St George Parish Council			DBDLP 810	Statement 1	Service Villages	Object	Reference made to early engagement with the Parish Council and village in 2017/2018. Workshops were held with the Parish Council and key stakeholders in the village; a vision as well as a	<p>Comments and objections noted.</p> <p>The vision and draft spatial plan for the village were devised in the early engagement work both of which fed into the Draft Local Plan. It is</p>	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>number of high level objectives were agreed. A spatial plan was also developed for the village. This work was to form part of the Draft Local Plan currently being consulted on. Concerns raised that there is no evidence in the Draft Local Plan with regards to how the vision will be achieved.</p> <p>Whilst Middleton St George is categorised as a service village in the plan there are concerns with the sustainability of the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GP service is no longer located within 1km of the centre of the village. • Bus service is only hourly weekdays until 6pm and does not serve the GPs surgery in its new location. • An improved bus service is required and this was agreed as a high level objective for the village in the early engagement. • The sustainability of the village should be reconsidered. • Infrastructure needs to be provided that residents ask for. • Improvement needed to narrow village roads. • Drainage and sewage systems are not adequate. <p>Concerns raised with regards to the level of housing growth proposed in Middleton St George. The village has supplied a significant amount of the housing target figure (492 dwellings per annum) via existing commitments and potential allocations (site details</p>	<p>considered that the vision will be delivered via the borough wide policies of the Draft Local Plan, even though some of which do not specifically refer to the Middleton St George.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development. Part of site 146 Land south of railway line, MSG is reserved for community facilities. This will ensure that if the GP surgery wishes to move to a more central location in the village in the future land is set aside for this.</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>Growth of the village will help to encourage a more frequent bus service. Contributions can be sought from developers in some circumstances to support new services however this is generally just for a short period.</p> <p>Further evidence base work is to be prepared on the sustainability of the service and rural villages.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been informed by detailed site assessments within the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal (available on the Council's website). Across the service villages more housing development is proposed at Middleton St George simply because the evidence base identified more sites which were available for development and had less physical constraints.</p>	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>provided). Cumulative total of 1,933 dwellings.</p> <p>The Council has now published its brownfield land register, there is potential for developing that land prior to doing so on greenfield sites. Vacant properties within the urban area should be refurbished first.</p> <p>In general the Parish Council agrees with the proposed development limit within the Draft Local Plan. However, development should be towards the A67 and not located in the centre of the village due to increased traffic congestion.</p>	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes. In addition sites on the brownfield land register and refurbishing empty homes would not be sufficient to meet the borough's quantitative housing need.	
Mr Derek Dodwell	Darlington Association of Parish Councils			DBDLP 1067	Statement 1	Service Villages	Object	Doubt that Service Villages can also support the needs of the Rural Villages and other rural areas, in the absence of even modest improvements in communications	The key function of service villages to provide some variety in housing choices and provide localised facilities for surrounding rural areas. It is hoped that reasonable population growth in these villages will help to sustain and potentially enhance service provision which may otherwise be lost the the main urban centre.	No change recommended
Kieron Warren				DBDLP 284	4.0.10	Paragraph	Neutral	Observation that improved links between service villages to Darlington Railway Station and Durham Tees Valley Airport could bring environmental, economic and employment benefits.	Comments noted and principle of improved connectivity is supported in numerous policies in the plan.	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 593	Statement 2	Rural Villages	Support	Policy supported	Support noted	No change recommended
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 853	Statement 2	Rural Villages	Object	Statement 2 for rural villages does not confirm how local need for housing will be identified or measured.	Paragraph 6.6.2 related to policy H 6 Rural Exception sites provides further detail on this issue.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Ken Walton				DBDLP 336	5	DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION	Object	Objection on design quality of new developments.	Agree with principle of improving design quality and this is supported by national policy (NPPF, 2018 Chapter 12).	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 888	5	DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION	Neutral	No comment.	n/a	No change recommended
Irene Ord	Listed Property Owner			DBDLP 864		Sustainable Design Principles	Neutral	Should be a greater emphasis on quality and sympathetic design particularly when effecting the historic environment.	Agree with principle of improving design quality and this is supported by national policy (NPPF, 2018 Chapter 12). In relation to considerations for the historic environment this policy should be considered in tandem with Draft Policy ENV 1 and relevant national policy and guidance.	No change recommended
Mr Ralph Bradley				DBDLP 116	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Support	Good design should be more strongly controlled by the local authority and not left to developers.	Through a combination of the draft local policies, adopted Design SPD and strengthened emphasis on design in the NPPF the local authority has sufficient tools to refuse poor design and seek improvements.	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 114	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Support	Support for good design.	Noted.	No change recommended
Gerald Lee	Heighington and Coniscliffe Councillor			DBDLP 268	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Neutral	Solar panels should be integrated into all new houses.	Whilst the integration of solar panels would be encouraged in all housing development (unless there are overriding reasons on to include such as heritage) it is difficult to insist on all development including for viability reasons. However further consideration will be given to how energy efficiency in new development will be considered.	No change at present but we will look at energy efficiency and the wider climate change issue after the Local Plan has been approved to ensure a consistent approach with out Tees Valley neighbours.
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 519	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Neutral	Design principals set by the Council are key requirement for any developer. Ensuring developments deal with surface water drainage adequately also of concern.	Agree that quality design is important and this is supported by national policy. More detailed design guidance is provided in the Council's 'Design of new development SPD'. New development will also be required to deal with rainwater runoff adequately and there is more detail on this in Draft Policy DC 4 and the Design SPD.	No change recommended

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 594	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Support	Support.	Noted	No change recommended
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1024	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Support	Support for policy as drafted.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1272	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Neutral	The policy should be strengthened by aiming to reduce carbon emissions and the carbon footprint from developments.	The principles of this policy are adequate and backed up by section 5.1.8 - 5.1.10.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1329	Policy DC 1	Sustainable Design Principles	Object	Broad support but object to the wording of part b) on energy efficiency.	Additional detail on energy efficient design is contained in national guidance as well as the Design SPD. It is acknowledged that energy efficiency should be considered across the entirety of larger developments as some units may be compromised or there may be other constraints that take precedent.	No change recommended
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 520	5.1.4	Paragraph	Support	Design statement for new Housing Supported	Noted.	No change recommended
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 677	5.1.8	Paragraph	Neutral	Suggestion that Stockton's approach as set out in their policies ENV2 and ENV3 be given consideration: https://www.stockton.gov.uk/media/876762/ex-sbc-10-local-plan-including-councils-suggested-modifications-5-february-2018.pdf Main modifications also relevant:	Since 2015 there has been significant change in Government policy on climate change, renewable energy and energy efficiency standards. Ministerial Statements have been made on the subject, including a restriction on the standards authorities can place on domestic dwellings, however legislation is still to be passed on these issues creating some uncertainty. As such the Council is looking to undertake a joint approach with the other Tees Valley authorities on these matters. This is likely to be dealt with in a separate document such as a supplementary planning document.	No change at present but we will look at energy efficiency and the wider climate change issue after the Local Plan has been approved to ensure a consistent approach with our Tees Valley neighbours.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								https://www.stockton.gov.uk/media/1584578/201809-v7-mm-schedule.pdf		
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 667	5.1.8	Paragraph	Neutral	<p>Suggestion that Stockton's approach as set out in their policies ENV2 and ENV3 be given consideration:</p> <p>https://www.stockton.gov.uk/media/876762/ex-sbc-10-local-plan-including-councils-suggested-modifications-5-february-2018.pdf</p> <p>Main modification will also need to be factored in:</p> <p>https://www.stockton.gov.uk/media/1584578/201809-v7-mm-schedule.pdf</p>	<p>Since 2015 there has been significant change in Government policy on climate change, renewable energy and energy efficiency standards. Ministerial Statements have been made on the subject, including a restriction on the standards authorities can place on domestic dwellings, however legislation is still to be passed on these issues creating some uncertainty. As such the Council is looking to undertake a joint approach with the other Tees Valley authorities on these matters. This is likely to be dealt with in a separate document such as a supplementary planning document.</p>	<p>No change at present but we will look at energy efficiency and the wider climate change issue after the Local Plan has been approved to ensure a consistent approach with out Tees Valley neighbours.</p>
Mr Simon Nicholson				DBDLP 23	5.1.10	Paragraph	Support	<p>Support for solar power in all development.</p>	<p>Since 2015 there has been significant change in Government policy on climate change, renewable energy and energy efficiency standards. Ministerial Statements have been made on the subject, including a restriction on the standards authorities can place on domestic dwellings, however legislation is still to be passed on these issues creating some uncertainty. As such the Council is looking to undertake a joint approach with the other Tees Valley authorities on these matters. This is likely to be dealt with in a separate document such as a supplementary planning document.</p>	<p>No change at present but we will look at energy efficiency and the wider climate change issue after the Local Plan has been approved to ensure a consistent approach with our Tees Valley neighbours.</p>
MR Mark Siddall				DBDLP 109	5.1.10	Paragraph	Neutral	<p>Provides an overview of the various best practice examples for housing standards as well as a number of policy examples from other authorities. A policy wording is suggested.</p>	<p>Since 2015 there has been significant change in Government policy on climate change, renewable energy and energy efficiency standards. Ministerial Statements have been made on the subject, including a restriction on the standards authorities can place on domestic dwellings, however legislation is still to be passed on these issues creating some uncertainty. As such the Council is looking to undertake a joint approach with the other Tees Valley authorities on these matters. This is likely to be dealt with in a separate document such as a supplementary planning document.</p>	<p>No change at present but we will look at energy efficiency and the wider climate change issue after the Local Plan has been approved to ensure a consistent approach with our Tees Valley neighbours.</p>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
MR Mark Siddall				DBDLP 437	5.1.10	Paragraph	Neutral	Energy Efficiency standard for new housing can be set under new NPPF	Since 2015 there has been significant change in Government policy on climate change, renewable energy and energy efficiency standards. Ministerial Statements have been made on the subject, including a restriction on the standards authorities can place on domestic dwellings, however legislation is still to be passed on these issues creating some uncertainty. As such the Council is looking to undertake a joint approach with the other Tees Valley authorities on these matters. This is likely to be dealt with in a separate document such as a supplementary planning document.	No change at present but we will look at energy efficiency and the wider climate change issue after the Local Plan has been approved to ensure a consistent approach with our Tees Valley neighbours.
Miss Lucy Blakemore				DBDLP 14	5.2.2	Paragraph	Neutral	How will additional medical facilities be provided?	The provision of new health facilities including GP's is an area where planning has limited influence. The local authority continues to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other partners to identify challenges facing the borough in terms of improving health and providing sufficient services for residents of the borough. The local plan looks to safeguard land in key growth zones however delivery of new facilities will be dependent on NHS/private funding.	No change recommended
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 241	5.2.2	Paragraph	Object	Additional need for medical facilities with growth in Skertingham and West Park area.	The provision of new health facilities including GP's is an area where planning has limited influence. The local authority continues to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other partners to identify challenges facing the borough in terms of improving health and providing sufficient services for residents of the borough. The local plan looks to safeguard land in key growth zones however delivery of new facilities will be dependent on NHS/private funding.	No change recommended
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 522	5.2.2	Paragraph	Object	New medical facilities for new development sites not evidenced.	It is acknowledged that the provision of new health facilities is an area where planning has limited influence. The local authority continues to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other partners to identify challenges facing the borough in terms of improving health and providing sufficient services for residents of the borough. The local plan looks to safeguard land in suitable locations within key growth zones that hopefully would prove attractive	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									locations to provide new facilities should the opportunity and need arise.	
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 115	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Neutral	Suggest cars will remain the dominant form of transport for the foreseeable future.	Noted however the NPPF (Chapter 9) requires plans to favour the use of sustainable transport methods.	No change recommended
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 179	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Object	Increased air and noise pollution and traffic congestion in Whinfield will not be achievable as a result of the proposals at Skerningham.	Point f) relates to improving air, water and reducing noise pollution across the main urban area. It is acknowledged that some areas may have some negative impacts but overall improvements will be sought through the delivery of sustainable development and improvements to services and technology over the plan period.	No change recommended
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 180	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Object	Object to building on 'green belt'. Building and additional congestion will also have a negative effect on residents wellbeing. Specific concerns about crossing new access roads.	Darlington does not have any formally designated greenbelt however protection of green space across the borough is important. Skerningham Masterplan area would be required to incorporate a significant amount of publically accessible green space within it. Also see response to comment DBDLP178.	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 199	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Object	Support for concepts but objection to Skerningham and Coniscliffe Park. There should be a stronger emphasis on environmental benefits. Should provide a levy for green infrastructure management and maintenance.	Draft policies ENV 3 to ENV 8 are the main policies that protect environmental issues associated with development and the plan needs to be considered as a whole. Planning obligations for maintenance and management of landscaping and open space are set out in the Planning Obligations SPD which will be updated in due course.	No change recommended
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 358	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Object	Support principles of policy but object to Skerningham.	General support to policy noted. For more detailed comments see responses to Policy H10.	No change recommended
Canon Chris Beales				DBDLP 345	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Support	Support for policy. Suggestion that it could be extended to include greater control over hot food takeaways.	On the back of Healthy New Towns work the inclusion of options to restrict hot food takeaways will be reconsidered in line with latest practice.	No change needed as there is not enough evidence to support a policy restricting hot food takeaways and that any policy would have any impact on obesity with phone apps such as 'Just Eat'. The

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
										Inspector at the Stockton on Tees Plan Examination removed their policy because of lack of evidence.
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 835	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Support	Support in context of Skerningham proposal.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier				DBDLP 972	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Object	Loss of agricultural land and countryside will have a negative on food productions as well as the health and wellbeing of residents.	Although the proposal at Skerningham would result in the loss of agricultural land where survey data exists this confirms that the land is class 3b i.e. not the best and most versatile. 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 and more detailed responses to Policy H10.	No change recommended
Mr Brian Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 978	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Support	General support but would like to see improved public transport to access health facilities	The provision of improved public transport throughout the borough is something the council would support. Routes have to operate on a commercial basis with limited money available to subsidies routes. The sustainable transport and planning teams continue to liaise with public transport operators to provide more frequent and convenient services.	No change recommended
Doris Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 953	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Support	General support but would like to see improved public transport to access health facilities	The provision of improved public transport throughout the borough is something the council would support. Routes have to operate on a commercial basis with limited money available to subsidies routes. The sustainable transport and planning teams continue to liaise with public transport operators to provide more frequent and convenient services.	No change recommended
Steve York	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 990	Policy DC 2	Health and Wellbeing	Support	General support but would like to see improved public transport to access health facilities	The provision of improved public transport throughout the borough is something the council would support. Routes have to operate on a commercial basis with limited money available to subsidies routes. The sustainable transport and planning teams continue to liaise with	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									public transport operators to provide more frequent and convenient services.	
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 523	5.2.11	Paragraph	Neutral	Support of Policy however implementation process poses a question.	As previously stated the provision of new health facilities including GP's is an area where planning has limited influence. The local authority continues to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other partners to identify challenges facing the borough in terms of improving health and providing sufficient services for residents of the borough. The local plan looks to safeguard land in key growth zones however delivery of new facilities will be dependent on NHS/private funding.	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 200	5.2.12	Paragraph	Support	Support of community infrastructure on strategic sites. Developers should fund provision of facilities.	The provision of new health facilities including GP's is an area where planning has limited influence. The local authority continues to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other partners to identify challenges facing the borough in terms of improving health and providing sufficient services for residents of the borough. The local plan looks to safeguard land in key growth zones however delivery of new facilities will be dependent on NHS/private funding.	No change recommended
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 362	5.2.12	Paragraph	Object	Objection on the grounds of lack of certainty surrounding funding of health care facilities.	The provision of new health facilities including GP's is an area where planning has limited influence. The local authority continues to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other partners to identify challenges facing the borough in terms of improving health and providing sufficient services for residents of the borough. The local plan looks to safeguard land in key growth zones however delivery of new facilities will be dependent on NHS/private funding.	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 597	5.2.12	Paragraph	Object	Objection on the grounds of lack of certainty surrounding funding of health care facilities.	The provision of new health facilities including GP's is an area where planning has limited influence. The local authority continues to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other partners to identify challenges facing the borough in terms of improving health and providing sufficient services for residents of the borough. The local plan looks to safeguard	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									land in key growth zones however delivery of new facilities will be dependent on NHS/private funding.	
Canon Chris Beales				DBDLP 346		Safeguarding Amenity	Support	Support for combining facilities.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 117	Policy DC 3	Safeguarding Amenity	Object	Would like to see planting and maintenance of trees incorporated within the policy.	Currently requirements for provision and maintenance of green infrastructure is dealt with within the Planning Obligations SPD.	No change recommended
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 359	Policy DC 3	Safeguarding Amenity	Support	Support for amenity policy as drafted.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 526	Policy DC 3	Safeguarding Amenity	Support	Developers should be more accountable for the upkeep of public realm and landscaping.	Responsibility for maintenance of open space is something developers contribute to via planning obligations as set out in the Planning Obligations SPD. Roundabouts are typically within the adopted public highway so that typically falls to the local highway authority to maintain.	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 598	Policy DC 3	Safeguarding Amenity	Support	Support for policy as drafted.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1025	Policy DC 3	Safeguarding Amenity	Support	Support for policy as drafted.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Mr Roger Fitzpatrick- Odahamier				DBDLP 977	Policy DC 3	Safeguarding Amenity	Object	Objection to Skerningham on the grounds of loss of amenity afforded by greenspace and views (it is acknowledged by the respondent that 'there is no right to a view' however the countryside does contribute to a feeling of wellbeing).	As acknowledged there is no right to a view however this does not mean that existing properties will not have their residential amenity protected. Draft Policy DC 3 and the council's design SPD set a number of requirements developments need to fulfil in order to maintain acceptable levels of amenity in both existing	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									and proposed development. These include minimum separation distances. 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 and more detailed responses to Policy H10.	
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1331	Policy DC 3	Safeguarding Amenity	Object	Generally supportive of policy as drafted however objection is raised to the resistance of excessive HGV movements. Objection also raised to the supporting text at 5.3.5 in relation to location of rooms on the basis it is not justified.	The resistance to excessive HGV movements has been in place for some time in the existing plan and is good practice for both amenity and safety. It's primary aim is to resist new commercial development generating excessive HGV movements on residential roads. In relation to guidance on location of rooms it appears there has been some misunderstanding of what is quite standard practice to locate compatible room uses in adjacent properties next to each other. It appears to have been read on a restriction within existing properties which is not the case.	No change recommended
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1278	5.3.3	Paragraph	Neutral	Should be strengthened by including reference to discourage sensitive uses being located near to significant sources of air pollution.	No objection to including this consideration but this is covered within the Adopted Design SPD (Page 25) which is probably the more appropriate location.	No change recommended
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1298		Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems	Neutral	SFRA needs to be produced to support plan.	Draft version of SFRA has been provided and final version will be published before next stage.	No change recommended
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 533	Policy DC 4	Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)	Object	There will be a detrimental impact on water discharge as a result of the Skerningham development.	Housing schemes of this size are required to provide adequate sustainable drainage (Para 163 of NPPF).	No change recommended
Mr Mike	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1048	Policy DC 4	Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage	Neutral	No objection.	Noted.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Allum						Systems (SUDS)				
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1181	Policy DC 4	Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)	Support	Support for policy as drafted.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1296	Policy DC 4	Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)	Neutral	Environment Agency have provided details of current guidance on Sequential Tests and Exemption Tests.	This information has been passed to our Development Management team so it can be used in the validation and pre-application process.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1332	Policy DC 4	Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS)	Object	Broad support for the approach but object to the wording which should be more flexible so it can adapt to changing circumstances throughout the plan period.	The council has consulted the Environment Agency and other statutory bodies in relation to this draft policy and appropriate modifications have been made. Local planning authorities are required to review their plans once adopted at least every 5 years which will enable further changes if required.	No change recommended
Mrs Laura Roberts	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 735	5.4.7	Paragraph	Support	Support for link between GI and SUDS.	Noted.	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 118	Policy DC 5	Skills and Training	Neutral	University Technical Collages are the main source of skill training.	Universities and Colleges have an important role to play in skills and training but this policy is primarily aimed at securing some opportunities directly associated with the developments proposed in the plan.	No change recommended
Ken Walton				DBDLP 337	Policy DC 5	Skills and Training	Neutral	Plan should promote quality, well paid jobs and apprenticeships.	This policy is primarily aimed at securing some opportunities directly associated with the developments proposed in the plan. Otherwise the planning system has limited control over the nature and types of jobs created.	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 600	Policy DC 5	Skills and Training	Support	Support for policy as drafted.	Noted.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1182	Policy DC 5	Skills and Training	Neutral	Alternative wording suggested: <i>"The Borough Council will encourage all local employers to participate in skills and employment training initiatives to increase access to employment for those who live within the area. Where development proposals would generate a significant number of construction and operational phase jobs, the Borough Council will seek to enter into a S106 Agreement to secure appropriate commitments and targets for employment skills and training, including apprenticeships appropriate to the development proposed. Where firms already run existing training programmes / apprenticeships this policy would not apply provided they can demonstrate these will include residents of the Borough"</i>	The exemption for builders with existing programmes (subject to demonstrating this will include builders from within the borough) is acknowledged within the reasoned justification of the plan. It is not considered necessary to include specific reference in the policy box.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1333	Policy DC 5	Skills and Training	Neutral	Generally supportive but alternative wording suggested to allow more flexibility.	Paragraph 5.5.3 makes it clear this requirement would only be sought 'were relevant and feasible'.	No change recommended
Canon Chris Beales				DBDLP 347	5.5.1	Paragraph	Support	Support for role of skills and education.	Noted.	No change recommended
Miss Lucy Blakemore				DBDLP 15	5.5.2	Paragraph	Support	Support for encouraging inward investment and improving skills.	Noted.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 889	6	HOUSING	Neutral	Housing requirement and target noted. Any housing development that is likely to generate trips at the Strategic Road Network (SRN) will need to demonstrate that their impact will not be severe at the SRN. Further comments on the individual site locations are provided. The cumulative	Comments noted. 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.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								impact of the proposed housing allocation will also be considered.		
Ms Michelle Saunders	North Yorkshire County Council			DBDLP 1070	6	HOUSING	Support	We welcome the commitment to deliver housing which meet the needs and aspirations of those living and working in the borough. We acknowledge that a significant proportion of this housing (circa 3000) is already committed within existing planning permissions. It is further noted that two large scales planning permissions are included close to the boundary with North Yorkshire. DBC should ensure that adequate provision of infrastructure is provided on and off site to service the requirements of growth within this area and any cross-boundary impacts arising.	Support noted. An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development.	No change recommended.
Frances Nicholson	Bellway Homes Limited (Durham)			DBDLP 1173	6	HOUSING	Support	In the main Bellway are supportive of Darlington Borough Council's proposed Housing Policy and their aspirations for housing delivery aside to specific objections highlighted in other representations. More specifically Bellway fully support site reference no. 392 'Elm Tree Farm' and strongly advise/recommend that it is retained in the 5 year housing land supply trajectory plans for short term delivery. The site is considered to be highly sustainable and is logical in its positioning for an urban extension. Further to this, preliminary assessments undertaken to inform a potential detailed planning application demonstrate that the site is predominantly unconstrained by environmental considerations and is not located within an area of high landscape or cultural heritage value or ecological sensitivity.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mrs Sally				DBDLP 158	6.0.2	Paragraph	Object	Brownfield sites should be developed instead of countryside.	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Tinkler										
Mr Neil Minto				DBDLP 781	6.0.2	Paragraph	Object	Brownfield sites should be developed instead of countryside.	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
Mr Paul Howell				DBDLP 323	6.0.3	Paragraph	Neutral	Concerns that development proposals are not clearly aligned with infrastructure improvements. There should be an association between the delivery of road solutions and the building of houses.	An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development. Transport modelling work is also ongoing to test highway mitigation schemes to ensure developments do not have an unacceptable impact on local and strategic highway network. Timing of infrastructure delivery will also be considered in the above evidence base work and secured through the planning application process.	No change recommended.
Canon Chris Beales				DBDLP 348	6.0.4	Paragraph	Support	<p>Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing mix will not be achieved in the current market driven system. Private housebuilders are not constructing homes for an aging population (e.g. bungalows). Not enough affordable homes being built. Social cohesion in new communities. Employment levels may be negatively effected by new technologies, automation. 	<p>Policy H 4 aims to encourage a mix of new homes including market and specialised housing suitable for older people. Policy H 5 also requires a proportion of affordable homes from market schemes. Policies and guidance within the Draft Local Plan and Design of New Development SPD (2011) encourage planning principles which promote social cohesion.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method with regards to employment levels.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 56	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. Contradicts ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington. Questioned if the 10,000 new homes needed in the plan is based	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								on the 7,000 new full time jobs and additional workers needed.		
Mr Tim Ellis				DBDLP 87	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. Contradicts ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington. Immigration should be brought under control via Brexit therefore this is the wrong time to assess future population growth.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. The impacts of Brexit on migration is unclear therefore long term migration trends have been utilised to inform the housing requirement and housing target. The likely effects will be kept under review and can be considered further in future Local Plan reviews when more information on the impacts are available.	No change recommended.
Mr Simeon Hope				DBDLP 247	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. Contradicts ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Alan Hutchinson	Whinfield Residents Association			DBDLP 164	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington which DBC state are flawed. DBC figures are based on assumptions and estimates. They are significantly different from the ONS figures.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mr Ralph Bradley				DBDLP 112	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. Contradicts ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington. Concerns raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts of housing growth on infrastructure and local services. Dispute the statement "substantial majority of the employed population both live and work in the town" 	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development. Evidence within Part 1 of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 shows that 71.2% of people who live in Darlington also work in Darlington. From the other perspective 64.7% of those who work in Darlington also live there (source: 2011 Census).	No change recommended.
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 119	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Neutral	Calculations of housing need disputed. Market forces will determine how many dwellings are built.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. Although market forces will largely drive how many	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>dwellings are built, the Council has to make an assessment of housing need and allocate sufficient land to accommodate this need over the plan period. If the market does not deliver as anticipated sites will simply not be developed and can come forwarded at a later time.</p>	
Mrs Gwen Park				DBDLP 181	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Government recommended figure is 177 dwellings per annum. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers have yet to build or sell the houses planned at West Park and Central Park. • Brownfield sites should be developed first. 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Sites which have planning permission and are building out, such as West Park and Central Park, are acknowledged in the draft Local Plan and contribute to meeting the identified housing need. Their estimated delivery is set out within Appendix A Housing Trajectory.</p>	No change recommended.
Mrs Donna Greenhow				DBDLP 183	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. Contradicts ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington. As such there is no need to develop sites within the countryside. Brownfield sites should be prioritised including the regeneration of the town centre which is losing big retailers.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	No change recommended.
Simon Bainbridge				DBDLP 400	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • House prices have been static therefore supply is meeting demand. • DBC figure is based on assumptions and estimates. • Migration difficult to estimate. • Brexit and contraction of the town centre will result in 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								static employment levels at best.		
b everington				DBDLP 276	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No evidence to support the higher figure. Population growth since 2011 has been minimal. House prices and rental values remained the same or decreased, showing supply is meeting demand. Town centre contracting. Durham County Council have utilised the governments calculations despite significant investment in the area. 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>Durham County Council's use of the standard method for calculating housing need has been noted. Darlington Council's approach is explained in the officer response referenced above.</p>	No change recommended.
Alan William Macnab				DBDLP 184	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Governments housing need figure for Darlington is 177 dwellings per annum. No exceptional circumstances put forward to justify Draft Local Plan figure of 422 dwellings per annum. This figure may not be reached for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effects of Brexit on the economy which have not been factored into the target. 7,000 new jobs not necessarily well paid to purchase new homes. There is not a demand for the type of homes which are being built. 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. The jobs forecast of 7,000 (FTE) over the plan period is based on past trends of employment growth and evidence work does look at an estimated sector split of these jobs (Darlington Future Employment Needs Report September 2017). If the need does not arise for new homes which are related to jobs growth as predicted, they will not be built by developers. However it is important that suitable sites are identified via allocations if the need does arise.</p> <p>Policy H 4 aims to encourage a mix of new homes in terms of size and tenures which meet local needs as identified within the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or by other evidence.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								Concerns that the appropriate infrastructure will not be provided.	An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development.	
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 203	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Neutral	Housing requirement / target disputed. Concern if 7,000 new jobs is achievable or sustainable.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 206	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Housing requirement and target disputed and considered excessive and unnecessary particularly given local economic issues and Brexit. Questioned whether 7,000 new jobs is achievable or sustainable.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mr Simeon Hope				DBDLP 246	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Projected number of dwellings required disputed and based on very little evidence. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dwellings required designed to appeal to landowners and developers. Will result in urban sprawl and the destruction of green areas. There are brownfield sites which should be developed for housing. <p>Housing plan should take more account of avoiding urban sprawl, the ecology of green areas and avoiding air pollution from traffic.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Policy H 4 aims to encourage a mix of new homes in terms of size and tenures which meet local needs as identified within the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or by other evidence.</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 the Sustainability Appraisal which was also published for consultation and is still available on the Council's website.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole and includes policies on green infrastructure, biodiversity and the protection of the countryside.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan seeks to minimise vehicle emissions through its locational strategy and a number of complimentary policy requirements. The strategy looks to locate development in sustainable locations reducing the need to travel</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									to access services, facilities and employment, maximising opportunities for people to use sustainable methods of travel, consequently reducing emissions from private vehicles.	
Mr Andrew Ward				DBDLP 196	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where are the households coming from. Housing shortage is in the south east not the north east. Brexit may result in a decrease in migration therefore demand will reduce. Low to medium rise apartments should be considered to cater for smaller household size. Therefore requiring less land. Government Ministers have said that the house building programme will not threaten green belt land. DBC state that ONS figures are flawed and applied their own figures from a consultancy. This assessment should be independently assessed. 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. The housing requirement in the plan will be assessed by an independent planning inspector, appointed by the government, at a Local Plan examination. This will take place once the plan has been submitted to the planning inspectorate.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there is more pressure in the south east for new homes, however, the Council is still required to plan for identified housing need in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The impacts of Brexit on migration is unclear therefore long term migration trends have been utilised to inform the housing requirement and housing target. The likely effects will be kept under review and can be considered further in future Local Plan reviews when more information on the impacts are available.</p> <p>Policy H 4 aims to encourage a mix of new homes in terms of size and tenures which meet local needs as identified within the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or by other evidence.</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. Please see officer response on brownfield land, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr M Gardner				DBDLP 189	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Many new homes have been built in the past. Concerns regarding the impact on the road network and additional congestion.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. The Local Plan identifies the housing need for the plan period 2016-36; any dwellings constructed during this period will contribute towards meeting the housing requirement and housing target of the plan. Homes built prior to 2016</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									therefore do not contribute to meeting the housing requirement and housing target of the plan. 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.	
Maria Jabs				DBDLP 253	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts Government's standard methodology requirement of 177 dwellings per annum. If further housing is required an alternative location should be sought.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
Anne Rudkin				DBDLP 255	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts Government's standard methodology requirement of 177 dwellings per annum without justification.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mr John Rudkin				DBDLP 290	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts governments suggested requirement of 177 dwellings per annum without justification.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mr James Wilson Chalk				DBDLP 447	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed. Concerns raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number suggests an increase in the number of high quality / paid jobs coming to the town so that potential owners can afford the cost. Alternative is that Darlington becomes a dormitory town which could have undesirable consequences. 	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. The jobs forecast of 7,000 (FTE) over the plan period is based on past trends of employment growth and evidence work does look at an estimated sector split of these jobs (Darlington Future Employment Needs Report September 2017). If the need does not arise for new homes which are related to jobs growth as predicted, they will not be built by developers. However it is important that suitable sites are identified via allocations if the need does arise.	No change recommended.

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 361	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DBC should be using the standard method figure of 177. No "exceptional circumstances" have been put forward to justify the Local Plan figures. Figures used in ORS report are based on estimates and assumptions. House and rental values have remained static therefore it appears that supply is meeting demand. No mention of the effect of Brexit or the contraction of the town centre. 7,000 new jobs seems aspirational rather than realistic. 	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mrs Jennifer Bradley				DBDLP 451	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. Contradicts ONS forecast of 177 per annum for Darlington. Also disagree with the statement that '<i>substantial majority of the employed population both live and work in the town</i>'.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>Evidence within Part 1 of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015 shows that 71.2% of people who live in Darlington also work in Darlington. From the other perspective 64.7% of those who work in Darlington also live there (source: 2011 Census).</p>	No change recommended.
Mrs Karen Gannon				DBDLP 468	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Exceeds the standard method figure outlined in the NPPF. No justification or evidence to increase these figures.</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 534	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts governments suggested</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. The housing target of 492 dwellings is aspirational as it makes an allowance for 7,000 (FTE) new jobs over the plan period. It is also however realistic	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>requirement of 177 dwellings per annum. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan states that the housing requirement is a balance between 'achievability and aspiration'. I disagree that housing requirement should be based upon aspiration – it should be based upon trends and forecasts. Objection to the method to calculate the housing need in the plan as it does not follow the standard method and it does not detail an exceptional circumstance which would justify an alternative approach. 	as it is based on past trends of employment growth in the borough.	
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 535	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts governments suggested requirement of 177 dwellings per annum without justification. Concerns raised on the development of greenfield sites.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Policy H 4 Housing Mix requires proposals for housing developments to provide an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures which meet local needs as identified in the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or by other evidence.</p>	No change recommended.
Paul Littleton				DBDLP 508	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Concerns raised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attention should be on other areas such as town centre. There are many empty properties in the town that could be utilised. 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	No change recommended.

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"> Urban sprawl into the countryside. Utilise brownfield sites first. 		
Mrs C Everington				DBDLP 528	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts governments suggested requirement of 177 dwellings. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population has remained static recently. Rental prices static, suggesting supply meets demand. Questionable if homes which are being built actually meet needs. 7,000 jobs estimate is questionable. 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>Policy H4 aims to encourage a mix of new homes in terms of size and tenures which meet local needs as identified within the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or by other evidence.</p> <p>The jobs forecast of 7,000 (FTE) over the plan period is based on past trends of employment growth and evidence work does look at an estimated sector split of these jobs (Darlington Future Employment Needs Report September 2017). If the need does not arise for new homes which are related to jobs growth as predicted, they will not be built by developers. However it is important that suitable sites are identified via allocations if the need does arise.</p>	No change recommended.
Mrs Anne Bland				DBDLP 554	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	There is disagreement regarding number of new homes needed. An organisation have suggested some alternative sites for housing so that green space can be preserved.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
G Martin				DBDLP 561	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts governments suggested requirement. Concerns that new homes would put pressure on infrastructure. If new homes are needed prioritise brownfield land.	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development.</p>	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) -			DBDLP 601	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts governments suggested requirement of 177 dwellings per	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. With regards to the comments on the County Durham Plan; the SHMA Update 2017 does make an allowance for in commuters and out commuters	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
	Darlington Group							<p>annum without justification. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of 7,000 jobs over the plan period questionable and not justified. Regard not taken to housing provision in the County Durham Local Plan which includes a significant element for a Teesside workforce commuting in from south Durham. Recommended requirement is 247 dwellings per annum. A reduced housing requirement will mean it is not as difficult to meet the five year housing land supply. 	for Darlington when calculating the homes needed for the additional 7,000 workers.	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 602	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Objection to final paragraph of the policy - it 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. Considers that the housing figure is vastly over inflated and the Council is effectively "set up to fail".</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, housing requirement and housing target and also the response on the five year supply fall-back position.</p> <p>In addition, if the Council is in a position in the future where it cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable sites the tilted balance of paragraph 11 of the NPPF (2018) would be engaged and decision makers will give appropriate weighting to other related (to the application) Local Plan policies.</p>	Please see officer response to five year supply fall-back position.
Judith Murray				DBDLP 524	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Plan states that the housing requirement is a balance between 'achievability and 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. The housing target of 492 dwellings is aspirational as it makes an allowance for 7,000 (FTE) new jobs over the plan period. It is also however realistic as it is based on past trends of employment growth in the borough.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>aspiration'. I disagree that housing requirement should be based upon aspiration – it should be based upon trends and forecasts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to the methodology used to calculate the housing need in the Plan as it does not follow the standard method (NPPF para 60) and it does not detail any exceptional circumstances which would justify an alternative approach. 		
Mr John Barker				DBDLP 673	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts governments suggested requirement of 177 dwellings per annum without justification.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mr Peter Evans				DBDLP 568	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts governments suggested requirement of 177 dwellings which is more accurate.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Franz Egarter				DBDLP 627	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Questions the need for 10,000 new dwellings.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Margaret Egarter				DBDLP 629	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Questions the need for 10,000 new dwellings.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council			DBDLP 727	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Support	Support that Darlington is considered as a separate Housing Market Area. SBC has no objections to the minimum requirement or housing target identified in the draft. In accordance with the duty to cooperate SBC is open to further engagement with Darlington Council as the Local Plan progresses.	Comments noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr McMain				DBDLP 720	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts Government's suggested requirement of 177 dwellings per annum without justification. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount of new jobs created over the plan period questioned. The impact of Brexit also not taken into account. 	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mrs H Kilcran				DBDLP 717	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts governments suggested requirement. Concerns regarding development on greenfield sites.</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and the response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
Mr Alan Hutchinson				DBDLP 750	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts Government's suggested requirement of 177 dwellings per annum without justification.</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mr John Atkinson				DBDLP 623	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts Government's suggested requirement of 177 dwellings per annum without justification.</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Miss Joanne Evans				DBDLP 631	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. ONS projection more accurate. DBC should commission an independent projection to provide more certainty.</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. The housing requirement in the plan will be assessed by an independent planning inspector, appointed by the government, at a Local Plan examination. This will take place once the plan has been submitted to the planning inspectorate.	No change recommended.
Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odhamier				DBDLP 981	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts Government's standard methodology requirement of 177 dwellings per annum without justification. Concerns raised:</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>The 2016 household projections were released in September 2018. Under normal circumstances the latest data is utilised to derive an areas housing requirement. However the</p>	No change recommended.

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"> No justification for deviating from the standard methodology. Has the effect of Brexit on the economy and population growth been taken into account. Population projections undertaken every 2 years. By the time a decision is made on this development your population forecasts will be out of date or will they be regularly revised. Why is there a need for these homes when economic data suggests that residents will not be able to afford them. Concern regarding the use of the term aspirational in the Local Plan. 	<p>Government announced in February 2019 that the 2016 projections should not be used in calculating housing need as this data shows very low levels of growth and authorities should continue to use the 2014 projections. As such the Strategic Housing Market Assessment has not been updated with the 2016 projections and in the next version of the Local Plan the minimum housing requirement is to be 177 net additional dwellings which is based on the 2014 projections.</p> <p>The housing target of 492 dwellings is aspirational as it makes an allowance for 7,000 (FTE) new jobs over the plan period. It is also however realistic as it is based on past trends of employment growth in the borough.</p> <p>The jobs forecast of 7,000 (FTE) over the plan period is based on past trends of employment growth and evidence work does look at an estimated sector split of these jobs (Darlington Future Employment Needs Report September 2017). If the need does not arise for new homes which are related to jobs growth as predicted, they will not be built by developers. However it is important that suitable sites are identified via allocations if the need does arise.</p>	
Ms Helen McIntyre				DBDLP 938	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed. Concern that they are overestimated.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mr Keith Stodart				DBDLP 942	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Miss Katherine Workman				DBDLP 945	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Simon Jones				DBDLP 947	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Ms Laura Gardner				DBDLP 959	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Town centre is declining and houses are being built further away from it which will not help this situation. Increased traffic congestion. Empty buildings and brownfield sites should be developed first instead of greenfield sites. 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Town centres around the country are facing a number of challenges. Growth within the borough will generate increased expenditure in the town centre that will help to support the vitality and viability of the centre. A town centre first approach is also advocated in policy TC 1 for all main town centre uses and the Council is exploring other ways to encourage and promote the growth of the town centre.</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>	No change recommended.
Mrs Liz Knight				DBDLP 960	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mr Knight				DBDLP 965	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Annual housing target of 492 houses disputed. ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington.	Please see officer response for housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1026	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Concern that the level of development proposed is excessive and is not justified. Explanation within the SHMA noted with regards to household projections and adjusting the starting point of 160 dwellings per annum to 384 dpa.</p> <p>Concern that the relationship with adjoining authorities in terms of</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>The relationship with adjoining authorities has been considered as part of the plan making process. Data and evidence within Part 1 of the Darlington SHMA (2015) indicated that the borough is generally a self contained housing market area. This is the geographical area within which a substantial majority of the</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>housing and the economy has not been fully considered. Evidence does not show a clear link between employment growth and the need for new homes.</p> <p>Significant departure from national household projections should be clear.</p>	<p>employed population both live and work, and where those moving house choose to stay. It is for this area which the Local Plan will address the housing needs.</p> <p>The officer response outlined above provides an overview of the jobs growth forecast over the plan period. Further detail can be viewed in the Darlington SHMA Update (2017) and the Darlington Future Employment Needs Report (2017) both of which are available on the Council's website. Factors considered in the SHMA Update (2017) included patterns of out commuting and in commuting of workers in the borough based on current trends.</p>	
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1049	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Neutral	Departing from the Government's methodology means that DBC must fully justify its OAN to any future Local Plan Inspector. No further comment.	Comments noted. Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mr Derek Dodwell	Darlington Association of Parish Councils			DBDLP 1068	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed. The plan should address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How to encourage the use of brownfield sites. A strategy for improving / bringing back into use existing stock. 	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
Ms Julie Nixon				DBDLP 1369	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. Contradicts ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
Mrs Janine Lee				DBDLP 1375	Policy H 1	Housing Requirement	Object	<p>Housing figure of 492 disputed. Contradicts standard method figure of 177 with no justification. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brownfield sites should be developed first. 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>The Council is supportive of residential development in the town centre, however these</p>	No change recommended.

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"> Town centre should be developed first and use vacant shops for housing. 	sites alone and the conversion of vacant shops would not be sufficient to meet quantitative housing needs. A mix of housing sites across the borough are required to meet both quantitative and qualitative housing needs.	
Major Frederick Greenhow MBE				DBDLP 92	6.1.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development allowed without adequate infrastructure provision. Impact on the countryside. Brownfield sites should be prioritised. 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr Phillip Thornberry				DBDLP 157	6.1.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>Concerns raised regarding traffic congestion particularly from the Skerningham site. No new housing should be built until the northern link road is completed.</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>The northern link road (proposed link between the A66 and A1) is a project which is being led on by Tees Valley Combined Authority with support from the Council and is subject to Central Government funding. At this time it is unclear whether funding is available for the project. As such the modelling work which is being undertaken for the Local Plan considers both circumstances of it being provided or not provided. The growth strategy of the plan is not dependent on the delivery of the link road.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr Ralph Bradley				DBDLP 128	6.1.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brownfield sites should be prioritised. 	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	No change recommended.

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"> Concerns regarding the impact / loss of the countryside. 		
b everington				DBDLP 438	6.1.2	Paragraph	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed. Contradicts Government's standard methodology requirement. Concerns regarding loss of greenfield land.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
Mrs Jennifer Bradley				DBDLP 452	6.1.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>Annual housing need of 492 houses disputed. ONS forecast is 177 per annum for Darlington. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brownfield sites should be prioritised. Concerns regarding the impact / loss of the countryside. 	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method, and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
Mr Anthony Scarre				DBDLP 32	6.1.5	Paragraph	Object	Concerns raised regarding the housing requirement and target and where the people will come from who need these homes. Housing need should be based on the additional 3500 economically active households which are estimated by 2036 in the 2017 housing strategy.	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>For clarification the document referred to is the Darlington SHMA Update (2017) which states at para 2.36 that the economically active population is likely to increase by 3,500 persons over the 20 year period 2016 - 36. This is a rounded figure. The issue raised is explained in the officer response referenced above.</p>	No change recommended.
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 536	6.1.5	Paragraph	Object	Concerns raised regarding the housing requirement and target and where the people will come from who need these homes. 3500 economically active households are estimated by 2036 in the 2017 housing strategy. Questioned if the housing need has been inflated for the Council's economic benefit (selling land).	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>For clarification the document referred to is the Darlington SHMA Update (2017) which states at para 2.36 that the economically active population is likely to increase by 3,500 persons over the 20 year period 2016 - 36. This is a rounded figure. The issue raised is explained in the officer response referenced above.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									The housing requirement and housing target have not been increased to benefit the Council financially. The figures represent an objective assessment of housing need over the plan period, full details of which can be found in the Darlington SHMA Update (2017). A large proportion of the proposed housing allocations are in private ownership and the Council would not benefit financially from the land sale.	
Mr Neil Minto				DBDLP 789	6.1.5	Paragraph	Object	The borough needs more affordable homes and so people can get onto the housing ladder. Higher value properties are not required.	Policy H 4 (Housing Mix) aims to encourage a mix of new homes in terms of size, type and tenure. Policy H 5 (Affordable Housing) seeks a proportion of affordable housing from residential schemes of a certain size. These policies will help to ensure that the correct type and tenure of new housing is delivered to meet the borough's housing needs.	No change recommended.
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 890		Housing Land Supply	Neutral	Given the scale of housing proposed, an assessment of each site is needed in order to ascertain any potential for impact on the strategic road 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.	No change recommended.
Amy ward	Planning Manager Barratt Homes			DBDLP 1004		Housing Land Supply	Object	<p>Recommendations/Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council to review commitments to ensure still deliverable, whether there is a housebuilder on board and whether there are any constraints preventing development coming forward Apply 20% lapse rate to existing commitments to account for permissions that will not be delivered. Sites with no permission or outline permission must be supported by clear evidence that housing completions will be on site within 5 years 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Substantial evidence base work has been undertaken to date to ensure the commitments and proposed allocations in the plan are deliverable/developable. 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. In view of this it has not been considered necessary to apply a 20% lapse rate to commitments.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to have a number of the proposed allocations within the five year supply as there is clear evidence to support that these sites will be delivered within the five year period. A Court of Appeal decision confirmed that planning permission is not required for a site to be realistically deliverable over the next</p>	No change recommended.

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"> • Increase housing requirement to account for this and provide further flexibility in the Plan • Review proposed delivery of site allocations as set out in the housing trajectory • Push all sites without planning permission outside of 5YLS • Ensure potential allocations deliverable in light of policy obligations in Local Plan • Review the commitments to ensure they are deliverable • Remove sites without planning permission • Allocate more sites to come forward in 5 years or justify potential allocations will deliver in 5 years • Proposed delivery appears to be high in parts of the trajectory. Amend the trajectory to reflect an average build out rate of 35 houses per annum • Apply a 20% buffer to the overall housing requirement. • Approach welcomed to not include contributions from windfall sites and brownfield regeneration schemes within the urban area in the housing allocations or trajectory. 	<p>five years and sites which are allocated in an emerging local plan can be suitable for inclusion in the supply figures. The likelihood that an authority will grant some planning permissions during the period was acknowledged in this decision.</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. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. A contribution 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>The housing trajectory has an average build out rate of 30 dwellings per annum on most sites. This has been increased where there is known to be more than one builder developing a site or more than one builder with an interest in a site.</p>	
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 363	6.2.1	Paragraph	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed. The paragraph does not caution that sites may not be delivered as anticipated and that permissions may not be built out as quickly as expected.	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>Substantial evidence base work has been undertaken to date to ensure the commitments and proposed allocations in the plan are</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>deliverable. Consideration has been given to whether sites have developer interest and physical constraints.</p> <p>There is also 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. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. This provides a level of flexibility in the plan if some sites weren't to come forward for development.</p> <p>Windfall sites, small sites and urban regeneration areas within the town centre fringe have also not been included in the housing supply figures to provide additional flexibility. It should also be noted that paragraphs 6.2.7 - 6.2.9 recognise that there is a possibility of under delivery and the Council will continually monitor delivery and the supply of sites. If there is a period of under delivery these paragraphs set out the actions the Council will take, including the fall-back position of policy H 1.</p>	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 603	6.2.1	Paragraph	Object	<p>The paragraph does not caution that sites may not be delivered as anticipated and permissions may not be built out as quickly as expected. There is a history of developers not building homes they have permission for.</p> <p>Objection to housing requirement / target.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</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 whether sites have developer interest and physical constraints.</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. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>plan period, post 2036. This provides a level of flexibility in the plan if some sites weren't to come forward for development.</p> <p>Windfall sites, small sites and urban regeneration areas within the town centre fringe have also not been included in the housing supply figures to provide additional flexibility. It should also be noted that paragraphs 6.2.7 - 6.2.9 recognise that there is a possibility of under delivery and the Council will continually monitor delivery and the supply of sites. If there is a period of under delivery these paragraphs set out the actions the Council will take, including the fall-back position of policy H 1.</p>	
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 207	6.2.2	Paragraph	Support	Darlington Friends of the Earth notes that whilst DBC considers it has a requirement for 8,440 dwellings, the Plan has sufficient land for approximately double this.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 364	6.2.2	Paragraph	Object	Objection to the plan identifying land to accommodate 16,000 new dwellings which is double the housing requirement of 8,440. Over allocation of land could result in the larger sites not being comprehensively developed. Remove Skerningham allocation to alleviate this uncertainty.	<p>Concerns noted.</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. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. This provides a level of flexibility in the plan if some sites weren't to come forward for development.</p> <p>The additional 5,500 new homes are anticipated to be delivered beyond 2036 on a number of the larger urban extensions and strategic sites. Due to the scale of these sites and infrastructure requirements it is anticipated that delivery will take place towards the end of the plan period and consequently continue post 2036 (largely at Skerningham and Greater Faverdale). Concerns raised are noted, however these sites have been allocated as a whole to ensure that they are</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									planned for as a single cohesive sustainable development, fully supported by necessary infrastructure provision and delivered in a coordinated and phased manner. This approach will help to prevent fragmented development in the long term.	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 604	6.2.2	Paragraph	Object	Objection to the plan identifying land to accommodate 16,000 new dwellings which is double the housing requirement of 8,440.	<p>Concerns noted.</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. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. This provides a level of flexibility in the plan if some sites weren't to come forward for development.</p> <p>5,500 new homes are anticipated to be delivered beyond 2036 on a number of the larger urban extensions and strategic sites. Due to the scale of these sites and infrastructure requirements it is anticipated that delivery will take place towards the end of the plan period and consequently continue post 2036 (largely at Skerningham and Greater Faverdale). Concerns raised are noted, however these sites have been allocated as a whole to ensure that they are planned for as a single cohesive sustainable development, fully supported by necessary infrastructure provision and delivered in a coordinated and phased manner. This approach will help to prevent fragmented development in the long term.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 57	6.2.3	Paragraph	Object	Windfall and brownfield sites should be included in the plan rather than first considering and allocating sites in the countryside.	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Ralph Bradley				DBDLP 130	6.2.3	Paragraph	Object	Questioned why no assessment has been made for Windfall and Brownfield development.	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 208	6.2.3	Paragraph	Neutral	Windfall and brownfield regeneration sites provision should be included and used first for housing before green areas.	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 365	6.2.3	Paragraph	Object	Objection to there being no provision for windfall and brownfield regeneration sites. Council are not following Government guidelines in terms of prioritising the redevelopment of brownfield land.	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes. Chapter 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) promotes the effective use of land and making as much use as possible of previously developed or brownfield land to meet objectively assessed needs. As outlined in the officer response above, brownfield sites have been allocated where possible and the Council is supportive of development on brownfield land. However, where there are doubts that a site will come forward over the plan period it can not be included or relied upon in the plan to meet housing needs.	No change recommended.
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 537	6.2.3	Paragraph	Object	Objection to the omission of windfall and brownfield sites and the focus on greenfield areas.	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 605	6.2.3	Paragraph	Object	Objects to no provision being made for windfall and brownfield sites. Durham County Council's Preferred Options Plan includes a contribution from small sites in its calculations for housing supply.	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes. A contribution from small sites has not been included in the housing land supply in order to create additional flexibility.	No change recommended.
Mr Neil Minto				DBDLP 799	6.2.3	Paragraph	Object	Windfall and brownfield sites should be included. Prioritise these sites and protect greenbelts outside the town.	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes. Darlington does not have any designated green belt. This is a formal designation typically	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									found in larger urban areas to prevent settlements merging.	
Mr Anthony Scarre				DBDLP 34	6.2.4	Paragraph	Neutral	The plan should look to replace poorer quality Victorian housing in certain areas such as North Road.	The housing stock in the borough is considered to be of relatively good quality and the Council does not have any housing regeneration programmes at this time. Demolition and replacement also requires relocation of existing residents and is limited in terms of meeting future quantitative housing needs.	No change recommended.
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 539	6.2.4	Paragraph	Neutral	There are a number of buildings along North Road and above commercial properties in the town centre that could/should be encouraged to be redeveloped.	The Council would be supportive of such schemes and there are permitted development rights which allow for conversions to housing without full planning permission. These buildings alone would not however meet the quantitative and qualitative housing needs of the borough over the plan period.	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 209	6.2.5	Paragraph	Object	Disagreement with the use of a figure of 422 dwellings per year, which it considers excessive. Completion rates for 2016/2017 was 163 dwellings which mirrors the figure the DCLG Standard Methodology calculation brings, which is 177 houses per year.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. Low housing delivery was recorded for 2016/17 with 163 net additional dwellings completed. This did increase in the following years to 485 net additional dwellings in 2017/18 and 627 net additional dwellings in 2018/19. Darlington has also experienced higher rates of delivery in the past, prior to the economic downturn. The completions recorded for 2016/17 is not a justification to reduce the housing target.	No change recommended.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 366	6.2.5	Paragraph	Object	Disagreement with the use of a figure of 422 dwellings per year. Completion rates for 2016/2017 was 163 dwellings which mirrors the figure the DCLG Standard Methodology calculation brings, which is 177 houses per year. House and rental values in the town have remained largely static over a 10 year period therefore it would appear that supply is meeting demand.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. Low housing delivery was recorded for 2016/17 with 163 net additional dwellings completed. This did increase in the following years to 485 net additional dwellings in 2017/18 and 627 net additional dwellings in 2018/19. Darlington has also experienced higher rates of delivery in the past, prior to the economic downturn. The completions recorded for 2016/17 is not a justification to reduce the housing target.	No change recommended.

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 606	6.2.5	Paragraph	Object	Disagreement with the use of a figure of 422 dwellings per year, which it considers excessive. Completion rates for 2016/2017 was 163 dwellings which mirrors the figure the DCLG Standard Methodology calculation, which is 177 houses per year.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method. Low housing delivery was recorded for 2016/17 with 163 net additional dwellings completed. This did increase in the following years to 485 net additional dwellings in 2017/18 and 627 net additional dwellings in 2018/19. Darlington has also experienced higher rates of delivery in the past, prior to the economic downturn. The completions recorded for 2016/17 is not a justification to reduce the housing target.	No change recommended.
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 792	6.2.5	Paragraph	Support	Support for the adoption of a 20% buffer in its five year housing land supply calculation.	Support noted. The percentage is however to be reduced to 10% in accordance with paragraph 73 of the NPPF (2019). The Council passed the housing delivery test in 2019 with 182% and therefore in line with para 73b and footnote 39 of the NPPF the Council has not experienced significant under delivery over the previous three years. As such a 10% buffer is to be applied.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 607	6.2.6	Paragraph	Object	The Plan states “The Local Plan allocates sites to meet and surpass the housing target of 9,840 dwellings over the plan period.”. In using the word “surpass” it indicates its allocation is excessive.	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. An additional 5,700 new homes are anticipated to be delivered beyond 2036 on a number of the larger urban extensions and strategic sites. Due to the scale of these sites and infrastructure requirements it is anticipated that delivery will take place towards the end of the plan period and consequently continue post 2036 (largely at Skerningham and Greater Faverdale). These sites have been allocated as a whole to ensure that they are planned for as a single cohesive sustainable development, fully supported by necessary infrastructure provision and delivered in a coordinated and phased manner. This	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>approach will help to prevent fragmented development in the long term.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above it is considered that the proposed allocations are not excessive.</p>	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 609	6.2.9	Paragraph	Neutral	<p>Provision for a review welcomed but questions raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What will be the criteria to trigger it? Will the existing policies be considered valid, have weight, whilst the review is carried out. If the trigger point for a review is being approached can the review be carried out before the existing policies lose "weight" so they retain their weight whilst the review is carried out? 	<p>The Council will continually monitor delivery and the supply of housing. There is no specific threshold to trigger a review but if under delivery becomes persistent a review will be undertaken.</p> <p>During the time taken to complete a review and prior to it, the weight given to relevant policies for the supply of housing will be dependent on whether a five year supply of housing land can be demonstrated. Other relevant national and Local Plan policies would still apply.</p>	No change recommended.
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 793	6.2.9	Paragraph	Neutral	Support for the additional flexibility that this paragraph introduces. Any review should however not come at the expense of allocated sites and in particular the strategic scale allocations which may require support and time should the investment and economic climate change.	Comments noted. If a review is undertaken the Council would still look positively at allocated sites as they have been considered suitable for residential development in the past.	No change recommended.
Miss Madeleine Sutcliffe				DBDLP 387	6.2.11	Paragraph	Object	A mixture of sites would be preferable and plans for the long-term should form the basis of development. Brownfield sites within town centre already have infrastructure and services. Concerns that the Council is encouraging out of town hubs at West Park and Faverdale, thus detracting from the town centre.	A mixture of housing sites are proposed in the Draft Local Plan in terms of size and location. The Local Plan has to ensure a rolling five year supply of housing sites throughout the plan period up to 2036 to meet the identified housing need. As such there are sites in the plan which are anticipated to come forward in the short and long term. The larger urban extension sites including the strategic sites at Skerningham and Greater Faverdale will come forward later in the plan period due to their size and infrastructure requirements. These sites are to be planned as	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>cohesive communities which are supported by the infrastructure and services which they require.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Neighbourhood centres are proposed at Skerningham and Greater Faverdale, providing supporting local community facilities and services to meet the day to day needs of residents. They have the potential to include a health hub, education, employment opportunities and retail facilities which are of a scale and type proportionate to the nature of the development. As outlined above these facilities are intended to serve day to day needs and are not to be of a scale or type of use which would detract from the town centre. This is also the case with regards to retail uses which have been developed in the West Park area. The western part of the borough has lacked convenience retail in the past and these developments meet day to day needs. A town centre first approach is also advocated in policy TC 1 for all main town centre uses and the Council is exploring other ways to encourage and promote the growth of the town centre.</p>	
Stephen Bibby				DBDLP 479	6.2.11	Paragraph	Object	<p>The strategic site proposed in the north east will not contribute much to the town as a whole. Shops and services would draw away from the town centre (as they do at West Park and Yarm Road). Brownfield sites in the main urban area should be developed first.</p>	<p>The Skerningham Strategic Allocation assists in meeting the quantitative and qualitative housing needs of the borough. The site is to be planned as a cohesive community which is supported by the required infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>A neighbourhood centre is proposed at Skerningham, providing supporting local community facilities and services to meet the day to day needs of residents. This has the potential to include a health hub, education,</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>employment opportunities and retail facilities which are of a scale and type proportionate to the nature of the development. As outlined above these facilities are intended to serve day to day needs and are not to be of a scale or type of use which would detract from the town centre. A town centre first approach is advocated in policy TC 1 for all main town centre uses and the Council is exploring other ways to encourage and promote the growth of the town centre.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1374	Table 6.2	Spatial distribution of housing allocations	Object	Supportive of settlement hierarchy however it is considered that some development will be required within the smaller villages to ensure future sustainability and vitality throughout the plan period. The plan should therefore take a flexible approach with regard to the delivery of housing within rural areas.	The locational strategy for the proposed allocations is focused within the main urban area, as urban extensions and at the larger service villages. It is considered that these are the most sustainable areas for new housing development. The policies within the plan will allow some residential development in the smaller villages, for example infill development, rural exception sites and dwellings related to the rural economy.	No change recommended.
	Church Commissioners for England (CCE)	Ms Lucie Jowett	Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1373	Table 6.2	Spatial distribution of housing allocations	Support	Supportive of identified settlement hierarchy and distribution of housing allocations.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Christopher Noble				DBDLP 5	6.2.12	Paragraph	Support	We agree that the percentage of new housing in the Service Villages within the Darlington area should not exceed 10% of the total.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Peter Hughes				DBDLP 50	6.2.12	Paragraph	Support	Allocation to service villages appears sufficient to village needs.	Support noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Geoffrey Crute	Councillor Neasham Parish Council			DBDLP 378	6.2.12	Paragraph	Support	Welcome the fact that no housing allocation is proposed for Neasham Parish. However, greater support for the sustainability of rural communities is required and this will be commented on later in this response.	Support and comments noted. Para 83 of the NPPF 2019 does outline that planning policy and decisions should support a prosperous rural economy and this includes enabling the retention and development of local services and community facilities. These principles are reflected in policy IN 10 (Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure) of the Draft Local Plan.	No change recommended.
Dr Ian Bagshaw				DBDLP 309	6.2.12	Paragraph	Support	Proposed level of 10% for service villages is right.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Stewart Booth				DBDLP 396	6.2.12	Paragraph	Support	Proposed 10.4% of housing allocated to service villages is sufficient. Any increase would place intolerable burden on villages' infrastructure.	Support and comments noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Anthony Scarre				DBDLP 36	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Neutral	Questioned if there is a preference order for the development of sites. Questioned if some sites are more appropriate than others such as brownfield sites?	There is not a preference order as such for the development of sites proposed for allocation. An estimate has been made of when sites are expected to be delivered which is outlined in Appendix A Housing Trajectory. Site information and standard assumptions have been utilised to form the trajectory. The assumptions include factors such as standard timescales for obtaining planning permission and average build rates. The trajectory does not place any phasing restrictions on the sites and they may come forward sooner than indicated. Please also see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
Alan Hutchinson	Whinfield Residents Association			DBDLP 165	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	Skerningham Strategic Allocation is expected to yield 1800 homes during the plan period, but if at least 2000 fewer are needed across the Town because of inaccurate figures this would	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.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>mean that the Skerningham Strategic Allocation is not required.</p> <p>WRA, therefore, urges that the Skerningham Strategic Allocation be removed completely from the Draft Local Plan and that the need for its future inclusion can be reviewed at the time of the production of the next Local Plan in 2036.</p>		
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 120	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Neutral	An annual update of the tables 6.3 and 6.4 must be presented to council.	The request can be undertaken separate to the Local Plan. Housing monitoring will be undertaken to assess whether delivery is meeting the housing requirement and target of policy H 1. A housing position statement will also be produced at the beginning of each financial year to set out the current five year housing land supply. This involves an update to the housing trajectory (Appendix A of the Draft Local Plan) which is a combination of tables 6.3 and 6.4 outlining expected delivery rates.	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 210	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target figure disputed and therefore objection to the housing allocations. Questions raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does highway transport modelling justify the new infrastructure and location of new dwellings. Should productive agricultural land be used for road building and housing development. If the Government's standard method was used then the Council would have a 5 year housing land supply without Skerningham and using agricultural land. 	<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 allocations are required to meet these needs.</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 on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes. In selecting allocation sites on the urban edge, the Council has sought to avoid areas of highest landscape, environmental and agricultural value as considered in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Anne Rudkin				DBDLP 256	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	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>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 brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr John Rudkin				DBDLP 291	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	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>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> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 367	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Housing requirement / target disputed and consequently object to the housing allocations particularly the urban extensions. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of agricultural land for development. If the Government's standard method was used DBC would have a 5 year housing land supply without the need to use agricultural land. 	<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 allocations are required to meet these needs.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	No change recommended.
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 541	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	Given the uncertainty surrounding Brexit and the expected increase in demand for 'home grown' resources agricultural land should not be reduced and brownfield sites developed first.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Patricia Newton				DBDLP 501	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	DBC should stop this type of development and build on brownfield sites.	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
Mrs C Everington				DBDLP 545	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	Concerns regarding urban extensions and the impact on the town centre. Very little in the way of planning for brownfield sites which would bring benefits to the town centre. Building on greenfield sites is subject to being kept affordable for local people and supported by recent evidence of unmet housing need. Questioned whether this criteria is met.	<p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes. Greenfield sites do not have to be developed purely for affordable housing, however the Draft Local Plan does have an affordable housing policy (H 5) which seeks a proportion of affordable housing from market led schemes. The sites proposed for allocation will meet the assessed housing needs of the borough over the plan period.</p> <p>Town centres around the country are facing a number of challenges. The nature of town centres are changing and adapting to these pressures becoming more of a mixed shopping and leisure destination, with an increase in other land uses including residential and office use. Growth around the town will generate increased expenditure in the town centre and will help to support local employment and the vitality and viability of the centre. A town centre first approach is also outlined in policy TC 1 of the Draft Local Plan and the Council are exploring ways in which to support the growth of the town centre.</p>	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 613	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Objection to the housing requirement / target and consequently the housing allocations.</p> <p>Objection to the use of productive agricultural land for large scale housing developments. If the Government's Standard Methodology was used then the Council would have a 5 year housing land supply without utilising productive agricultural land.</p> <p>The status of some of the housing sites in Policy H2 (allocations), table 6.4 (commitments) and the policies map should be checked. The status of sites</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 allocations are required to meet these needs.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes. This provides information on site selection. Further detail can be found in the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal which are available on the Council's consultation portal. The value of agricultural</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								with permissions subject to Section 106 agreements should be classed as commitments as it would be difficult for the Council to reverse its decision to grant permission.	land has been considered via these assessments. The status of the housing allocations and commitments will be checked prior to the next stage of plan preparation. Sites which have been minded to approve subject to a section 106 agreement are not classed as commitments as the decision notice has not yet been issued by the Council. The decision will be issued once the legal agreement has been signed. A condition is also currently placed on a minded to approve decision that the s106 agreement must be signed within a certain period otherwise a refusal will be issued (unless an extension of this time period can be agreed with the Council) . If this does occur and a refusal issued, the Council will not necessarily renew a permission as circumstances can change.	
Mrs Laura Roberts	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 736	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Support	Broadly support the proposed spatial strategy set out in the draft local plan. As the statutory water and sewerage undertaker it is our duty to ensure that appropriate infrastructure is in place to serve these communities. NWL has a large capital investment programme for the whole of the north east region which operates in 5 yearly cycles known as Asset Management Plan periods (AMPs). The next AMP period is from 2020 to 2025 and is now finalised, but our investment process does allow for some flexibility to enable network reinforcement which may be required to facilitate new development. We can confirm that we have received pre-development enquiries for the majority of the allocated sites, and although this has highlighted that there are some network capacity issues in some specific areas of the borough, we will work with the Local Authority and Developers to ensure that any necessary reinforcement to our network is programmed in to support the delivery of the plan. With	Support and comments noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>regards to treatment capacity, the majority of Darlington's Borough drains to Stressholme sewage treatment works, which currently has sufficient capacity to accommodate all of the proposed development.</p> <p>Some of the sites allocated have been identified to have strategic assets crossing the boundary, such as South Coniscliffe Park. We have recently contacted the Council and agreed to conduct a high level assessment of allocated sites, to assess if there are any assets on site. This will enable the council to strengthen their evidence base and will allow for Northumbrian Water, the Local Authority and the developer(s) to hold discussions from the earliest design stages to ensure any necessary diversion, relocation or protection measures required prior to the commencement of the development are suitably considered and integrated.</p>		
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 794	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Support	<p>Hellens Land fully supports the allocation of Greater Faverdale in Policy H2 of the Local Plan. It is the most sustainable and deliverable location for new housing and employment.</p> <p>The 2012 NPPF at paragraph 52 states that <i>"the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns [...]"</i>. The Greater Faverdale allocation provides an effective way of ensuring long term housing supply and the strategic benefits of delivering a comprehensively planned mixed use site.</p>	Support noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								Policy H2 states that Greater Faverdale has an indicative yield of 810 by 2036. We welcome the term indicative in the policy as it should be recognised the site may come forward sooner and it would be unsound to place artificial restrictions on the ability of the site to deliver homes.		
Mr Alan Hutchinson				DBDLP 751	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed therefore the Skerningham strategic allocation is not required and should be removed from the plan. National guidelines say that development in the countryside should be a last resort, DBC are contradicting this.	<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 allocations are required to meet these needs including the Skerningham strategic allocation.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p>	No change recommended.
Joanne Harding	Home Builders Federation			DBDLP 796	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Neutral	<p>It is important that all the sites contained within the plan are deliverable over the plan period and planned to an appropriate strategy. The HBF would expect the spatial distribution of sites to follow a logical hierarchy, provide an appropriate development pattern and support sustainable development within all market areas.</p> <p>The Council's assumptions on sites in relation to delivery and capacity should be realistic based on evidence supported by the parties responsible for housing delivery and sense checked by the Council based on local knowledge and historical empirical data.</p> <p>It is important that the plan should seek not only to provide sufficient development opportunities to meet the housing requirement but also to provide a buffer over and above this requirement. The reasons for the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</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>It is considered that the proposed allocations do follow a logical hierarchy, provide an appropriate development pattern and support sustainable development.</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>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								inclusion of such a buffer are two-fold. Firstly, the NPPF is clear that plans should be positively prepared, aspirational and significantly boost housing supply. In this regard the housing requirements set within the plan should be viewed as a minimum requirement, this interpretation is consistent with numerous inspectors' decisions following local plan examination. Therefore, if the plan is to achieve its housing requirement as a minimum, it stands to reason that additional sites are required to enable the plan requirements to be surpassed. Secondly, to provide flexibility. A buffer of sites will therefore provide greater opportunities for the plan to deliver its housing requirement. The HBF recommend a 20% buffer of sites be included within the plan.	development. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. Contributions from small sites, windfall sites and brownfield regeneration sites within the main urban area have also not been included in the supply and create additional flexibility.	
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 837	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	Support the identification of Skerningham as a defined allocation within the Local Plan. Skerningham Estates Ltd would seek to identify an increased site yield at Skerningham by 2036.	The housing trajectory is indicative and as outlined in the Draft Local Plan it does not place any phasing restrictions on sites and they may come forward sooner than indicated.	No change recommended.
Miss Jennifer Earnshaw	Project Secretary Banks Property			DBDLP 870	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	Additional site put forward for allocation at School Aycliffe. Site plan and supporting material available on Council's consultation portal linked to policy H 2 ref DBDLP870. The site is suitable for residential development and a logical extension to the western edge of the village. Development can be sensitive to the character and needs of the surrounding area. Site yield of 120 units which could be delivered in the short term.	The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been 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 to focus new development within the main urban area, as urban extensions and at the larger service villages, as it is considered that these are the most sustainable locations. The proposed site does not accord with the locational strategy outlined above. School Aycliffe has very limited services and facilities and it is considered there are more sustainable	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									locations for housing development across the borough. As such the site is not proposed for allocation.	
Mr Roger Fitzpatrick- Odahamier				DBDLP 982	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed therefore the Skerningham strategic allocation is not required and should be removed from the plan. Objection to the use of greenfield sites over brownfield for development. This goes against the National Planning Policy Framework.	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 allocations are required to meet these needs including the Skerningham strategic allocation. Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 855	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Objection that the policy does not include any housing allocations within, or on the edge of rural villages.</p> <p>The current approach is not consistent with national planning policy which does not support blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding. The policy should be reworded to provide means of housing coming forward in rural villages.</p> <p>NWL's land interest at Sadberge Reservoir (HELAA site ref 98) is a suitable and sustainable location for new housing and it should be allocated within the Local Plan for residential development (site location plan available on the Council's consultation portal - comment linked to policy H 2 ref DBDLP855). Previously developed site with a indicative yield of 46 dwellings. The site would support services within the village and nearby Middleton St George in line with para 78 of the NPPF. Infrequent bus service adjacent to the site. Would result in the development of a vacant brownfield site</p>	<p>The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been 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 to focus new development within the main urban area, as urban extensions and at the larger service villages, as it is considered that these are the most sustainable locations. As such there are no proposed housing allocations at the rural villages.</p> <p>This approach does not result in a blanket restriction to residential development in rural areas as other policies within the plan will allow infill development, rural exception sites and dwellings for rural workers; the plan should be read as a whole.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>which has had issues with anti social behaviour, trespassing and health and safety.</p> <p>Technical assessments have been prepared which demonstrate that the site is suitable for housing development.</p>		
Mr Brian Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 971	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Concern regarding the amount of housing proposed at Middleton St George. Problems relating to over development should be considered including potential impacts on community cohesion and local services.</p> <p>New housing estates should have attractive tree planting and highways which reduce speeds.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes which provides detail on the site selection process. The policies and principles set out in the Local Plan aim to create cohesive mixed communities which are well integrated to existing settlements. Housing policies in the plan also encourage a mix of new homes including specialised housing suitable for older people and affordable housing.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development, including local services.</p> <p>Tree planting is promoted and encouraged via policy ENV 7 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development) of the Draft Local Plan and via the adopted Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (2011).</p> <p>New developments will have to meet the minimum highway standards set out in the Tees Valley Design Guide & Specification. This document sets out approaches and methods to reduce vehicle speeds.</p>	No change recommended.
Doris Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 948	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Concern regarding the amount of housing proposed at Middleton St George. Problems relating to over development should be considered including potential impacts on community cohesion and local services.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes which provides detail on the site selection process. The policies and principles set out in the Local Plan aim to create cohesive mixed communities which are well integrated to existing settlements. Housing policies in the plan also encourage a mix of new</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								New housing estates should have attractive tree planting and highways which reduce speeds.	<p>homes including specialised housing suitable for older people and affordable housing.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development, including local services.</p> <p>Tree planting is promoted and encouraged via policy ENV 7 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development) of the Draft Local Plan and via the adopted Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (2011).</p> <p>New developments will have to meet the minimum highway standards set out in the Tees Valley Design Guide & Specification. This document sets out approaches and methods to reduce vehicle speeds.</p>	
Steve York	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 985	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Concern regarding the amount of housing proposed at Middleton St George. Problems relating to over development should be considered including potential impacts on community cohesion and local services.</p> <p>New housing estates should have attractive tree planting and highways which reduce speeds.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes which provides detail on the site selection process. The policies and principles set out in the Local Plan aim to create cohesive mixed communities which are well integrated to existing settlements. Housing policies in the plan also encourage a mix of new homes including specialised housing suitable for older people and affordable housing.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development, including local services.</p> <p>Tree planting is promoted and encouraged via policy ENV 7 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development) of the Draft Local Plan and via the adopted Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (2011).</p> <p>New developments will have to meet the minimum highway standards set out in the Tees Valley Design Guide & Specification. This</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									document sets out approaches and methods to reduce vehicle speeds.	
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1050	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Neutral	<p>Durham County Council note the focus of the Draft Plan on two strategic allocation policies, Policy H10 and Policy H11. As well as these policies, we note Policy H2 explains the housing allocations by Urban Extensions, Urban Area and Villages with a number of Urban Extensions planned.</p> <p>We welcome further discussions, as necessary, on the implications of major developments on the highways network in County Durham.</p>	Comments noted. Further discussions will be undertaken between the authorities and duty to cooperate statements prepared with regards to both housing and the highway network.	No change recommended.
Mr Derek Dodwell	Darlington Association of Parish Councils			DBDLP 1065	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Objection to the amount of housing allocations in the service villages, particularly given the recent increase in house building and the impact on environmental matters and transport infrastructure. Services and facilities are in decline in the service villages and an analysis of current capacity should be undertaken involving Parish Council's</p>	<p>The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been 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 to focus new development within the main urban area, as urban extensions and at the larger service villages, as it is considered that these are the most sustainable locations. The sites at the service villages also assist with delivery in the first five years of the plan as the larger urban extensions and strategic sites will take longer to commence due to the size of these sites and the infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of the sites have been considered via the Sustainability Appraisal associated with the plan.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development. A survey of facilities and services</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>within the borough's villages is also to be carried out as part of the evidence base work.</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>	
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1082	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Neutral	<p>In principle, Gladman is supportive of the approach the Council has taken in identifying suitable and sustainable housing sites such as land at Staindrop Road and Land at Grendon Gardens to meet the housing needs of the borough.</p> <p>Should planning applications come forward on the proposed allocations prior to the submission of the Local Plan the Council should take a positive approach in considering these applications and approve sites which are in accordance with the emerging Local Plan. This will also provide certainty at the Local Plan examination.</p> <p>Noted that site yield in table 6.3 is indicative and final number of homes will be determined by a planning application. This could result in the housing land supply being lower. Recommended that the Council implement a 20% buffer above OAN to the housing allocations should the Council's commitments not come forward as anticipated.</p>	<p>Support and comments noted.</p> <p>Prior to submission of the Local Plan the Council is taking a positive approach to sites which are proposed allocations and are subject to planning applications.</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.</p> <p>There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. A contribution 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>	No change recommended.
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1383	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Objection to the land known as 'Berrymede Farm Phase 2' (HELAA Site Reference 049) being omitted from the Darlington Draft Local Plan as an allocated site. (Site location plan available on consultation portal linked the Appendix A ref DBDLP1383).</p> <p>The site could contribute towards a 20% buffer of sites but it is considered</p>	<p>Although Berrymead Farm Phase 2 (site ref 49) was assessed as suitable, available and achievable in the HELAA, this is a high level assessment of sites and not the final decision on whether a site will be proposed for allocation.</p> <p>It is considered that there are more suitable sites proposed for allocation within the plan and there is sufficient flexibility of sites. Taking into account the completions recorded for the first</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>the site should be allocated on its own merits. The site is considered by the promoter to be suitable, available and achievable in line with the outcomes of the Council's HELAA (2017).</p> <p>The site would also assist in facilitating a road link between the A167 and Faverdale. This is not set out in the Draft Local Plan but is a longer term aspiration of the Council. This would be a continuation of the Skerningham distributor road. Work is also being undertaken on site access which would align with the access to the Skerningham site.</p>	<p>three years of the plan period there is sufficient land to provide a buffer of 16% above the remaining housing target figure. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. A contribution 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>It is acknowledged that site 49 would be a logical extension to site 3 (South of Burtree Lane) and site 8 (Berrymead Farm), however it is not required for this plan period and more suitable sites are available in closer proximity to the main urban area. The site can be considered again during future Local Plan reviews.</p> <p>The potential of the site providing a road link is noted, however this is not required for the delivery of the Draft Local Plan.</p>	
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1184	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Neutral	<p>The Council's assumptions on sites in relation to delivery and capacity should be realistic based on evidence supported by the parties responsible for housing delivery and sense checked by the Council based on local knowledge and historical empirical data.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes recommend a 20% buffer of sites be included within the plan. The NPPF is clear that plans should be positively prepared, aspirational and significantly boost housing supply. Therefore housing requirements should be viewed as a minimum requirement and additional sites are required to enable the plan requirements to be surpassed. This is supported by inspectors decisions.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Substantial evidence base work has been undertaken to date to ensure the commitments and proposed allocations in the plan are deliverable/developable. 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. Where additional information is available from developers on site capacity this has been utilised for indicative yields.</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</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>provides a level of flexibility in the plan if some sites weren't to come forward for development.</p> <p>There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. A contribution 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>N/A</p> <p>Darlington Farmers Auction Mart</p> <p>N/A</p>		<p>Mr</p> <p>Joe</p> <p>Ridgeon</p>		<p>DBDLP 1127</p>	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Support	<p>Darlington Farmers Auction Mart Company Ltd (DFAM) supports Policy H2 – Housing Allocation, Site ref. 243 – Snipe Lane, Hurworth Moor. DFAM have further land to the south of the A66 which would also be suitable for development (plan available on consultation portal attached to comment ID DBDLP1371 linked to site 243).</p>	<p>Support for site 243 noted.</p> <p>With regards to the alternative sites proposed, it is considered that there are more suitable sites proposed for allocation within the plan. The alternative sites proposed are located to the south of the A66 which is the logical boundary to the main urban area of the Darlington. Housing development in this location would be disconnected and isolated from the main urban area. This would raise issues with the sustainability of the site.</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.</p> <p>There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. A contribution 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>Alternative sites proposed can be considered again during future Local Plan reviews.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Christopher Martin	WYG	DBDLP 1114	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>WYG notes that the Council has not yet published a Whole Plan Viability Assessment to accompany the Local Plan. Consequently, it is not currently possible to determine the deliverability of these sites. Our Client therefore believes this approach is unsound as the allocations are unjustified. To ensure the policy is sound, the Council needs to prove that the allocations are viable (with the relevant policy requirements).</p> <p>The plan should seek to provide development opportunities to meet the housing requirement, but also provide a buffer over and above this requirement. The housing requirements set within the plan should be viewed as a minimum requirement. Therefore, if the plan is to achieve its housing requirement as a minimum, additional sites are required to enable the plan requirements to be surpassed. Second, this will also allow a degree of flexibility. A 20% buffer of sites recommended. Our clients landholdings (at Humbleton Farm) can provide a future development option in the shape of a new settlement/Garden Village.</p>	<p>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. This evidence will be available at the next stage of plan preparation.</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. A contribution 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>With regards to the landholdings which could provide a future development option at Humbleton Farm, it is considered that this is not a sustainable location for housing development and would not accord with the locational strategy of the Local Plan. Housing allocations are focused on the main urban area and service villages as these 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.</p>	No change recommended.
Frances Nicholson	Bellway Homes Limited (Durham)			DBDLP 1166	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Support	<p>Bellway are fully supportive of site reference no. 392 'Elm Tree Farm' included within Policy H2 and confirm it is deliverable within the plan period. Currently preparing a planning application for the site. Whilst the site is not located on 'brownfield land', it is considered to be a sited in a highly sustainable location which has the</p>	<p>Support and comments noted.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								potential to accommodate a good mix of housing to assist meeting housing need over the plan period including a significant number of affordable housing units. Bellway support the approach that the yield shall be determined via the planning process and the yield within the plan should not be considered an upper limit.		
Mr G Raistrick		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1245	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>We strongly object to the non-inclusion of the Land at Heighcroft House, Heighington as a proposed housing allocation in Policy H2. We consider that the Land at Heighcroft House, Heighington is a preferable site to the proposed allocation of "Site 95 – Beech Crescent East, Heighington" as that site will have a greater impact on setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Trafalgar House.</p> <p>The site is in a sustainable location and no physical constraints identified. Site plan available on the consultation portal linked to overall Draft Local Plan consultation point - ID DBDLP1237. Site proposed for market housing with an indicative yield of 38 dwellings (25dph).</p>	<p>With regards to the alternative site at Heighcroft House, it is considered that there are more suitable sites proposed for allocation within the plan. Site 95 Beech Crescent East, Heighington is more preferable as it is a logical extension to site 34 Beech Crescent West, Heighington which has planning permission, is under construction and is expected to deliver new homes early in the plan period.</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. A contribution 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>Alternative sites proposed can be considered again during future Local Plan reviews.</p>	No change recommended.
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1301	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>We consider a suitable additional allocation to address many of the concerns in these representations is land north of Neasham Road, Hurworth (HELAA Site 83). The evidence submitted alongside these representations demonstrates the suitability and deliverability of the site,</p>	<p>The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been informed by detailed site assessments within the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal (available on the Council's website).</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>and its capacity to accommodate a range of house types and sizes which will make a significant positive contribution to the overall objectives of the plan.</p> <p>All supporting documents available on the Council's consultation portal, linked to policy H 2, ID DBDLP1301.</p> <p>The proposed site has been assessed as suitable for housing development in the Council's latest Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment. There is also limited opportunities for development in Hurworth over the plan period. Site 333 benefits from a detailed planning permission and is expected to be delivered in the short term.</p> <p>A plan wide viability assessment must be undertaken as soon as possible and we reserve over position to comment further on this as necessary.</p>	<p>Although the site proposed (ref 83 North of Neasham Road, Hurworth) was assessed as suitable, available and achievable in the HELAA, this is a high level assessment and further analysis of sites was undertaken via the SA. At this stage it was considered that the site would significantly affect the Hurworth Conservation Area and Grade II listed Strawberry Cottage. It was also considered that development of the site would impact upon the river setting of this part of the village. As such is was considered that there were other more suitable sites which could be proposed for allocation.</p> <p>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. This will be available at the next stage of plan preparation.</p>	
Mr Derek Dodwell	Darlington Association of Parish Councils			DBDLP 1372	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Concerns regarding the allocation of sites in the service villages. Considered to be too burdensome and assessment of infrastructure capacity required. Suggested to increase allocations within the urban area and town centre fringe to reduce pressure on service villages.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development.</p> <p>In addition to this the Council has to maintain a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. It takes more time for the larger strategic urban extensions to start delivering new homes due to the size of the developments and the infrastructure requirements. The service villages already have a number of facilities/services and good transport links, therefore they are considered sustainable locations for housing development. The sites at the service villages importantly help to contribute to the five year</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									supply of sites and are anticipated to deliver new homes within the first five years of the plan period.	
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Steven Longstaff		DBDLP 1232	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Taylor Wimpey do not consider that the Council has allocated sufficient housing land to meet the proposed housing target and to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility.</p> <p>Current flexibility in the plan is only 10% above the housing target figure. Advised that the buffer should be increased to 20%. In light of historic delivery issues and the reliance within the plan on two large strategic sites (Skerningham and Greater Faverdale) with ambitious lead-in times and delivery rates, Taylor Wimpey do not consider this level of contingency to be enough. Additional sites should be allocated including Land South of Coniscliffe Road.</p> <p>Due to historic delivery issues and given the lack of flexibility, the plan should include potential triggers for a full plan review if the plan fails to deliver against the housing requirement for a specific period of time.</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.</p> <p>There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. A contribution 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>Para 6.2.9 does set out if monitoring indicates that there is persistent and prolonged under delivery of housing, a review of the housing chapter and housing allocations will be undertaken in order to resolve the situation. Consideration will be given to a specific trigger.</p>	No change recommended.
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Steven Longstaff		DBDLP 1239	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Taylor Wimpey are disappointed that land South of Consicliffe Road has not been included in the draft allocations (HELAA site 85). The site is deliverable and a suitable location for housing development. The Council has recently granted permission for 37 dwellings on land to the east of Gate Lane, Low Coniscliffe (ref 16/01231/FUL) thereby accepting that Low Coniscliffe is a suitable location for housing development.</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 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. Subsequently the site referenced is not proposed for allocation.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								Full details of supporting information submitted can be viewed on the consultation portal linked to policy H 2, ref DBDLP1239.	The housing permission referenced was determined at a time when the Council could not demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. As such the tilted balanced of para 11 of the NPPF (2019) applied. Although the site did not accord with the locational strategy of the existing policies of the development plan or emerging Local Plan, the Council considered that the adverse impacts of the scheme did not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. As such permission was granted in line with national policy.	
	Church Commissioners for England (CCE)	Ms Lucie Jowett	Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1157	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Support	Support for allocation of clients land Site 100 Hall Farm, Branksome. The Site represents a sustainable and logical urban extension to the existing settlement. The Site is deliverable and will significantly contribute to Darlington's identified housing need.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Mark Walton		Mr Ian Lyle		DBDLP 1219	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Re-balancing of the proposed spatial distribution of housing sought to increase proportion at service villages, particularly Hurworth. Allocating the land proposed by our client to the West of Roundhill Rd, Hurworth would help to achieve this objective (site map available on the Council's consultation portal - view full comment linked to policy H 2).</p> <p>As part of this re-balancing, objection to the proposed strategic urban extensions in policy H 2 (Greater Faverdale and Skerningham). Reliance on such large scale strategic extensions is not robust because of significant delays that can occur in bringing such sites forward and their associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Noted that only a proportion of these sites contribute to housing land supply within the plan period but even these</p>	<p>The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been 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>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 site physical constraints. This is reflected in the housing trajectory and the estimated timescales for delivery. Delivery rates in the housing trajectory are considered to be reasonable and not overly optimistic. A Local Plan Viability Assessment is being prepared, this will ensure that allocations are</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>assumptions are too optimistic and the plan is therefore unsound.</p> <p>Advised to delete Skerningham and Greater Faverdale from H2 or reduce the supply from these sites within the plan period to more realistic levels. Shortfall from this can be addressed via our client's site, windfalls and other smaller scale urban extensions, including elements of the Skerningham site which are adjacent to the existing built up area.</p> <p>Proposed site could deliver 300+ dwellings. It is broadly flat and currently in use as farmland, within floodzone 1 and with no known biodiversity interest. The site would help to meet housing need and support the long term vitality and viability of the shops, services and facilities at Hurworth.</p>	<p>deliverable when taking into account planning obligations which are set out in the plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 72 of the NPPF (2019) supports the Council's approach in allocating large urban extensions as it states, "The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities." Allocating the site as a whole rather than a number of small individual allocations, ensures that the area is planned as a single cohesive sustainable development fully supported by the necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>With regards to the alternative site proposed, it is considered that there are more suitable sites proposed for allocation within the plan and there is sufficient flexibility of sites. 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. A contribution 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. The alternative site proposed can be considered again during future Local Plan reviews.</p>	
	Godolphin Developments Ltd	Ms Jennifer Nye	Lichfields	DBDLP 1265	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	Policy H 2 does not include any housing allocations in any Rural Villages or sustainable areas not identified as a Rural Village. This approach is not consistent with national planning policy which does not support	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 be able to provide) the level of services, facilities and	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding. The policy should be reworded to provide means of housing coming forward in Rural Villages.</p> <p>Godolphin Developments Ltd's land interest at Great Stainton is a suitable and sustainable location for new housing and we consider it should be allocated within the Local Plan for residential development. Site proposed for approximately 10-15 dwellings with potential for live-work units, shop, community facility such as a play area. See consultation portal for site plan and supporting documents linked to policy H 2, ID DBDLP1265.</p> <p>In this context the use of development limits to prevent any development around Rural Villages in Darlington and a hierarchy which does not positively support housing development in smaller locations not identified as a Rural Village is not considered to be justified. Important that local rural housing needs are met. We therefore consider that this policy of defining development limits to be unsound.</p>	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. The site proposed was considered not suitable for housing development in the HELAA for the reasons outlined above.	
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1335	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Support for allocation of our Client's land interests at Great Burdon (identified as Site 20) and Elm Tree Farm (identified as Site 392). These sites represent sustainable and logical urban extensions to the existing settlement. The sites are deliverable and will significantly contribute to Darlington's identified housing need.</p> <p>With regard to our Client's land interests at Burtree Lane (HELAA site reference 109), it is noted that this is not included as a draft allocation. The</p>	<p>Support for site 20 and 392 noted.</p> <p>With regards to site 109 (East of Whesseo House) although the site was assessed as suitable, available and achievable in the HELAA, this is a high level assessment of sites and not the final decision on whether a site will be proposed for allocation. It is considered that there are more suitable sites proposed for allocation within the plan and there is sufficient flexibility of sites; a 16% buffer above the remaining housing target figure. It is acknowledged that site 109 would be logical extension to site 3 (South of Burtree Lane) and</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>HELAA identified that the site is suitable, available and achievable for residential development and noted no major constraints which would preclude development from coming forward. The Council's evidence base does not provide any justification for the exclusion of this site as an identified housing allocation and the decision to exclude this site is therefore not consistent or justified. The site is considered to be available, suitable, achievable, deliverable and viable for residential development and would help contribute to the Council's housing target. As a result, our Client objects to Policy H 2 on the basis that it is not effective, justified or consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The site (ref 109) is also a logical extension to two sites which have been minded to approve and are acknowledged in the Local Plan - site 3 South of Burtree Lane and site 8 Berrymead Farm.</p>	site 8 (Berrymead Farm), however it is not required for this plan period and more suitable sites are available in closer proximity to the main urban area. The site can be considered again during future Local Plan reviews.	
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1365	Policy H 2	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>The Consultation Draft Plan does not allocate our Client's land interests at Burtree Lane for development (HELAA site ref 109).</p> <p>It is considered that in order to ensure that the Council's identified housing needs are met, additional land will be required should other sites not come forward. Information and evidence submitted to demonstrate that the site is available, suitable and deliverable for residential development.</p> <p>Site is available and there are no ownership issues with the site. Our client has an option on the land and is committed to development subject to the land obtaining an allocation or</p>	Although site 109 (East of Whesseo House) was assessed as suitable, available and achievable in the HELAA, this is a high level assessment of sites and not the final decision on whether a site will be proposed for allocation. It is considered that there are more suitable sites proposed for allocation within the plan and there is sufficient flexibility of sites; a 16% buffer above the remaining housing target figure. It is acknowledged that site 109 would be logical extension to site 3 (South of Burtree Lane) and site 8 (Berrymead Farm), however it is not required for this plan period and more suitable sites are available in closer proximity to the main urban area. The site can be considered again during future Local Plan reviews.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>planning permission for residential development.</p> <p>A range of desktop assessments have been undertaken which demonstrate that the site is suitable for development and there are no constraints identified that would preclude the development of the land for residential use. The site (ref 109) is also a logical extension to two sites which have been minded to approve and are acknowledged in the Local Plan - site 3 South of Burtree Lane and site 8 Berrymead Farm.</p> <p>Full details of the sites sustainability and suitability can be found on the Council's consultation portal - comment linked to policy H2 ID DBDLP1365.</p> <p>The site should be included with the development limit to ensure that suitable and appropriate sites are not dismissed unnecessarily. The site should be allocated for development or at the minimum be able to come forward as a windfall.</p> <p>The site is considered to be achievable and there is excellent prospect that it can be developed in the short term (0-5years) and is therefore deliverable.</p>		
Mr Peter Hughes				DBDLP 49	Table 6.3	Housing Allocations	Support	Agree allocation to Hurworth is suitable and sufficient for village needs.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Simeon Hope				DBDLP 248	Table 6.3	Housing Allocations	Object	Housing target disputed. Contradicts ONS forecast of 177 per annum for Darlington. This means that Skerningham Strategic Allocation is unnecessary.	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, including the Skerningham strategic allocation, are required to meet these needs.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Stephen Bibby				DBDLP 480	Table 6.3	Housing Allocations	Object	Massively skewed distribution, unnecessarily so. Developers are driving the consultation, rather than the needs of the town.	The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been 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 to focus new development within the main urban area, as urban extensions and at the larger service villages, as it is considered that these are the most sustainable locations. Further explanation can be found in officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.	No change recommended.
S Jobe				DBDLP 744	Table 6.3	Housing Allocations	Neutral	<p>It is requested that the development limits of Middleton St George be amended to include Site 90 (HELAA ref) and further considered for housing allocation.</p> <p>This site was assessed and accepted as being suitable, available and achievable for 109 housing units over the next 6 to 10 years in the recent DBC HELAA process.</p> <p>The site is approximately 10 acres. The site size makes it suitable for disposal to a single house builder and quick, simple delivery plan. Single family ownership, avoids complex delivery.</p> <p>Location: Natural continuation of the village. It is a self-contained site within strong boundaries on all sides. Being positioned at the approach to the village, with immediate access to the A67, the impact of a housing development on traffic levels on the center of the village would be relatively minimal. Self-contained agricultural land with no significant constraints.</p>	<p>Although site 90 (West of St Georges Gate, MSG) was assessed as suitable, available and achievable in the HELAA, this is a high level assessment of sites and not the final decision on whether a site will be proposed for allocation. It is considered that there are more suitable sites proposed for allocation within the village which are located more centrally and in closer proximity to services and facilities. There is also sufficient flexibility of sites in the plan; a 16% buffer above the remaining housing target figure. The site can be considered again during future Local Plan reviews.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>Site Features: The land is arable grade 3, no contamination issues. The site is screened by hedgerow/trees on all boundaries. Connections possible to existing roads and established footpaths bordering the site. Generally a flat site. The land is not liable to flooding (flood zone 1), but would require sustainable drainage in development (SUDS), which would be easily achievable given the physical features of the site. Utilities are readily accessible. There are no Rights of Way/Public Foot Paths on site. The site is not in a conservation area or area of archeological interest or significance.</p> <p>Site is capable of providing a significant amount of affordable housing to help meet local needs. Development would help support local village facilities and services.</p>		
S Jobe				DBDLP 829	Table 6.3	Housing Allocations	Neutral	<p>Site 90 (HELAA ref) to be included in the development limits of Middleton St George and the overall housing allocation.</p> <p>Comments below are suggested additions to the existing commentary regarding the viability and sustainability of Site 90, in the Sustainability Appraisal (response also linked to SA consultation).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is ideally located to connect to PROW and cycle routes. • The development would help support local village facilities and services. • Good access to green infrastructure and national cycle route. 	Comments noted, however it is considered that there are more suitable sites proposed for allocation within the village which are located more centrally and in closer proximity to facilities and services. There is also sufficient flexibility of sites in the plan; a 16% buffer above the remaining housing target figure. The site can be considered again during future Local Plan reviews.	No change recommended.

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"> The site will have no detrimental impact on the safety and security of people and property and will have minimal increase in traffic in the centre of the village. Growth of village will encourage more frequent bus service. Site is suitable for sustainable drainage (SuDS). Site would promote access to green infrastructure. <p>Suggested amendment:</p> <p>The development would be a continuation of the existing predominantly linear form of the village. There are no physical constraints to the site and it offers a viable, highly developable and sustainable site. An area of just over 1 acre of mature woodland is part of the site. The woodland screens the beck, provides habitat for wildlife and is a substantial buffer/screen for the site. The beck remains accessible for clearance and maintenance, ensuring the free flow of water. Any additional mitigation requirements would of course be considered.</p>		
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1094	Table 6.3	Housing Allocations	Object	<p>Gladman are promoting land at Neasham Road, Middleton St George for residential development. This site is available, suitable and deliverable and should be allocated within the Local Plan for residential development.</p> <p>Site plan available on Council's consultation portal ref DBDLP1076</p>	The site was considered as part of a wider area in the HELAA (sites 309, 373 and 388) and was considered unsuitable for development. The site put forward forms part of the settlement gap between Middleton St George and Middleton One Row and is adjacent to Middleton One Row conservation area. The area forms part of the rural gap between the two villages which is outlined in policy ENV 3 Local Landscape Character. Development within this area would reduce the open space between the two villages	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>linked to Draft Local Plan (figure 3 in attachment).</p> <p>Site offers a realistic opportunity to deliver housing in a sustainable location and would meet the borough's housing needs.</p> <p>The site is well connected to the village and existing facilities. The site is subject to an outline planning application (ref 18/00275/OUT) for 280 dwellings, 60 apartments for the elderly and significant areas of public open space. The documents submitted with the application demonstrate how the scheme represents sustainable development and that it is available, suitable and deliverable. There are no technical constraints that would preclude delivery.</p>	and would also have a negative impact upon the setting of the conservation area and local landscape character. The development limits of the Draft Local Plan have been drawn to retain the open space between the two villages. The site is therefore considered unsuitable for allocation.	
Major Frederick Greenhow MBE				DBDLP 93	6.2.13	Paragraph	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed therefore Skerningham strategic allocation is not required and should therefore should be removed from the plan.	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 allocations, including the Skerningham Strategic Allocation, are required to meet these needs.	No change recommended.
Mr Ralph Bradley				DBDLP 131	6.2.13	Paragraph	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed therefore Skerningham strategic allocation is not required and should therefore should be removed from the plan.	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 allocations, including the Skerningham Strategic Allocation, are required to meet these needs.	No change recommended.
Mrs Jennifer Bradley				DBDLP 453	6.2.13	Paragraph	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed therefore Skerningham strategic allocation is not required and should therefore should be removed from the plan.	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	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									borough. As such the proposed housing allocations, including the Skerningham Strategic Allocation, are required to meet these needs.	
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 543	6.2.13	Paragraph	Object	Housing requirement / target disputed.	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	No change recommended.
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 795	6.2.14	Paragraph	Neutral	For the allocated sites there should also be a recognition that yields may differ, potentially significantly, from the indicative yields in this policy and, as long as this in line with the principles of sustainability and deliverability, this will be acceptable.	Policy H 1 does state that the yield identified is for indicative purposes only and the final number of of homes to be delivered on a site will be determined by the planning application process.	No change recommended.
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1315	6.2.14	Paragraph	Object	It is not clear if assumptions used to calculate yields have considered other policy requirements of the Consultation Draft Local Plan which could have significant impact, including the building regulations Part M standards set out in Policy H4.	Comments noted. 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.	No change recommended.
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 59	6.2.15	Paragraph	Object	<p>"Avoiding areas which have significant physical constraints and avoiding environmentally sensitive locations."</p> <p>Objection to sites 251 Skerningham and 392 Elm Tree Farm as they contradict the above statement. These sites do have constraints due to the large numbers of traffic which would be generated by these sites. The road network is already congested and these sites would significantly worsen this situation. Traffic congestion would increase by people taking children to local schools and travelling to work. The new link road from the A1 to the A66 will not mitigate the impact.</p> <p>Regarding avoiding environmentally sensitive locations site ref 251</p>	<p>Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation and response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes.</p> <p>Policy H 10 Skerningham Strategic Allocation does set out a requirement for space for two primary schools and associated nursery provision and reserving space for a secondary school. New school provision within the site will reduce residents need to travel by car. The policy also states that the site shall provide an integrated transport network focused on sustainable transport modes, including public transport, walking and cycling with strong links to adjoining communities, employment locations and Darlington town centre.</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>Skerningham includes a burial site, a protected deserted medieval village (which is missed from Appendix C Darlington's Heritage Assets), woodland including some rare black Poplar trees that were funded locally, public footpaths and bridleway that were improved and part funded by the National lottery fund, and rare local wildlife some of which are protected under law.</p> <p>It is an environmentally sensitive area of green corridor and beautiful countryside which is enjoyed by residents for their mental and physical health which you state is very important within the Local Plan.</p>		
Mr Geoffrey Crute	Councillor Neasham Parish Council			DBDLP 380	6.2.15	Paragraph	Neutral	Neasham Parish Council is concerned that the housing allocations at Middleton St George and Hurworth will generate more traffic on the country roads which serve Neasham and the surrounding area.	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.	No change recommended.
Stephen Bibby				DBDLP 481	6.2.15	Paragraph	Object	<p>Objection to this paragraph and Skerningham strategic allocation. Concerns raised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local roads are already congested. Limited access to basic services will increase the problem. Environmentally sensitive locations will be lost. They provide wildlife habitats and recreational space for residents. Loss of greenbelt. 	<p>Please see officer response to Skerningham Strategic Allocation 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>Policy H 10 Skerningham Strategic Allocation does set out requirements for the site including space for two primary schools, a secondary school and a centrally located and well connected neighbourhood centre providing facilities to meet residents day to day needs. The provision of these facilities within the site will reduce residents need to travel by car.</p> <p>Darlington does not have any designated green belt. This is a formal designation typically</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
									found in larger urban areas to prevent settlements merging.	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 614	6.2.15	Paragraph	Neutral	Within the paragraph there is a list with bullet points. Bullet points can be difficult to refer to accurately and it is suggested some form of sub numbering/letter is used, eg i. ii, etc.	Comments noted. Formatting will be finalised prior to the publication stage.	No changes recommended.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 369	6.2.17	Paragraph	Object	Objection as the current housing commitments are not included in the figures. We note the statement "The allocations are in addition to the supply of dwellings from existing commitments, some of which are currently being built out." On the basis there are 2,994 houses with consent that are presently undeveloped this "existing commitment" should be deducted from the overall "allocation".	Commitments have been counted towards the housing land supply and are set out in table 6.4 and the housing trajectory in Appendix A. It is not necessary to include them within policy H 2 as these sites already have planning permission. The commitments and allocations combined contribute to meeting the housing requirement and housing target of policy H 1.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 642	6.2.17	Paragraph	Object	CPRE notes the statement that "The allocations are in addition to the supply of dwellings from existing commitments, some of which are currently being built out." Should the "commitment" not be subtracted from the "allocation" so reducing what is already and overinflated figure?	Commitments have been counted towards the housing land supply and are set out in table 6.4 and the housing trajectory in Appendix A. It is not necessary to include them within policy H 2 as these sites already have planning permission. The commitments and allocations combined contribute to meeting the housing requirement and housing target of policy H 1.	No change recommended.
Mr Christopher Noble				DBDLP 6	Table 6.4	Housing Commitments	Support	New development in Hurworth on Tees should be strictly limited to sites 103 and 333.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Peter Hughes				DBDLP 51	Table 6.4	Housing Commitments	Support	Commitment appears suitable and sufficient for Hurworth.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 212	Table 6.4	Housing Commitments	Object	Darlington Friends of the Earth have the following concerns with the development at West Park Garden Village. Concerns raised:	West Park Garden Village (ref 68) has outline planning permission for residential development. Impacts on traffic congestion will have been considered when the application was determined by the Council. Traffic generated by	No change recommended.

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"> • Increase in traffic congestion and degradation of air quality. • Green policy and outputs is not clear. • It is not clear that the Highways Authority Traffic Modelling justifies the housing allocation. • Any new road should have a 100m green infrastructure buffer zone. 	<p>the scheme will also be factored in to transport modelling work for the Local Plan which will test highway mitigation schemes to ensure developments do not have an unacceptable impact on the local and strategic highway network.</p> <p>Discharge of Reserved matters is still required for the site which will include issues such as layout, design and green infrastructure provision. Green infrastructure will be expected to be delivered on site in line with the standards contained in the adopted Planning Obligations SPD or any replacement. Any scheme will also be expected to meet the requirements of green infrastructure policies within the development plan.</p> <p>There are a number of planning policies in the existing development plan and emerging Local Plan which aim to prevent new development from contributing to unacceptable levels of air pollution. For example 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 efficient thereby reducing carbon emissions. The locational strategy of the existing and emerging Local Plan also looks to locate development in sustainable locations reducing the need to travel to access services, facilities and employment, maximising opportunities for people to use sustainable methods of travel, consequently reducing emissions from private vehicles.</p>	
Dr Ian Bagshaw				DBDLP 310	Table 6.4	Housing Commitments	Support	The provision of sites 103 and 303 seem to satisfy the needs adequately.	Support noted.	No changes recommended.
Mrs Catherine				DBDLP 314	Table 6.4	Housing Commitments	Support	The proposed development of sites 103 and 333 will more than satisfy the needs of Hurworth for the life of the Plan	Support noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Noble										
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 644	6.2.18	Paragraph	Object	Concerns raised regarding the housing delivery test and the implications if the Council's housing requirement/target figure is used to assess delivery rather than the local housing need figure from the standard method.	Government guidance outlines that the figure used for the housing delivery test will be the lower of either the latest adopted housing requirement or the minimum local housing need figure. This approach has been taken so as to not punish local authorities which are aiming for growth in their Local Plans.	No change recommended.
Gerald Lee	Heighington and Coniscliffe Councillor			DBDLP 260	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>It is good to see that the village development boundaries have been reinstated although this protection from development has been offset by Policy H 6. This policy contradicts the proposal to maintain the village size and as such is unacceptable.</p> <p>I assume that the reason why there have been no development boundaries shown on the Chestnuts, the new Oaklands site, Killerby, Summerhouse, Denton and Walworth is because they are designated as 'countryside' and as such are not included in any plans to build any new houses in and around these small villages.</p>	<p>Support for village development limits noted. The approach in policy H 6 Rural Exceptions is set out in national planning policy. Para 77 of the NPPF (2019) 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.</p> <p>Rural villages without development limits will be subject to countryside related policies of the Local Plan.</p>	No change recommended.
Alan William Macnab				DBDLP 186	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 the existing green infrastructure of trees, woodland, hedgerows, footpaths, bridleways and open fields. Blur the distinctiveness of existing communities and by expanding the communities' new challenges for the existing communities will be created. 	<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>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>	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
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Destroy the open countryside between settlements and destroy the Skerningham countryside's intrinsic character and beauty because it will be urbanised, and new green areas created within the development which will take many years to mature. <p>Questioned if Skerningham will be a separate community or will it be part of Whinfield, Great Burdon and Barmpton which surround it?</p>		
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 645	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>CPRE supports the concept of this policy. However, CPRE objects to the extension of those Development Limits into the countryside as we consider many of the extensions into the countryside are unnecessary.</p> <p>Masterplan's for a number of sites, such as Skerningham, Faverdale and Coniscliffe show that there would only be housing on the inner part of the sites adjacent to the town. Why is the Development Limit not drawn to cover only the potential housing areas, instead of all the site including the green infrastructure elements? Developers will look at the Development Boundary in the Local Plan and interpret it that they can build out to the Development Limit without the green infrastructure.</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 allocations are required to meet these needs.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been 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 to focus new development within the main urban area, as urban extensions and at the larger service villages, as it is considered that these are the most sustainable locations.</p> <p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes for further detail.</p> <p>Masterplan frameworks have been prepared for Skerningham and Greater Faverdale and are set out in the Local Plan. The Skerningham site</p>	No change required.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									does have a large proportion of green infrastructure within it. This is included in the allocation so that the Council can plan for the area as a whole and also have greater control over the provision of the green infrastructure. Any development must accord with the masterplan framework within the Local Plan.	
Mr A Macnab	Middleton St George Parish Council			DBDLP 821	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	The Local Plan retains the gap between Middleton St George and Middleton One Row. It should also maintain the gap between Middleton St George and Oak Tree/Airport, and the proposed development boundary should be altered to ensure this.	Suitable and sustainable sites for residential development have been proposed for allocation at Middleton St George to meet housing needs. Development limits have been extended to include these sites. A rural gap is retained between Middleton St George and Oak Tree which is outlined in policy ENV 3 Local Landscape Character.	No change recommended.
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 856	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>The policy of defining development limits is unsound. The NPPF promotes plans and policies being sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change and accommodate needs not anticipated. Whilst the NPPF expects local plans to identify land where development would be inappropriate, and do not explicitly preclude the use of development limits, they do encourage positively seeking opportunities to meet needs and supporting sustainable development. In this context, the use of development limits to prevent any development around rural villages in Darlington is not considered to be justified.</p> <p>Concerns raised that rural housing needs will not be met.</p> <p>However, should the development limits be retained, the Sadberge Reservoir site (HELAA site 98) should be included within the development limits of Sadberge.</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>Rural housing needs can be met via rural exception sites (policy H 6) and housing which meets criteria set out within policy H 7 Residential Development in the Countryside.</p> <p>Please see officer response to H 2 regarding the alternative site proposed ref DBDLP855.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr Brian	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 973	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	Concern regarding the amount of housing proposed at Middleton St George. Problems relating to over development should be considered	Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes which provides detail on the site selection process. The policies and principles set out in the Local Plan aim to	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Jones								<p>including potential impacts on community cohesion and local services.</p> <p>New housing estates should have attractive tree planting and highways which reduce speeds.</p>	<p>create cohesive mixed communities which are well integrated to existing settlements. Housing policies in the plan also encourage a mix of new homes including specialised housing suitable for older people and affordable housing.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development, including local services.</p> <p>Tree planting is promoted and encouraged via policy ENV 7 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development) of the Draft Local Plan and via the adopted Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (2011).</p> <p>New developments will have to meet the minimum highway standards set out in the Tees Valley Design Guide & Specification. This document sets out approaches and methods to reduce vehicle speeds.</p>	
Doris Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 949	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>Concern regarding the amount of housing proposed at Middleton St George. Problems relating to over development should be considered including potential impacts on community cohesion and local services.</p> <p>New housing estates should have attractive tree planting and highways which reduce speeds.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes which provides detail on the site selection process. The policies and principles set out in the Local Plan aim to create cohesive mixed communities which are well integrated to existing settlements. Housing policies in the plan also encourage a mix of new homes including specialised housing suitable for older people and affordable housing.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development, including local services.</p> <p>Tree planting is promoted and encouraged via policy ENV 7 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development) of the Draft Local Plan and via the adopted Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (2011).</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									New developments will have to meet the minimum highway standards set out in the Tees Valley Design Guide & Specification. This document sets out approaches and methods to reduce vehicle speeds.	
Steve York	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 986	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>Concern regarding the amount of housing proposed at Middleton St George. Problems relating to over development should be considered including potential impacts on community cohesion and local services.</p> <p>New housing estates should have attractive tree planting and highways which reduce speeds.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes which provides detail on the site selection process. The policies and principles set out in the Local Plan aim to create cohesive mixed communities which are well integrated to existing settlements. Housing policies in the plan also encourage a mix of new homes including specialised housing suitable for older people and affordable housing.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan has been prepared to support the Local Plan that identifies infrastructure required to support new development, including local services.</p> <p>Tree planting is promoted and encouraged via policy ENV 7 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development) of the Draft Local Plan and via the adopted Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (2011).</p> <p>New developments will have to meet the minimum highway standards set out in the Tees Valley Design Guide & Specification. This document sets out approaches and methods to reduce vehicle speeds.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr Derek Dodwell	Darlington Association of Parish Councils			DBDLP 1064	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Support	DAPC supports the reintroduction of development limits, the policies restricting development outside of those limits and the policies controlling intensification within them. In particular it welcomes the general statement of the unsuitability of Rural Villages for housing development except in very limited cases (e.g. Policy H 6 – Rural Exceptions).	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1084	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Support	Gladman raise concerns in relation to the above policy as it only allows for	The use of development limits is a long established principle in planning, which	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
John Fleming								development within the limits identified on the policy maps. This approach runs counter to the proactive approach to boosting the supply of housing as required by the Framework. The Framework is clear that development that is sustainable should go ahead without delay in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.	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.	
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1186	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>Objection to the use of development limits. The use of development limits will potentially constrain otherwise sustainable development opportunities on the urban fringe of the town. This is contrary to national policy.</p> <p>If the Council seek to retain the use of development limits, Berrymead Farm Phase 2 should be encompassed within the development limits as discussed in relation to policy H 2. (HELAA site 49. Site plan also available on the consultation portal linked to policy H 2 ref DBDLP1382).</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>With regards to the alternative site proposed for allocation (HELAA site 49) please officer response to comments on H 2, ref DBDLP1382.</p>	No change recommended.
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1131	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>Objection to the policy as the approach is too restrictive and not in accordance with the NPPF which seeks a more flexible and positive approach.</p> <p>The Council have rolled forward development limits from the previous Plan or introduced new limits to development without real consideration</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	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>of the potential for settlements to accommodate.</p> <p>Should the Council consider that development limits are required, the following wording is proposed for addition to Policy H3:</p> <p>At any point in the plan period where there is no longer a demonstrable supply of sites to fully meet the five year land requirement, sustainable housing sites that would both make a positive contribution to the five year supply of housing land and be well related to Development Limits of Settlements will be supported where these proposals comprise sustainable development and are consistent with relevant policies in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>development proposals. As such development limits are to be utilised in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>A review of the development limits has been undertaken. The limits from the previous plan were used as a starting point; criteria and key principles were applied and the limits amended where necessary. Main changes involve the inclusion of the proposed allocations and commitments within the development limits.</p> <p>The additional wording suggested for policy H 3 is not required as it is set out in policy H 1 Housing Requirement. It is considered that duplication of this element of the policy does not bring any additional benefit.</p>	
Frances Nicholson	Bellway Homes Limited (Durham)			DBDLP 1167	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>Bellway consider that greater flexibility should be afforded to this policy to allow opportunities for windfall sites to be brought forward outwith arbitrary boundaries, and in many cases such sites could be considered more sustainable than sites located within boundary limits and separate assessment criteria could be utilised to assess a site's suitability i.e. to ensure that windfall sites are well related to existing development.</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>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.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. A contribution 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.	
Mr Alastair Mackenzie	Clerk Sadberge Parish Council			DBDLP 1225	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Support	The Parish Council agrees that development should normally be within the defined Development Limits, and that the Sadberge Development Limits (Map 14) are appropriate.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr G Raistrick		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1249	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>Objection to the policy as the approach is too restrictive and not in accordance with the NPPF which seeks a more flexible and positive approach.</p> <p>The Council have rolled forward development limits from the previous Plan or introduced new limits to development without real consideration of the potential for settlements to accommodate.</p> <p>Should the Council consider that development limits are required, the following wording is proposed for addition to Policy H3:</p> <p>At any point in the plan period where there is no longer a demonstrable supply of sites to fully meet the five year land requirement, sustainable housing sites that would both make a positive contribution to the five year supply of housing land and be well related to Development Limits of Settlements will be supported where these proposals comprise sustainable development and are consistent with relevant policies in the Local Plan.</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>A review of the development limits has been undertaken. The limits from the previous plan were used as a starting point; criteria and key principles were applied and the limits amended where necessary. Main changes involve the inclusion of the proposed allocations and commitments within the development limits.</p> <p>The additional wording suggested for policy H 3 is not required as it is set out in policy H 1 Housing Requirement. It is considered that duplication of this element of the policy does not bring any additional benefit.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr		Mr		DBDLP 1220	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	Objection to the development limits for Hurworth shown on Policies Map as	Please see officer response to policy H 2 on the alternative site proposed ref DBDLP1219.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mark Walton		Ian Lyle						they fail to include our clients land West of Roundhill Road both within the development limit and allocation for housing development. The policies map should be amended to include the land edged red on Figure 1 attached at representation H 2 (available on the Council's consultation portal ref DBDLP1219) within the development limits for Hurworth.		
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1316	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>It is considered Policy H 3 requires greater flexibility. It is suggested similar wording to that recommended for Policy SH 1 is also incorporated into this policy. We suggested the following wording is inserted into the policy:</p> <p>“At any point in the Local Plan period where there is no longer a demonstrable supply of sites to fully meet the five year land requirement, sustainable sites that would both make a positive contribution to the five year supply of housing land and be well related to the development limits of the main urban area or service villages (as defined in Policy SH1) will be supported”</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary to provide any further flexibility to policy H 3 as 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. A contribution 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>The additional wording suggested for policy H 3 is not required as it is set out in policy H 1 Housing Requirement. It is considered that duplication of this element of the policy does not bring any additional benefit.</p>	No change recommended.
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1336	Policy H 3	Development Limits	Object	<p>One of the key restrictions to delivering homes during the plan period is development limits of previous policies preventing any development on the ‘wrong’ side of an arbitrary boundary. Sites adjoining settlements can be equally if not more sustainable than those within settlements. It is therefore considered that this policy should be revised to allow flexibility for appropriate developments to come</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</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>forward on sustainable sites that are well related to existing settlements.</p> <p>Settlement limits should be logical and allow for future expansion. They should not be overly restrictive and should allow for future development in and around the existing and proposed urban area.</p> <p>Current boundary to the north of the main urban area is considered illogical and has been fully defined by existing planning applications (site ref 3 and 8). Objection to policy H 3 in its current form and suggested that the settlement boundary is amended to ensure it is appropriate, justified and defensible. Our clients site at Burtree Lane (HELAA ref 109) should be included within the proposed boundary to ensure that suitable and appropriate sites are not dismissed unnecessarily.</p>	<p>development proposals. As such development limits are to be utilised in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>A review of the development limits has been undertaken. The limits from the previous plan were used as a starting point; criteria and key principles were applied and the limits amended where necessary. Main changes involve the inclusion of the proposed allocations and commitments within the development limits.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to provide any further flexibility to policy H 3 as 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. A contribution 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 to policy H 2 ref DBDLP1335 with regards to the alternative site proposed.</p>	
Mr Christopher Noble				DBDLP 8	6.3.1	Paragraph	Support	There must be a presumption against any new development outside the Development Limits of the urban area and the town's villages.	Support noted. Any development proposed beyond the limits would be assessed against relevant local and national policies including those related to the countryside.	No change recommended.
Mr Geoffrey Crute	Councillor Neasham Parish Council			DBDLP 381	6.3.1	Paragraph	Support	Paragraph 6.3.1 and the succeeding paragraphs succinctly emphasise the desirability of development limits, particularly being tightly drawn in rural localities.	Support noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mrs Catherine Noble				DBDLP 315	6.3.2	Paragraph	Support	There must be a presumption against any form of development outside the development limits.	Support noted. Any development proposed beyond the limits would be assessed against relevant local and national policies including those related to the countryside.	No change recommended.
Mr Christopher Noble				DBDLP 4	6.3.3	Paragraph	Support	We agree with the revised Development Limit to the village of Hurworth on Tees, maintaining the separation from Hurworth Place and limiting proposed new housing to site numbers 103 and 333.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 61	6.3.3	Paragraph	Object	Concerns regarding the northern development limit boundary of Darlington and where the built up area ends and countryside begins. Skerningham is classed as countryside not an urban area, so unsure why the Council wants to extend the boundaries proposed development up to the river Skerne which is natural flood plain.	<p>A review of the development limits has been undertaken. The limits from the previous plan were used as a starting point; criteria and key principles were applied and the limits amended where necessary. Main changes involve the inclusion of the proposed allocations (including Skerningham) and commitments within the development limits.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been 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 to focus new development within the main urban area, as urban extensions and at the larger service villages, as it is considered that these are the most sustainable locations. Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes for further detail.</p> <p>Policy H 10 Skerningham Strategic Allocation has a requirement to protect and enhance the River Skerne and its valley setting. The masterplan framework for the site (figure 6.1) illustrates that development will not be focused adjacent to the river Skerne and the area is identified as indicative green infrastructure. Development would also have to comply with</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
									policy DC 4 Flood Risk & Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) which directs development to areas of low flood risk. Please see officer response on Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	
Mr Christopher Noble				DBDLP 7		Housing Mix	Support	Support for the policy.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Dr Ian Bagshaw				DBDLP 311		Housing Mix	Support	Area policies relating to the development in the countryside.	Support noted. Unclear on comment made. The policy requires that proposals for housing development will be expected to provide an appropriate mix of housing as identified within the most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment or by other evidence.	No change recommended.
Mr Nigel Swinbank		Mr Andrew Moss	Ward Hadaway	DBDLP 42	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	Support the reference to custom and self build housing. Sites should be specifically allocated in the Plan for such development. Without prejudice to other objections it is submitted that such development can be sustainably accommodated in / close to the Rural Villages and policy should allow for this.	The Council is currently reviewing it's self build register. If permissions are required to meet demand consideration will be given to the allocation of sites for such development. Directing this type of development to rural villages does not accord with the locational strategy for new housing development in the Local Plan. The plan approach is to focus new development within the main urban area, as urban extensions and at the larger service villages, as it is considered that these are the most sustainable locations.	No change recommended.
Gordon Pybus	Darlington Association on Disability			DBDLP 77	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	Currently we are happy with 90% type 2 however 10% for type 3 is too low. What will need to be explained is how the census figures for the amount of disabled people in Darlington, which is larger than the national average, fits in with the SHMA. Also H 5 affordable requirements shows areas that will only be required to 10%, 20% and 30% affordable housing in theses area. However when you take 10% of the affordable 10% for type 3 houses it's only going to be one house in the full area.	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.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									The requirements in the plan for affordable and accessible/adaptable dwellings have been derived utilising available evidence and considering site viability. The Council cannot request higher standards which are not supported by evidence.	
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 121	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	Does not refer specifically to affordable housing and we reject the principle of higher densities.	<p>The policy does require a mix of new homes including in terms of tenure; this would include affordable housing. Policy H 5 Affordable Housing also sets out requirements for affordable homes from market schemes across the borough.</p> <p>The NPPF (2019) outlines that planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land. Minimum density standards are suggested for cities, town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport. Policy H 4 is in line with this approach.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 213	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Neutral	Energy efficient building standards should be adopted; e.g. passivhaus standards. We should not be locked into unsustainable energy demand. Roof mounted solar arrays should be considered.	Since 2015 there has been significant change in Government policy on climate change, renewable energy and energy efficiency standards. Ministerial Statements have been made on the subject, including a restriction on the standards authorities can place on domestic dwellings, however legislation is still to be passed on these issues creating some uncertainty. As such the Council is looking to undertake a joint approach with the other Tees Valley authorities on these matters. This is likely to be dealt with in a separate document such as a supplementary planning document.	No change recommended.
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 548	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Neutral	Not only must the buildings reflect the demand for fully inclusive accessibility, there must be similar consideration given to vehicle parking. Too many new builds sacrifice adequate car parking in place of additional buildings.	New development shall adhere to policy IN 4 Parking Provision including Electric Vehicle Charging. The policy states that new development will be required to provide safe and secure vehicle parking. The number of spaces provided and the nature of the provision will have regard to local circumstances and the standards set out in the Tees Valley Highway Design Guide or any successor.	No change recommended.

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 646	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Support	<p>CPRE supports this policy.</p> <p>There is a list of bullet points within the policy. Bullet points can be difficult to refer to accurately and it is suggested some form of sub numbering/letter is used, eg i. ii, etc.</p>	Support noted. Formatting will be finalised prior to the publication stage.	No change recommended.
Mr Brian Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 974	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	<p>Concern regarding the amount of housing proposed at Middleton St George. Problems relating to over development should be considered including potential impacts on community cohesion and local services.</p> <p>New housing estates should have attractive tree planting and highways which reduce speeds.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes which provides detail on the site selection process. The policies and principles set out in the Local Plan aim to create cohesive mixed communities which are well integrated to existing settlements. Housing policies in the plan also encourage a mix of new homes including specialised housing suitable for older people and affordable housing.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan is has been prepared to support the Local Plan that identifies infrastructure required to support new development, including local services.</p> <p>Tree planting is promoted and encouraged via policy ENV 7 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development) of the Draft Local Plan and via the adopted Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (2011).</p> <p>New developments will have to meet the minimum highway standards set out in the Tees Valley Design Guide & Specification. This document sets out approaches and methods to reduce vehicle speeds.</p>	No change recommended.
Doris Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 950	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	<p>Concern regarding the amount of housing proposed at Middleton St George. Problems relating to over development should be considered including potential impacts on community cohesion and local services.</p> <p>New housing estates should have attractive tree planting and highways which reduce speeds.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes which provides detail on the site selection process. The policies and principles set out in the Local Plan aim to create cohesive mixed communities which are well integrated to existing settlements. Housing policies in the plan also encourage a mix of new homes including specialised housing suitable for older people and affordable housing.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>An infrastructure plan has been prepared to support the Local Plan and that identifies infrastructure required to support new development, including local services.</p> <p>Tree planting is promoted and encouraged via policy ENV 7 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development) of the Draft Local Plan and via the adopted Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (2011).</p> <p>New developments will have to meet the minimum highway standards set out in the Tees Valley Design Guide & Specification. This document sets out approaches and methods to reduce vehicle speeds.</p>	
Steve York	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 987	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	<p>Concern regarding the amount of housing proposed at Middleton St George. Problems relating to over development should be considered including potential impacts on community cohesion and local services.</p> <p>New housing estates should have attractive tree planting and highways which reduce speeds.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on brownfield sites, urban sprawl and empty homes which provides detail on the site selection process. The policies and principles set out in the Local Plan aim to create cohesive mixed communities which are well integrated to existing settlements. Housing policies in the plan also encourage a mix of new homes including specialised housing suitable for older people and affordable housing.</p> <p>An infrastructure plan has been prepared to support the Local Plan that identifies infrastructure required to support new development, including local services.</p> <p>Tree planting is promoted and encouraged via policy ENV 7 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development) of the Draft Local Plan and via the adopted Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (2011).</p> <p>New developments will have to meet the minimum highway standards set out in the Tees Valley Design Guide & Specification. This document sets out approaches and methods to reduce vehicle speeds.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Christopher Martin	WYG	DBDLP 1115	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	<p>Support of the overall flexibility of this policy in terms of house types, sizes and tenure, however we have concerns regarding the requirements in relation to category 2 requirements and category 3 requirements and believes their current inclusion in the policy renders it unsound for being unjustified.</p> <p>The optional technical standards should be clearly evidenced in terms of need and viability. Part 2 of the 2015 SHMA is severely lacking in detail and does not justify the specific requirements of the policy. To ensure the soundness of the policy these requirements should be deleted.</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.	No change recommended.
	Church Commissioners for England (CCE)	Ms Lucie Jowett	Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1158	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	<p>Support for the general aims of the policy. Objection to its wording.</p> <p>CCE is concerned that the policy fails to include for viability of development. As set out within paragraph 173 of the Framework, development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened.</p> <p>It is considered that additional evidence should be provided by the Council for seeking Category 2 and 3 standards. This evidence should demonstrate that the Council has fully assessed the requirement for these standards in the local area, taking into account other relevant factors, including viability.</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.	No change recommended.
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1317	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	<p>Support for the general principle of the policy.</p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the introduction of building regulations Part M standards which will impact on site viability, site densities, residential</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	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>unit numbers and absorption into the market.</p> <p>The evidence to justify the need of the standards is set out in Part 2 of the 2015 SHMA. This evidence is lacking and falls short of what is required by the NPPG.</p> <p>Requirements should be factored in to assumptions on site yields. The requirements may mean that many of the sites in the plan become unviable and this must be considered through a plan wide viability assessment.</p>	<p>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 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>	
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1337	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	<p>Support for the general aim of the policy.</p> <p>Concerns with the wording of the policy and object on the basis that the policy is unjustified, ineffective, not positively planned and inconsistent with national policy and therefore unsound. Concern that the policy fails to include for viability of development and this should be included in policy wording.</p> <p>The policy also needs to be adaptable over the plan period and reflect changing requirements that may emerge up to 2036.</p> <p>Additional evidence should be provided by the Council for seeking category 2 and 3 building regulation standards. Evidence should identify the need for the requirements and also account for viability.</p>	<p>It is considered that the policy is adaptable over the plan period as it acknowledges that other evidence can be utilised to support a particular housing mix. The plan will also be reviewed at least every five years and consideration will be given to updating evidence base documents such as the SHMA.</p> <p>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>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</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									support the plan and will consider the requirements of the policy.	
	Godolphin Developments Ltd	Ms Jennifer Nye	Lichfields	DBDLP 1270	Policy H 4	Housing Mix	Object	Recognition of the importance of self build plots is welcomed. The policy should be strengthened to recognise that smaller locations such as Rural Villages or smaller can represent suitable and sustainable locations for self-build, including sites that are not within defined settlement limits.	The Council is currently reviewing its self build register. If permissions are required to meet demand consideration will be given to the allocation of sites for such development. Directing this type of development to rural villages / beyond development limits, does not accord with the locational strategy for new housing development in the Local Plan. The plan approach is to focus new development within the main urban area, as urban extensions and at the larger service villages, as it is considered that these are the most sustainable locations.	No change recommended.
Miss Lucy Blakemore				DBDLP 16	6.4.3	Paragraph	Support	Support for the consideration of the housing needs of different groups of society. Questioned if houses with specialist facilities are planned to be in all new residential areas in Darlington.	The policy does not require specialist housing on every housing allocation. It does however outline that the Council will be supportive of the delivery of such schemes providing they are in suitable and sustainable locations.	No change recommended.
Gerald Lee	Heighington and Coniscliffe Councillor			DBDLP 263	6.4.3	Paragraph	Object	<p>‘Provision may come in the form of bungalows or homes which can be adapted to meet a change in need’</p> <p>Due to an ageing population people need to down size for convenience or health reasons so it is imperative that bungalows are included in some housing development schemes and DBC planning should insist that they are included. The word ‘may’ should be changed to ‘must’ otherwise developers will continue to ignore the needs of people who need this kind of home.</p>	Policy H 4 does expect proposals for housing development to provide an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet local needs. The Council will encourage the delivery of bungalows to meet the needs of the aging population, however it would be an unreasonable approach to insist on bungalows on every site as other types of property can assist in meeting needs of older people and site location and characteristics can influence the type/mix of dwellings which are appropriate.	No change recommended.
Mr Brian Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 975	6.4.4	Paragraph	Object	Middleton St George has a large percentage of elderly residents who need to down-size their homes. There is an increasing need for in-village services that support this age group, such as speciality housing, local shopping, medical and care services all of which need to be accessible to those without access to a car.	<p>Policy H 4 does expect proposals for housing development to provide an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet local needs. The policy also outlines that the Council will support proposals for specialised housing for older people.</p> <p>Any new services or facilities will be directed within the development limits of the village in</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									line with policy H 3 (Development Limits) to ensure that they are in accessible and sustainable locations. It is acknowledge that the local GPs practice has recently moved out of the village. Land is to be reserved at site 146 (Land South of Railway, MSG) for a school and community uses. Therefore land would be reserved for new facilities, including if the GP practice wished to relocate to a more central location once again.	
Doris Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 951	6.4.4	Paragraph	Object	Middleton St George has a large percentage of elderly residents who need to down-size their homes. There is an increasing need for in-village services that support this age group, such as speciality housing, local shopping, medical and care services all of which need to be accessible to those without access to a car.	<p>Policy H 4 does expect proposals for housing development to provide an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet local needs. The policy also outlines that the Council will support proposals for specialised housing for older people.</p> <p>Any new services or facilities will be directed within the development limits of the village in line with policy H 3 (Development Limits) to ensure that they are in accessible and sustainable locations. It is acknowledge that the local GPs practice has recently moved out of the village. Land is to be reserved at site 146 (Land South of Railway, MSG) for a school and community uses. Therefore land would be reserved for new facilities, including if the GP practice wished to relocate to a more central location once again.</p>	No change recommended.
Steve York	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 988	6.4.4	Paragraph	Object	Middleton St George has a large percentage of elderly residents who need to down-size their homes. There is an increasing need for in-village services that support this age group, such as speciality housing, local shopping, medical and care services all of which need to be accessible to those without access to a car.	<p>Policy H 4 does expect proposals for housing development to provide an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures to meet local needs. The policy also outlines that the Council will support proposals for specialised housing for older people.</p> <p>Any new services or facilities will be directed within the development limits of the village in line with policy H 3 (Development Limits) to ensure that they are in accessible and sustainable locations. It is acknowledge that the local GPs practice has recently moved out of the village. Land is to be reserved at site 146 (Land South of Railway, MSG) for a school and community uses. Therefore land would be</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									reserved for new facilities, including if the GP practice wished to relocate to a more central location once again.	
Amy ward	Planning Manager Barratt Homes			DBDLP 1014		Affordable Housing	Support	<p>Support for the policy. The viability of the proposed affordable housing percentages should be justified, it would be useful to see the viability assessment referenced in the plan. The Council should work with housebuilders to ensure that the percentages of affordable housing will be viable, along with other policy burdens proposed in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The policy states, in some individual cases these proposed levels of affordable housing may not be viable due to other site specific issues. In such circumstances applicants will be expected to submit evidence to substantiate this consisting of a viability assessment'. The Government is keen to avoid such a situation where viability assessments are being submitted regularly to vary planning policy obligations.</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>It is recognised that the Government is keen to avoid situations where viability assessments are regularly being submitted with planning applications to vary planning policy obligations. The Local Plan Viability Assessment undertaken will ensure that such situations are avoided, however this work is a high level assessment and cannot factor in site specific issues which may arise. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF (2019) outlines that particular circumstances may justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. Subsequently the final paragraph of the policy has been included.</p>	No change recommended.
Gordon Pybus	Darlington Association on Disability			DBDLP 78	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Object	<p>If percentages for the housing categories change then DAD will just have to deal with that as it happens but at the moment we are happy with 90% type 2 but think 10% for type 3 is too low. What will need explain is how the census figures for the amount of disabled people in Darlington which is larger than the national average fits in with the SHMA. Also H5 affordable requirements shows areas that will only be required to 10%, 20% and 30% affordable housing in these area. However when you take 10% of the affordable 10% for type 3 houses it's only going to be one house in the full area.</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.</p> <p>The requirements in the plan for affordable and accessible/adaptable dwellings have been derived utilising available evidence and considering site viability. The Council cannot</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									request higher standards which are not supported by evidence.	
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 122	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Object	We do not accept the percentages of affordable housing as correct. An explanation is required why there are such variations.	There is substantial need for affordable homes in Darlington Borough. It is important to maximise the amount of affordable housing that can be delivered through market housing led developments. However the Council cannot over burden developments with policy requirements which would make them unviable. As such the percentages within the affordable housing policy are set at a level which would not stifle development. The percentages have been informed by the Local Plan Viability Assessment which will be published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The requirement is set at a higher level in areas of the borough where developments can yield higher profits and therefore provide a greater number of affordable dwellings without impacting on deliverability.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 647	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Object	CPRE is in favour of the concept of affordable housing, but questions whether this is the best Policy The threshold for triggering a requirement to provide affordable housing should alternatively include a minimum site size to cover very low density developments.	It is set out in National Planning Practice Guidance that contributions for affordable housing should only be sought on major housing developments (10 dwellings or above). The guidance recently changed this threshold, from 11 dwellings or more. The threshold within the policy will be updated to reflect the latest position within the guidance.	No change recommended.
Joanne Harding	Home Builders Federation			DBDLP 805	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Object	The HBF supports the need to address the affordable housing requirements of the borough. The NPPF is, however, clear that the derivation of affordable housing policies must not only take account of need but also viability. There does not appear to be a viability report available with this document and therefore at this point it is not possible for the HBF to comment on the viability of this policy or others within the document. The Council should be mindful that it is unrealistic to negotiate every site on a one by one basis because the base-line aspiration of a	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. The Local Plan Viability Assessment undertaken will ensure that negotiations are avoided on every site, however this work is a high level assessment and cannot factor in site specific issues which may arise. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF (2019) outlines that particular circumstances may justify the need for a	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								policy or combination of policies is set too high as this will jeopardise future housing delivery. Therefore, site by site negotiations on these sites should occur occasionally rather than routinely.	viability assessment at the application stage. Subsequently the final paragraph of the policy has been included.	
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 839	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Support	<p>Part 1 of the SHMA (2015) is identified as the current assessment of affordable need which is 160 dpa. This would be 38% of the housing requirement figure of 422 dpa, however this should be 32.5% of the Local Plan target of 492 net dwellings per annum.</p> <p>This level of affordable housing is unlikely to be delivered. Two options to increase delivery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uplift to the housing number to meet affordable needs ;and/or • Increase the affordable housing requirement set out in Policy H 5. <p>The Draft Local Plan seeks to address affordable housing needs through the latter of these two options. However, the Plan is careful to identify future affordable requirements which will not stifle development and render sites undeliverable. Policy H 5 is clear that where a site is unable to deliver the required level of affordable housing, the onus is on the developer to provide a detailed viability assessment.</p> <p>The supporting text for Policy H 5 states that the Full Plan Viability Assessment will be published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Therefore it is not possible to understand whether the levels of affordable housing requirement identified in Policy H 5 are</p>	<p>A Local Plan Viability Assessment is being prepared, and has informed the percentage requirements within this policy. The assessment 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>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								underpinned by the evidence identified in the viability assessment.		
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1087	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Neutral	<p>Support for securing affordable housing to meet needs.</p> <p>The NPPF is clear that the delivery of affordable housing should not only take account of need but also its effects on development viability. The proposed affordable housing percentages do not appear to have been tested through a viability assessment and it is therefore not possible to provide detailed comments. Such policies should be tested through the viability assessment so that it does not hinder the delivery of sustainable development sites across the plan period.</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>	No change recommended.
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1190	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Neutral	<p>Support to address affordable housing need. Affordable housing policies must take account of need and viability in line with the NPPF.</p> <p>There does not appear to be a viability report available with this document and therefore at this point it is not possible for Persimmon Homes to comment on the viability of this policy or others within the document. The Council should be mindful that it is unrealistic to negotiate every site on a one by one basis because the base-line aspiration of a policy or combination of policies is set too high as this will jeopardise future housing delivery.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to uplifting the overall housing requirement to ensure adequate affordable housing is provided without undermining the viability of development sites across the borough.</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>The Local Plan Viability Assessment undertaken will ensure that negotiations are avoided on every site, however this work is a high level assessment and cannot factor in site specific issues which may arise. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF (2019) outlines that particular circumstances may justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. Subsequently the final paragraph of the policy has been included.</p> <p>An uplift to the housing requirement has not been applied to increase affordable delivery. A higher requirement was assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal, based on higher jobs growth, however it was considered that this may be unrealistic and unachievable. The Council is also active in delivering affordable dwellings</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									and aims to build 100 homes per year which are largely for affordable rent. This meets a large proportion of the need identified in Part 1 of the SHMA (2015). Therefore, in view of the above it is not considered appropriate or necessary to apply an uplift to the housing requirement to increase affordable delivery.	
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Christopher Martin	WYG	DBDLP 1117	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Object	<p>Any policy requirements should be supported by appropriate evidence; the Council has not published a Whole Plan Viability Assessment. The NPPF highlights that such considerations are critical to the plan-making process.</p> <p>As such, it is not possible to ascertain whether the contributions to affordable housing are appropriate. Currently we therefore believe the policy is unsound for being unjustified. The Council should be mindful that it is unrealistic to negotiate every site on a one by one basis because the base-line aspiration of a policy or combination of policies is set too high as this will jeopardise future housing delivery. Site by site negotiations should occur occasionally rather than routinely.</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>The Local Plan Viability Assessment undertaken will ensure that negotiations are avoided on every site, however this work is a high level assessment and cannot factor in site specific issues which may arise. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF (2019) outlines that particular circumstances may justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. Subsequently the final paragraph of the policy has been included.</p>	No change recommended.
Frances Nicholson	Bellway Homes Limited (Durham)			DBDLP 1169	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Support	<p>Bellway supports the principle of this policy whereby schemes should make provision for affordable housing, however in line with NPPF 2012, up to date evidence on viability should be accepted to ensure that the scale of obligations and policy burden do not threaten the ability for development to be forthcoming.</p> <p>Current viability work undertaken for site reference no. 392 has indicated that it is able to accommodate 20% affordable housing based on detailed design work and therefore is likely to meet the aspirations of Darlington Borough Council in this respect.</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>	No change recommended.

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 1408	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Object	<p>Whilst the supporting text references the SHMA (2015) which identifies the need for affordable housing across the Borough, no evidence appears to be available to justify the percentages applied to different wards. Banks Property wish to review such evidence before being able to form a view on whether the percentages are realistic and likely to be achieved through new development.</p> <p>The delivery of affordable housing is directly related to other developer contributions and how substantial the full Section 106 requirements are and therefore needs to be considered on a case by case basis. Therefore, Banks Property suggest that Policy H 5 is amended to provide a range within each category to allow flexibility regarding affordable housing taking into account other contributions that are necessary.</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. This work will ensure that the percentages required are deliverable in the majority of cases. As such it is not considered necessary to alter the policy to provide a range for the requirements.</p> <p>The Government is keen to avoid situations where viability assessments are regularly being submitted with planning applications to vary planning policy obligations. The Local Plan Viability Assessment undertaken will ensure that such situations are avoided, however this work is a high level assessment and cannot factor in site specific issues which may arise. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF (2019) outlines that particular circumstances may justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. Subsequently the final paragraph of the policy has been included and provides some flexibility.</p>	No change recommended.
Diane Dobson				DBDLP 1381	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Object	The building of and need for affordable housing, despite years of developments like the one you propose, is still a problem for the UK population. More often than not the housing built is still beyond the financial reach of those who need it.	Affordable housing secured on market led schemes will have to meet the definition of affordable housing as set out in the NPPF (2019). The definition is set by central Government and has recently been widened to give greater flexibility.	No change recommended.
	Church Commissioners for England (CCE)	Ms Lucie Jowett	Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1159	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Object	Whilst our Client is broadly supportive of the policy, there appears to be a lack of evidence which supports this. There is no viability report available to review and further clarification is therefore required to ensure that the proposed levels required by the policy are appropriate and achievable. The NPPF sets out the importance of viability testing to ensure sites are not subject to	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.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>obligations which would threaten their ability to be developed.</p> <p>Our Client therefore objects to this policy on the basis that it is unjustified, ineffective, not positively planned and inconsistent with national policy and therefore unsound.</p>		
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1338	Policy H 5	Affordable Housing	Object	<p>Whilst our Client is broadly supportive of the policy, there appears to be a lack of evidence which supports this. There is no viability report available to review and further clarification is therefore required to ensure that the proposed levels required by the policy are appropriate and achievable. The NPPF outlines the importance of viability testing to ensure sites are not subject to obligations which compromise delivery.</p> <p>Our Client therefore objects to this policy on the basis that it is unjustified, ineffective, not positively planned and inconsistent with national policy and therefore unsound. Further evidence should be provided to justify the requirements of the policy.</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.	No change recommended.
Mr Simon Nicholson				DBDLP 24	Table 6.5	Affordable Housing Requirement	Support	It is vital that housing developments incorporate a mix of housing both in size and tenure. Social cohesion requires that a mix of people by age and income can be accommodated in any new housing development. Far too often in the UK, we have seen exclusive developments taking place which do not fulfil these criteria.	Support noted. In combination policy H 4 (Housing Mix) and H 5 (Affordable Housing) aim to encourage a mix of new homes in terms of size, type and tenure. Policy H 5 sets out that affordable housing shall normally be provided on-site as part of, and integrated within, market housing to help deliver balanced communities.	No change recommended.
Mr Anthony Scarre				DBDLP 35	Table 6.5	Affordable Housing Requirement	Object	Concerns regarding a higher percentage requirement for affordable housing in the Hummersknott and Mowden areas (30%). Commented that these areas have a low number of social housing at present.	There is substantial need for affordable homes in Darlington Borough. It is important to maximise the amount of affordable housing that can be delivered through market housing led developments. However the Council cannot over burden developments with policy requirements which would make them unviable.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									As such the percentages within the affordable housing policy are set at a level which would not stifle development. The percentages have been informed by the Local Plan Viability Assessment which will be published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Hummersknott and Mowden wards have a higher percentage requirement for affordable housing as these areas are considered to be more viable for development and schemes have the potential to generate greater profits. As such sites in these areas can provide more affordable units whilst still being deliverable and viable to developers. If an area has a low number of affordable units at present, this is not a justification to not deliver affordable units in the area. In combination policies H 4 Housing Mix and H 5 Affordable Housing, aim to create mixed housing schemes in terms of size, type and tenure creating sustainable balanced communities.	
Mrs Catherine Noble				DBDLP 316	Table 6.5	Affordable Housing Requirement	Support	Developers should not be allowed, in any circumstances, to backtrack on the commitment for 30% affordable housing, particularly where they may have agreed to pay too much for the site.	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 Local Plan Viability Assessment undertaken will ensure that the affordable housing requirements are reasonable and can be provided by developers. However this work is a high level assessment and cannot factor in site specific issues which may arise. As such there may be situations where the the affordable requirement cannot be provided. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF (2019) outlines that particular circumstances may justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. Subsequently the final paragraph of the policy has been included. Developers over paying for a site is not generally a justification to reduce affordable housing requirements.	No change recommended.
Stephen Bibby				DBDLP 483	Table 6.5	Affordable Housing Requirement	Neutral	I seek to understand the weighting within groupings. For example, where Hummersknott, Hurworth, Mowden, Park West, Whinfield are grouped, is it possible that the overwhelming	There is no weighting within the groupings. Any allocations or windfall schemes which come forward will be required to provide the affordable dwellings required by the policy. The amount of affordable homes delivered will be	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								majority of affordable housing would be located at Whinfield (Skerningham) and Park West, with little or none in Hummersknott, Hurworth or Mowden?	dependent on the schemes which come forward in an area. Large strategic sites will provide a larger number of affordable homes due to their size.	
Kieron Warren				DBDLP 285	6.5.2	Paragraph	Neutral	In relation to Section 6.5.2, which discusses a "substantial need for affordable homes", there could be a commitment to hold developers to account if they fail to provide the amount of affordable homes they had agreed on previously.	Affordable homes which are to be delivered as part of a market led scheme are secured via a s106 legal agreement or by condition linked to the planning permission. If a developer failed to provide the amount of affordable homes they had agreed on previously, they would not be complying with the legal agreement / condition therefore the development would be unlawful. If the developer wished to provide fewer affordable units they would have to negotiate this with the Council via the appropriate routes (deed of variation to the legal agreement or variation of condition application).	No change recommended.
Stephen Bibby				DBDLP 484	6.5.2	Paragraph	Neutral	Presumably people in the Hummersknott, Hurworth and Mowden areas will require affordable housing. Is there any sense of the distribution, ward by ward? If affordable housing is concentrated in the Skerningham development, how will access to good quality facilities, including good schools, be assured?	Affordable housing will be required on proposed housing allocations which can be viewed on the associated policies maps. This will give an indication of distribution but will depend on site yield/size and the affordable requirement for the area. Affordable dwellings will also be required on any windfall development which may come forward in the future. The Skerningham strategic allocation will provide a large number of affordable units due to its size. Policy H 10 Skerningham Strategic Allocation sets out that the site will provide a centrally located and well connected neighbourhood centre providing local community facilities to meet day to day needs. Land is also to be reserved for two primary schools, nursery provision and a secondary school on site.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 649	6.5.3	Paragraph	Object	Questions why the Local Plan Viability Assessment has not been published with this consultation. The wording suggests that the document exists. The Submission Local Plan is usually a final version of the Plan ready for	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. A draft version of the assessment was utilised to inform the percentage requirements within the policy, however it was not at a suitably	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								submission to government and consultation only looks at the “soundness” of the Plan and further discussion of policy is generally severely constrained to matters which have already been discussed. If anyone is unhappy at the contents of the Local Plan Viability Assessment and its resulting implications for the Local Plan their ability to challenge the document will be severely limited.	developed stage to be published alongside the Draft Local Plan. The consultation at the submission stage is focused on the soundness of the Local Plan, however this does not prevent any other comments from being submitted. Copies of representations received at this stage will also be sent to the planning inspectorate with the submission documents. One of the tests of soundness is that the plan is effective and deliverable over the plan period. As such it is considered that there would not be any issues with comments being submitted at the next stage on the Local Plan Viability Assessment as this relates to deliverability.	
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 123	Policy H 6	Rural Exceptions	Object	Pleasing to note contrary to Policy H 5 affordable housing is based on need. We do not agree such dwellings should remain so for perpetuity as right to buy exists.	For clarification the percentage requirements for affordable housing as set out in policy H 5 have been set to meet affordable housing needs whilst ensuring that deliverability is not affected. Although right to buy is still available, legal controls can be used to ensure that housing on rural exception sites remain affordable in perpetuity.	No change recommended.
Gerald Lee	Heighington and Coniscliffe Councillor			DBDLP 262	Policy H 6	Rural Exceptions	Object	It is good to see that the village development boundaries have been reinstated although this protection from development has been offset by Policy H 6. This policy contradicts the proposal to maintain the village size and as such is unacceptable. I assume that the reason why there have been no development boundaries shown on the Chestnuts, the new Oaklands site, Killerby, Summerhouse, Denton and Walworth is because they are designated as ‘countryside’ and as such are not included in any plans to build any new houses in and around these small villages.	Support for village development limits noted. The approach in policy H 6 Rural Exceptions is set out in national planning policy. Para 77 of the NPPF (2019) 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. Rural villages without development limits will be subject to countryside related policies of the Local Plan.	No change recommended.

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 215	Policy H 6	Rural Exceptions	Neutral	How will affordable housing needs be assessed?	Affordable housing need in rural areas would have to be demonstrated by a local needs survey. This would normally be carried out by a parish council or Registered Provider and would have to satisfy the Borough Council.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 650	Policy H 6	Rural Exceptions	Object	CPRE welcomes the focus that rural exception sites should be about providing affordable housing in rural communities. Suggested figure of 10% indicating what small proportion of market housing would be acceptable. There is a danger with this policy developers/builders could sequentially apply for and build sites adjacent to the villages.	The approach in policy H 6 Rural Exceptions is set out in national planning policy. Para 77 of the NPPF (2019) 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. It is not considered necessary to add a percentage figure to the policy with regards to an acceptable proportion of market housing. This will be considered on a case by case basis as each site/location is different, however the Council will aim to maximise affordable units on such sites.	No change recommended.
Mrs Laura Roberts	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 737	Policy H 6	Rural Exceptions	Support	We have concerns regarding in effect windfall site allowances of any size where there is ambiguity as to the developments proposed location. Although the policy refers to the rural exceptions being within the existing service and rural villages, this does not offer clarity with regards to which of our assets within specific settlements that may be impacted.	The approach in policy H 6 Rural Exceptions is set out in national planning policy. Para 77 of the NPPF (2019) 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 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. The Council is however committed to working with Northumbrian Water and consultation would be undertaken if an application was submitted for rural affordable housing, to ensure that assets are not impacted upon.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Alastair Mackenzie	Clerk Sadberge Parish Council			DBDLP 1226	Policy H 6	Rural Exceptions	Support	The Parish Council agrees that Policy H 6 is appropriate, and suggests that any survey to identify a need for additional affordable homes in the Parish of Sadberge should be either carried out by the Parish Council or be subject to approval by the Parish Council.	Support noted. It is set out in the supporting text to the policy (para 6.6.2) that a local needs survey would normally be carried out by the Parish Council or a Registered Provider and would have to satisfy the Borough Council. If a planning application was submitted by a Registered Provider with a local needs assessment submitted in support, the Parish Council would be consulted as part of the application process and would be able to provide comment.	No change recommended.
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1339	Policy H 6	Rural Exceptions	Neutral	Our Client does not have any specific comments in relation to this policy but reserve the right to comment at a later date.	Noted.	No change recommended.
Mrs Catherine Noble				DBDLP 317	6.6.1	Paragraph	Support	Support higher percentage of affordable housing in any scheme.	Support noted. Rural exception sites should comprise of affordable homes. Only in exceptional circumstances a small proportion of market housing may be provided on these sites where it supports delivery and if it can be demonstrated via a detailed viability assessment that a 100% affordable scheme would be unviable. Housing allocations in the service villages (market led schemes) will be subject to the affordable housing requirements set out in policy H 5. The percentage requirements have been set to maximise delivery of affordable units but to ensure sites are still deliverable.	No change recommended.
Stephen Bibby				DBDLP 485	6.6.1	Paragraph	Neutral	Affordable housing developments in and around the villages seems necessary and sensible.	Comments noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Nigel Swinbank		Mr Andrew Moss	Ward Hadaway	DBDLP 43	Policy H 7	Residential Development in the Countryside	Object	Objection raised on the use of development limits in a separate comment. Notwithstanding this comment the limits used are not considered to reflect circumstances on the ground now.	Development limits remain a useful tool in planning and will remain part of the plan. More detailed reasoning is provided in the responses to Policy H 3. The development limits will not be altered to include the site area of the permission as the scheme is contrary to the locational strategy of	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								As drafted the policy would prevent new garages to serve existing dwellings from being constructed in a development already approved in Neasham.	the plan. If the scheme is implemented in the future, the limits can be altered to include the development area during a Local Plan review.	
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 124	Policy H 7	Residential Development in the Countryside	Object	Policy needs to be more robust.	This policy has not previously been in place and it is national policy that has proved more permissive. This policy allows more local criteria to be allied to support more sympathetic rural development.	No change recommended
Ken Walton				DBDLP 334	Policy H 7	Residential Development in the Countryside	Object	Loss of Greenspace in the countryside and objection to named Sites	Please see officer response on Skerningham.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 651	Policy H 7	Residential Development in the Countryside	Object	Policy would benefit from more precision in wording. Agricultural land should be afforded more protection in the interests of future food security.	Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land has been avoided as far as possible and has been factored into the site selection process. Currently national policy has little scope to protect agricultural land any further.	No change recommended.
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1088	Policy H 7	Residential Development in the Countryside	Neutral	Reiteration of previous objection to use of development limits.	Development limits remain a useful tool in planning and will remain part of the plan. More detailed reasoning is provided in the responses to Policy H 3. Extensions to development limits are proposed in areas to accommodate sufficient growth in the most sustainable locations for the plan period.	No change recommended
Mr Alastair Mackenzie	Clerk Sadberge Parish Council			DBDLP 1227	Policy H 7	Residential Development in the Countryside	Support	Support for policy as drafted.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1319	Policy H 7	Residential Development in the Countryside	Neutral	For consistency with other policies in the plan it is suggested that the reference to sites well located to development limits should be considered in the event of a five year housing supply not being achieved.	Draft Policy H 1 sets out the position should a five year supply not be in place and that includes sites well related to development limits. It is not considered a duplication would help in this policy.	No change recommended

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 1340	Policy H 7	Residential Development in the Countryside	Neutral	No objection at this time.	Noted.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 652	6.7.7	Paragraph	Neutral	Restriction on further standalone structures in barn conversions should be in the policy rather than reasoned justification.	This is already reflected in the policy at point j)	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1341	Policy H 8	Housing Intensification	Neutral	No comments at this time.	Noted.	No change recommended
Mr Steven Drabik	Architectural Liaison Officer Durham Constabulary			DBDLP 752	6.8.4	Paragraph	Neutral	Consideration should be given to adopting an Article 4 Direction in relation to HMO's.	This is something the council has considered in the past and will continue to keep under review. The Article 4 process can be undertaken separately to the local plan so should the need arise an Article 4 area could be designated.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 891		Accommodating Travelling Groups	Neutral	GTAA 2017 noted and future demand need to be communicated with HE in relation to proximity Strategic Road Network in the planning application process	Future applications for G+T sites will be in future shared through the statutory consultation process with HE	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 125	Policy H 9	Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation	Object	Darlington has complied with the Regional Assembly maximum of sites and there is no further need for any new sites	The local GTAA replaces advice for needs of Sites and Pitches / demand has been established for the next 20 years (The Regional Assembly has been abandoned and advice is not valid any more)	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 656	Policy H 9	Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation	Object	Excessive G+T application in the countryside Unplanned development in Hurworth Moor, Brafferton and Heighington.	The policy and evidence does not support further development of G+T sites in fact it restricts it based on demand to 0 over the next 5 years. Based on this evidence applications currently can be easily refused. The G+T pitch and caravan count identifies numerous empty pitches on sites which have planning Applications in those areas.	No change recommended
Mr Mike	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1051	Policy H 9	Gypsy and Travellers	Support	DCC support the commitment to provide needs for Gypsy and Traveller community	Comments noted	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Allum						Accommodation				
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1195	Policy H 9	Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation	Neutral	DBC when identifying the location of Gypsy and Traveller Sites and extensions, as it is considered that there is the potential to undermine the marketability and therefore viability of housing sites.	Issues noted on impact for future housing development	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1342	Policy H 9	Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation	Neutral	No comments at this stage	No comments	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 892		Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	Given the scale of the site and its location close to A1 (M) Junction 59 to the north and its close proximity to the A66 to the south-east, this site will be of concern.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Miss Jennifer Earnshaw	Project Secretary Banks Property			DBDLP 868	6.10.1	Paragraph	Support	<p>Whilst being part of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation, Banks Property request that land at Beaumont Hill is allocated as a stand-alone housing proposal in the same manner that site 392, Elm Tree Farm has been allocated. Further work has been done to illustrate how the area would look in more detail.</p> <p>Banks Property have undertaken more detailed masterplanning for the land under our control to the west of the railway line (East Coast Mainline). A number of plans have been prepared and are appended to this submission (available on the Council's Consultation Portal).</p> <p>Beaumont Hill is different in character to the wider Skerningham area and is severed by the East Coast Mainline. The plans demonstrate how the land to the west of the railway line can come forward as an early phase of development whilst not prejudicing the</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Banks Property are committed to bringing forward a development which complies with policy H 10 and the Skerningham Masterplan Framework. It is however not considered appropriate to create a stand alone housing allocation with its own red line boundary for the site proposed as Banks Property have been involved in the masterplanning process from the start and the land is critical to the delivery of the wider masterplan area with regards to highway infrastructure. A separate site could also lead to the fragmentation of the masterplan area and the strategic allocation. There is nothing to prevent distinct parts of the strategic allocation site coming forward in advance of others provided that the adhere with the masterplan and deliver the necessary infrastructure to support development as set out in Policy H 10.</p> <p>The Elm Tree Farm site is different in that the landowners/developers have not been involved in the masterplanning process and the site is subject to a current planning application. Although it has been emphasised with the landowners/developers that any development</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>wider Skerningham Strategic Allocation. Banks Property acknowledge the need to safeguard land for highways purposes and such an area has been safeguarded in the northern part of the site.</p> <p>Banks Property are committed to bringing forward a development that complies with Policy H10 as part of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation, but believe that the site should have its own red line boundary.</p>	proposal at Elm Tree Farm would have to be well integrated with the masterplan area and accord with the principles set out in Policy H 10.	
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 62	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>All of the principle vehicular access points already have bad traffic congestion during the morning and afternoon peak.</p> <p>Even is a link road goes ahead the additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution and noise.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 63	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>All of the existing community woodland should be retained.</p> <p>Many parts of Skerningham have flood problems.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Linda Foster				DBDLP 79	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development will put a strain on town's already overstretched roads. The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution and noise.</p> <p>Object to the loss of green space and countryside.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Lesley Walton				DBDLP 80	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	Object to the Skerningham allocation.	Objection noted.	No change recommended.
Alison Jenkins				DBDLP 110	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	Question the need for the number of houses being planned for. It will lead to	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>an outward sprawl of housing around the town.</p> <p>Local services are already stretched and the roads are overcrowded.</p> <p>Development will result in the loss of countryside that should be viewed as an asset to the town and protected.</p> <p>The relocation of Darlington Golf Club makes no sense.</p>	Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.	
Mrs Sally Tinkler				DBDLP 159	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government figure is much lower.</p> <p>We should use brownfield land first.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on town's already overstretched services.</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution and noise.</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>	No change recommended.
Mr David Stokes				DBDLP 94	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	Object to the plan.	Objection noted.	No change recommended.
Joe Penny				DBDLP 95	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Brownfield sites should be prioritised for housing development.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes. The Government estimates are much lower.</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>	No change recommended.
Mr Adam Walker				DBDLP 98	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development will put a strain on town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>Urge the Council to seek alternative locations for housing. Priority should</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>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>Believe that public comments will not affect the outcome.</p>		
Mr Graham Simpson				DBDLP 99	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>There has been insufficient public consultation regarding the proposals for Skerningham.</p> <p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on green space and wildlife.</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution and affect road safety.</p> <p>Dispute the need for this many homes. Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>There are not the jobs of infrastructure needed to support this scale of development.</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>	No change recommended.
Jill Mitchell				DBDLP 107	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development will put a strain on town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>Object to the loss of green space.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Mr David Milner				DBDLP 108	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>There has been no consultation with local community groups on the proposals.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on town's already overstretched roads. The three new access points through the Whinfield area will result in more traffic on the A1150.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.

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/wildlife habitat.</p> <p>The development will have no environmental benefits for the area.</p>		
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 126	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Neutral	Much of this policy is aspiration and can only be supported as a proposal.	Comment noted.	No change recommended.
Sue Mann				DBDLP 172	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	Object to the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	Objection noted.	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 214	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>The allocation is not required.</p> <p>There is no need for a Northern Link Road or a local distributor road. Consider a four way junction at the existing Junction 57 instead.</p> <p>How will this fit with the Brightwater Project?</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Alan Burdess				DBDLP 278	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development will take up green land.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched roads and services.</p> <p>There are not the jobs needed to support this scale of development.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Beryl Burdess				DBDLP 279	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Where are all these people coming from? Where are the jobs for all these people?</p> <p>There are too many empty homes already.</p> <p>There are not enough services to support development.</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>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								Access is a major issue. Whilst the proposed bypass may remove heavy goods vehicles it will not help with the huge numbers of cars.		
Simon Bainbridge				DBDLP 404	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>The Skerningham Masterplan is at odds with the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy and standards.</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>Darlington Council's designations such as Skerningham Countryside park , Green Infrastructure strategy , Skerningham Community Woodland , Designated Wildlife Area and Green Corridors all seem to be forgotten.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The strategies and designations referred to have been taken into account in the drafting of Policy H 10 and in developing the Masterplan Framework as reflected in the provisions made in the policy relating to the community woodland, heritage assets and green infrastructure network. The Skerningham Strategic Allocation policy should not be read in isolation from the other policies in the Local Plan. The plan as a whole will need to be considered when determining any future planning application on this site.</p>	No change recommended.
Jeanette French				DBDLP 429	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes.</p> <p>Object to the loss of woodland and green space.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>Development will cause extra traffic, air pollution and health issues.</p> <p>There are not enough services.</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>	No change recommended.
Peter Voss				DBDLP 459	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Dispute the need for this many homes when we have empty ones available.</p> <p>We do not have the infrastructure to cope with development of this size.</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>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>How is the Council going to cope as every time we ask for a problem to be solved we are given the stock answer of "sorry but we have had to introduce so many cuts we can't afford to do them".</p>		
Pauline Burton				DBDLP 515	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	How will this proposal help to save the town centre?	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Pauline Burton				DBDLP 516	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>There has been insufficient public consultation regarding the proposals for Skerningham.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>The impact of this development will be irreversible.</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>	No change recommended.
Mrs Anne Bland				DBDLP 552	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Object to the loss of green space around the Whinfield area which is a loss to humans and wildlife.</p> <p>Agree with the objections raised by the Whinfield Resident's Association.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
G Martin				DBDLP 559	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.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land. What about developing the West End!</p> <p>The town is going downhill and needs improvement.</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>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Andrew Burton				DBDLP 586	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	How will this proposal help to save the town centre?	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Mr Andrew Burton				DBDLP 587	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>There has been insufficient public consultation regarding the proposals for Skerningham.</p> <p>Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</p> <p>The impact of this development will be irreversible.</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.
Mrs Laura Roberts	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 738	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Neutral	Welcome the allocation of Skerningham and pleased to see the policy states that the development shall incorporate sustainable drainage systems. All surface water flows could discharge directly to the watercourse via sustainable drainage systems which will require a lifetime maintenance plan.	Comment noted.	No change recommended.
Mrs H Kilcran				DBDLP 719	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Concerned about disruption during the construction period.</p> <p>The additional traffic will cause congestion, pollution and affect road safety.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services (including schools, health care, dental care and social services).</p> <p>Children use the tracks/green space for walking and cycling, encouraging them to be active. This development will impact greatly on this.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that there is always some disruption during construction, this is temporary and the impact will be controlled by appropriate conditions placed on the planning permission.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Vic Mcintosh				DBDLP 733	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Development of this site will have an adverse impact on the local environment.</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.</p> <p>If a link road goes ahead any traffic removed will be replaced by that from the Skerningham development resulting in further congestion, pollution and noise.</p> <p>Development will put a strain on the town's already overstretched services.</p> <p>Barmpton Lane will not cope with the increased volume of traffic.</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>	No change recommended.
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 909	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Given the sites proximity to the A1(M) Junction 59 and the A66 a significant proportion of trips from this development is likely to utilise the Strategic Road Network potentially impacting on its operation during peak periods. However, the likely trip generation and trip distribution of development trips would have to be confirmed in order to ascertain the scale of impact at the SRN.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Miss Katherine Workman				DBDLP 944	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>This development has been hidden until very recently, a development of this size surely requires its own entity?</p> <p>Darlington has many areas in need of redevelopment. Priority should be given to the development of brownfield land.</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>	No change recommended.

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 998	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>I would urge the council's responsibilities under the Human Rights Act, in particular Protocol 1, Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions which includes their home and other land. I believe that the proposed development allocation at Skerningham would have a dominating impact on me and my right to the quiet enjoyment of my property.</p> <p>Additionally, Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that a person has the substantive right to respect for their private and family life. In the case of Britton vs SOS the courts reappraised the purpose of the law and concluded that the protection of the countryside falls within the interests of Article 8. Private and family life therefore encompasses not only the home but also the surroundings and I would like to object on these grounds against the Skerningham Strategic development.</p>	<p>Article 8 and Article 1 of Protocol 1 of the Human Rights Act 1998 are not an absolute right and must be balanced against other factors, such as the interests of the wider community, or to protect other peoples's rights. The planning system by its very nature respects the rights of the individual whilst acting in the interest of the wider community. It is an inherent part of the decision-making process for the Council to consider the effects that the Local Plan will have on individuals and weigh these against the wider public interest in determining whether development proposals should be allowed to proceed. In carrying out this balancing exercise the Council will of course wish to be satisfied that it has acted proportionately.</p> <p>The plan making process includes a number of opportunities for public involvement in shaping the content of the plan and culminates in an examination in public where the views of objectors to the plan will be heard by an independent Inspector. Consideration of the effect of the emerging Local Plan on different groups within Darlington will be assessed within an Equality Impact Assessment to be published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Residents will also be able to comment on planning applications for sites allocated in the Local Plan when they are submitted to the Council.</p> <p>The Local Plan includes a number of policies that will help to safeguard amenity, and thereby the rights of existing residents. In particular, Policy DC 3: Safeguarding Amenity stipulates that new development should be sited, designed and laid out to protect the amenity of existing users of neighbouring land and buildings and the intended users of the new development, whilst Policy DC 2: Health and Wellbeing includes a number of criteria aimed at supporting improvements to the health and wellbeing of people in Darlington.</p>	No changes recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>The case quoted from 1997 in which the protection of the Countryside was held to fall within interests set out in Article 8(2) by which a planning application may interfere with the right to a person's home is noted. However, the Local Plan seeks to protect the countryside through adopting a strategy that directs development towards the Darlington town and larger service villages. In line with the NPPF, the Council has sought to make effective use of land in prioritising the development of previously developed land where land is available, and it is suitable and viable to do so. In selecting allocation sites on the urban edge, the Council has sought to avoid areas of highest landscape, environmental and agricultural value as considered in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and other related evidence. In addition, through Policy ENV 3: Local Landscape Character, the Council seeks to protect the character and local distinctiveness of the Borough's urban area, villages and rural area.</p>	
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1108	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>The site includes a number of Grade II heritage assets and may affect the setting of some further afield. It is also adjacent to a scheduled monument, Ketton Bridge, a packhorse bridge to the north of the allocation area. The area and its heritage assets are in an area characterised by its agricultural character and formed in part by their rural setting which makes an important contribution to their significance and understanding.</p> <p>The NPPF considers Scheduled Monuments, to be of the highest significance and any substantial harm to or loss of these designated assets (including setting) should be wholly exceptional. The NPPF considers that any substantial harm to the significance or loss of a Grade II listed heritage</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>

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>asset (including setting) should be exceptional.</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 requirements of the NPPF and the 1990 Act.</p>		
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1196	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Neutral	<p>Development of the Berrymead Phase 2 Land will be able to support the delivery of the Skerningham allocation through proportional contributions to necessary shared infrastructure items (such as schools, community centre, A167 access and highways network mitigation).</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The Skerningham Strategic Allocation will be expected to provide all of the infrastructure necessary to support development on the site, and it will be unnecessary to rely on the infrastructure that could be provided on other potential development sites in the area. Development of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site will be carefully phased so that new infrastructure and facilities are provided alongside, or where appropriate in advance of, new properties. Phasing will ensure that new communities are supported by appropriate infrastructure, and to minimise the pressure placed by development on existing services and facilities in the area.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr Alastair Mackenzie	Clerk Sadberge Parish Council			DBDLP 1228	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Support	The Parish Council supports the proposal to construct a new Northern Link Road connecting the A66 east of Darlington to the A1(M) north of Darlington.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 1377	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Support	With forward funding of infrastructure, an earlier than anticipated start on site and faster build out rates, substantially more homes (an additional 630 dwellings) could be built during the	Comment noted. The housing trajectory contained in the Local Plan provides an estimate of the amount of dwellings expected to be delivered over the plan period to 2036. It has been informed by site information and standard	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								plan period. Recommend changes to the policy to reflect this.	assumptions, including factors such as timescales for obtaining planning permission and average build rates. As stated in the introduction to Appendix A, the housing trajectory does not place any phasing restrictions on the sites allocated in the plan and they may come forward sooner than indicated.	
Miss Jennifer Earnshaw	Project Secretary Banks Property			DBDLP 1406	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Support	Policy support for H10 Does not take account of the Berrymead and South of Burtree Lane debvelpemnet to support best location for retail and Local Centre facilities	Support noted	No change recommended
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Steven Longstaff		DBDLP 1235	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	Whilst Taylor Wimpey fully support the identification of their land at part of the wider strategic allocation, they do not support the Skerningham Masterplan Framework at Figure 6.1 of the Draft Local Plan as it currently shows their land (0.66 ha adjacent to the A167) as Strategic Green Infrastructure. Taylor Wimpey request that their land is identified for residential development on the Masterplan Framework or the site is identified as a discrete housing allocation in its own right. The site is deliverable and can come forward now.	As recognised in Policy H 10, the Skerningham Masterplan Framework provides an illustration of the key principles for development on the Skerningham site, including the broad locations for different land uses and facilities. As such, this would not necessarily preclude the development of housing on this small corner of the site, subject to appropriate siting design and layout, and the retention and enhancement of the right of way across the site.	No change recommended.
Thoroton and Croft Estate		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1259	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Support	The proposed allocation accords with paragraph 52 of the NPPF. The Policy requires the submission of a “comprehensive masterplan” to ensure cohesive development is delivered at Skerningham. It is also recognised in the policy that a “network of green and blue infrastructure” is required to make the proposals acceptable. Support from all of the landowners will be essential to ensure deliverability of the wider scheme, as this is key to	Support noted. Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								ensuring the acceptability of the whole Strategic Allocation by mitigating the harm caused by the development, as well as being required as part of Policy H10, ENV4 and ENV5.		
Mr Mark Walton		Mr Ian Lyle		DBDLP 1221	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>There are significant uncertainties about the likely timetable for such a scheme and its associated infrastructure, and ancillary facilities (schools, shops etc) necessary to make the development sustainable.</p> <p>Reducing the size of the site or replacing it with a range of smaller sites around the urban area and in service villages like Hurworth would be a more deliverable strategy.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1313	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	<p>Part of wider response logged against Policy H 2.</p> <p>The site is subject to significant infrastructure requirements being delivered, although the policy does not yet establish phasing for the various elements of infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council need additional evidence to confirm the site is capable of delivering the stated 150 units per annum without any potential slippage from 2026/2027 onwards.</p> <p>The strategy places too much reliance on the delivery of large strategic sites to achieve the housing requirements.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The housing trajectory contained in the Local Plan provides an estimate of the amount of dwellings expected to be delivered over the plan period to 2036. It has been informed by site information and standard assumptions, including factors such as timescales for obtaining planning permission and average build rates. The housing trajectory has an average build out rate of 30 dwellings per annum on most sites. This has been increased where there is known to be more than one builder developing a site or more than one builder with an interest in a site.</p>	No change recommended.
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1343	Policy H 10	Skerningham Strategic Allocation	Object	Our Client is supportive of this policy and welcomes the Council's commitment to delivering this urban extension. However, the policy fails to include for viability of development.	<p>Comments noted. Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</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</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>Each application for development should be considered on its merits. Unrealistic requirements can be an obstacle to house building and in order to promote development and increase the supply of housing, the Council should include flexibility and the consideration of viability in the policy wording.</p> <p>Housing density should be based on local circumstances and not harm the overall objective of boosting significantly housing supply.</p>	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.	
Canon Chris Beales				DBDLP 349	6.10.2	Paragraph	Support	<p>Skerningham will, over the coming years, become a small town. Ideas and plans are very exciting.</p> <p>Darlington can model here a really imaginative, forward looking, well designed and integrated community. Placemaking is essential - a place where people love to live is the goal - so local facilities and very well designed, mixed, integrated housing are essential (along the lines I have written about above).</p> <p>If innovative smaller developers, rather than the "usual suspects", can be attracted to invest, that would be very desirable.</p> <p>Where land is owned by a local authority or other public body, or what should be a philanthropic organisation like the Church Commissioners, could there not be a new kind of joint development or a covenant put on the land being sold, requiring things like community facilities to be built and maintained?</p>	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr	Member	Mr	Member	DBDLP 373	6.10.3	Paragraph	Object	There has been insufficient consultation with local residents regarding the	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.

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>proposals for Skerningham, yet there appears to have been considerable co-operation between DBC and the landowners/site promoters.</p> <p>The so-called "consultation" by the site promoters in Autumn 2017, with DBC's backing was as a result of pressure from local residents and groups, was presented as a 'fait accompli'.</p> <p>DBC should have involved the public at a much earlier stage.</p>		
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 216	6.10.4	Paragraph	Object	<p>Why is the Development Limit not drawn to cover only the potential housing areas, instead of the entire site including the green infrastructure elements? Developers will take it that they can build up to the limit.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The development limit has been drawn around the entire extent of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site in the 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 will be 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 Infrastructure Strategy. However, until the detailed plans for the site are finalised as part of the planning application process the exact extent of the built up area forming the new northern edge of the town is not known and it is therefore</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									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 217	Figure 6.1	Skerningham Masterplan Framework	Object	Why is the Development Limit not drawn to cover only the potential housing areas, instead of the entire site including the green infrastructure elements? Developers will take it that they can build up to the limit.	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>The development limit has been drawn around the entire extent of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation site in the 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 will be 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 Infrastructure Strategy. However, until detailed plans for the site are finalised as part of the planning application process 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 Skernignham site, to reflect the final position on the extent of the built up area of the site, during future reviews of</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									the Local Plan, due to take place at least every five years.	
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 64	6.10.5	Paragraph	Object	Object strongly to this proposed development.	Objection noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 375	6.10.5	Paragraph	Object	<p>There are significant infrastructure requirements needed but no indication of when they will be delivered. Conversely the infrastructure could be built but is circumstances change, as they are likely to do, there is no guarantee that any more than 1800 homes will be built.</p> <p>The scale of the site is beyond the needs of Darlington and out of scale with the town and its facilities.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 1380	6.10.12	Paragraph	Neutral	Request a change to the paragraph to allow flexibility on the depth of habitat buffers.	The requirement to provide a habitat buffer of at least 50 metres is considered appropriate to create viable ecological corridors, enabling the movement of wildlife within the landscape and allowing for the multifunctional use of such space (e.g. combined with public access, landscaping, SUDs etc.).	No change recommended.
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 556	6.10.13	Paragraph	Object	Object to the loss of recreational spaces due to impact on peoples health and wellbeing.	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 218	6.11.1	Paragraph	Object	Area may be better suited to employment uses due to proximity to A1(M).	Faverdale is a strategic mixed use allocation and will include a significant proportion of employment uses in suitable areas to be informed by the masterplan. Housing within the area would have to have adequate mitigation to deal with any noise or air pollution issues from the A1(M) or adjoining employment uses.	No change recommended
Simon Bainbridge				DBDLP 403	6.11.1	Paragraph	Neutral	Area suitable for additional housing development and has a good range of existing services. Loss of agricultural land a concern.	Comments noted. Loss of agricultural land is a consideration and has been reflected in site assessment criteria within the supporting Sustainability Appraisal.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 127	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Neutral	Support for proposed development.	Comment noted.	No change recommended
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 409	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Support	Faverdale considered a more logical location for extension for housing than Skerningham.	Support for residential use noted	No change recommended
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 557	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Support	More sustainable location for development. Consider introducing park and ride at West Park/Faverdale and Lingefield Point.	Support noted	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 660	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Object	Housing requirement is too high. Delivering housing on this site at the same time as Skerningham will cause the local housing market to fail. If allocated, this site should be used for employment development in line with current Local Plan.	Please see officer response to housing requirement. If delivery rate does slow we will keep this under review for future reviews of the plan which the government requires to take place at least every 5 years.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 906	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Object	Housing Site The site has the potential for impact on junction 58 of the A1(M). Given the scale of the site as an employment allocation and proximity to the A1(M) it will be 'of concern' for Highways England. The likely trip generation and distribution would have to be confirmed in order to ascertain the scale of impact on the Strategic Road Network.	Concern noted but taken forward by site specific modelling to identify and mitigate issues	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 927	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Object	Employment site aspect The site has the potential for impact on junction 58 of the A1(M). Given the scale of the site as an employment allocation and proximity to the A1(M)	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.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								it will be 'of concern' for Highways England. The likely trip generation and distribution would have to be confirmed in order to ascertain the scale of impact on the Strategic Road Network.		
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 801	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Support	<p>Support the allocation of Greater Faverdale as a strategic site.</p> <p>The site offers a number of significant locational and sustainable benefits.</p> <p>Providing a mix of uses on the site will facilitate the delivery of speculative employment land by increasing viability across the site.</p> <p>The site is capable of delivering a number of improvements and mitigation.</p>	Support noted	No change recommended
Mr Mark Walton		Mr Ian Lyle		DBDLP 1222	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Object	<p>Significant uncertainties about the timetable and associated infrastructure/facilities for the site.</p> <p>The Borough would be better served by smaller and more deliverable sites around the urban area and service villages.</p>	Comments noted and alternative options for housing delivery have been tested including the provision of allocations in service villages. Please see the officer response on housing requirement and also the consideration of alternatives within the Sustainability Appraisal.	No change recommended
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1310	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Object	Concerns raised with the assumed delivery rate for the site and doubts that the site will deliver 810 homes by 2036. No evidence of an application becoming forthcoming, no known developer commitment and significant infrastructure requirements for the scheme. Multiple outlets rarely results in a simple doubling of outputs. The plan places too much reliance on the delivery of large strategic sites to achieve housing numbers.	The Council has been and is continuing to engage with the main landowner and developer at Faverdale, in order to identify all of the constraints and opportunities involved, and to prepare a masterplan for the area. A substantial amount of work has been undertaken by the landowner on the site, including but not limited to a masterplan framework, heritage assessment, archaeology assessment, ecology surveys and report, flood risk assessment, landscape assessment, highways assessment and utilities assessment. A visioning document and delivery strategy have also been prepared to support the masterplan. A pre-application enquiry has also been submitted to the Council and discussions are ongoing. Evidence on the anticipated	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>delivery rates of the site has been obtained from developers and it is expected that there will be multiple house builders on the site. Despite this, delivery for this site over the plan period has been reduced for the next stage of plan preparation given latest information. It is considered that the estimated delivery in the trajectory is appropriate, allowing for suitable lead in times.</p> <p>A range of sites are proposed for allocation to meet housing needs. Paragraph 72 of the NPPF (2019) also supports the Council's approach in allocating large urban extensions as it states, "The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities." Allocating large strategic sites rather than a number of smaller sites also ensures that the area is planned as a single cohesive sustainable development fully supported by the necessary infrastructure.</p>	
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1344	Policy H 11	Greater Faverdale - Strategic Site Allocation	Neutral	Holding response for a future date if required	Comment noted.	No change recommended
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 410	6.11.8	Paragraph	Neutral	Site capable of accommodating more than 2000 houses.	Comment noted. Policy H 11 provides for circa 2000 homes on the site.	No change recommended.
Ms Julie Nixon				DBDLP 333	7	EMPLOYMENT FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH	Neutral	Ambition for future kind of business attracted to Darlington to support environmentally sustainable business for the benefit of the borough	Comments noted	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mrs Laura Roberts	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 740	7	EMPLOYMENT FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH	Support	Support for policies and request to guide investors to NWGroup for early in the development process in discussions for waste water effluent / water requirements and SUDS	Support noted	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 894	7	EMPLOYMENT FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH	Neutral	Summary of Policies under Sect 7 Highways England wants to understand size and detailed proposal under E1 -E4 to evaluate impact on Strategic Road 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.	No change recommended
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1205	7	EMPLOYMENT FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH	Support	Support for sites in E1 and E2 areas in the Local Plan Policy map including DVTA North and South. Proximity of land for attraction of business investment next to airports is good practice in the North. Flexibility of use classes is preferred by investors and make sites more attractive.	Points above noted for DTVA sites.	No change recommended
Canon Chris Beales				DBDLP 351		Promoting New and Retaining Employment Opportunities	Support	Consider as well Modular Housing factory as a way to create Skilled local jobs and increase sustainable housebuilding.	Noted as an idea and such a use could be supported within a number of sites proposed for allocation.	No change recommended
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1053		Promoting New and Retaining Employment Opportunities	Support	Support of inclusion in the section of cross boundary Sites in School Aycliffe and Heighinton Lane (Merchant Park)	Support noted	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 220	7.1.8	Paragraph	Object	Questions the number of 7000 jobs for Darlington by 2036 and concern that most low paid jobs will not be able to support housing numbers in Darlington but commuting.	The 7000 jobs figure is based on TVCA ambition and employment need identified / Figures will have to be monitored and updated based on available evidence.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mrs C Everington				DBDLP 542	7.1.8	Paragraph	Object	7000 jobs not achievable due to the loss of employment numbers in the Town Centre by retailers.	7000 jobs not related to retail growth, other sectors will drive employment growth forward as identified in the recent demand study.	No change recommended
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 803	7.1.8	Paragraph	Support	Support of employment space for future growth sectors. Greater Faverdale identified as a key employment site supported in the plan.	Support for further economic growth	No change recommended
Mr Neil Minto				DBDLP 812	7.1.8	Paragraph	Object	Questions if 7000 jobs are permanent or in construction. No monitoring of job outputs	7000 jobs will be Full Time jobs and monitoring based on Planning, Business Rates and Funding Application which are taking place through DBC and TVCA sources. Monitoring in the AMR report for planning though will not take place as Job Creation is not a target for this report. The revised and updated Darlington Economic Strategy based on the TVCA Local Industrial Strategy might be a way of monitoring job growth.	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 663	Policy E 1	Safeguarding Existing Employment Opportunities	Support	Support of Site 361 DTVA North Should be for Airport and Airport related uses only.	All of the mentioned uses in the table are on site / the uses in box are not prioritised	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 461	Policy E 1	Safeguarding Existing Employment Opportunities	Support	Current sites must be retained and reserved	Comment noted	No change recommended
Chris McGough	Director McGough Planning Consultants Limited			DBDLP 806	Policy E 1	Safeguarding Existing Employment Opportunities	Object	Hansteen land should be excluded from 343 in E1 due to envisaged retail purposes	Commercial use can be included in E1 as in several other E1 areas (357 / 353 / 346 etc)	No change recommended
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council			DBDLP 729	Policy E 1	Safeguarding Existing Employment Opportunities	Support	A DTVA Common Ground Statement has been produced by DBSC and SBC which recognises employment	Support noted.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								allocations in line with applications and the Airport masterplan. DTVA employment sites are a strategic cross boundary issues.		
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1197	Policy E 1	Safeguarding Existing Employment Opportunities	Neutral	Persimmon Homes does not support the current wording of this policy, as it does not allow for flexibility of the land use towards residential of the sites identified. Reviews of the sites should take place	The Land use prospects of employment sites is reviewed through the HELAA process which takes NPFF Para 22 into account and will ensure long term protection. DBC has shown flexibility where possible in relation to employment sites being used for residential.	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 133	Table 7.2		Neutral	Council should receive annual update on table 7.2	Should be part of enhanced monitoring and included in the Annual Monitoring Report which will include uptake of land on employment sites .	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 221	Table 7.2		Neutral	Doubt of 7000 job creation over Plan Period	Figure based on evidence and ambition of the Tees Valley and the Borough	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 665	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Object	CPRE objects to Site 185 being included in E2 (majority of site has been included in 1997 Local Plan as Faverdale reserve Policy EP8 (Not a newly allocated Site) If the site has an allocation it should be for Employment only	The site was allocated in 1997 Plan but this time the North Eastern Site is an extension to the allocation and the site is now proposed as a mixed use strategic site with 70ha Gross for employment.	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 462	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Neutral	Employment sites must be reserved.	Comment noted	No change recommended
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council			DBDLP 730	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Support	A DTVA Common Ground Statement has been produced by DBC and SBC which recognises employment allocations in line with applications and the then produced Airport masterplan by Peel Holding. DTVA employment sites are a strategic cross boundary issues which is	The Airport now in ownership of the Mayor and TVCA is a key cross boundary development site for employment and growth. The ambitions for included sites in the plans might change due to involvement of TVCA in running the airport and a new management company. Available sites within Darlington Borough council very small on the North Site. The South	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								recognised by both local plans in Stockton and Darlington.	Site is depending on Progress on the Stockton side and plans of the Mayor an TVCA. However, currently it is felt that activity on the Darlington South site is most likely to happen outside of plan period after 2036.	
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 928	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Object	Central Park South 368 a possible concern for HE	Will be dealt with through traffic plans and impact assessment for individual application plots on site	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 929	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Object	Site 80 East of Lingfield Point HE considers site as a concern due to proximity to the B6279/A66 junction. Trip generation and impact need to be confirmed for any proposal.	The council is working with Highways England to model and accurately understand the impact and necessary mitigation measures required for allocations proposed within the local plan. A statement of common ground is being prepared with Highways England to accompany the publication draft of the plan.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 930	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Object	Site 356- Ingenium Parc concern for HE	The council is working with Highways England to model and accurately understand the impact and necessary mitigation measures required for allocations proposed within the local plan. A statement of common ground is being prepared with Highways England to accompany the publication draft of the plan.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 931	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Object	Site 360 Heighington Lane North a possible concern for HE. Due to proximity to junction 59 of the A1(M) Trip generation and impact need to be confirmed for any proposal.	The council is working with Highways England to model and accurately understand the impact and necessary mitigation measures required for allocations proposed within the local plan. A statement of common ground is being prepared with Highways England to accompany the publication draft of the plan.	No change recommended.
	Hellens Land	mr Baker		DBDLP 802	Policy E 2	Promotion of New	Support	Support for 200,000 sqm of employment space in Greater Faverdale. Locational factors for the	Support noted	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
						Employment Opportunities		site are outlined and the benefits for mixed use including residential.		
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 934	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Neutral	Site 351- South West TCF/Beaumont Street is no concern for HE	Comments noted	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 932	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Object	Site 362 DTVA Airport South is concern for HE due to closeness to the B6280/A66/A67 junction. Likely trip generation and distribution of development trips would have to be confirmed with planning application process.	The council is working with Highways England to model and accurately understand the impact and necessary mitigation measures required for allocations proposed within the local plan. A statement of common ground is being prepared with Highways England to accompany the publication draft of the plan.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 933	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Object	Site 367 Link 66 has been reviewed by CH2M HE considers site a concern as immediately adjacent to the A66 at the B6279/A66 junction. Likely trip generation and distribution of development trips would have to be confirmed.	The council is working with Highways England to model and accurately understand the impact and necessary mitigation measures required for allocations proposed within the local plan. A statement of common ground is being prepared with Highways England to accompany the publication draft of the plan.	No change recommended
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1144	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Object	No robust assessment of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting to inform the suitability of the sites for Employment Consequently, before allocating any site there would need to be some evaluation of the impact, which the development might have upon those elements that contribute to the significance of a heritage asset including their setting, through undertaking a heritage impact assessment. The assessment of the sites needs to address the central issue of	A Heritage Impact assessment will be undertaken for all sites prior to the next stage of the Plan.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								whether or not the principle of development and loss of any open space is acceptable.		
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1146	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Object	<p>Site 146 is adjacent to Grade II* heritage assets, Kerbstones, Cummins Engine Factory and Security Fence at Cummins Engine Factory and there is the potential for harm to the setting of these assets.</p> <p>Therefore, before allocating the site there will need to be some evaluation of the impact the development of the site might have upon those elements that contribute to the significance of the heritage assets including their setting.</p>	A Heritage Impact assessment will be undertaken for all sites prior to the next stage of the Plan.	No change recommended
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1147	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Object	<p>Site 362 – DTVA Airport South</p> <p>The site is adjacent to Grade II heritage asset and there is the potential for harm to the setting of this asset.</p> <p>Therefore, before allocating the site there will need to be some evaluation of the impact the development of the site might have upon those elements that contribute to the significance of the heritage assets including their setting.</p>	A Heritage Impact assessment will be undertaken for all sites prior to the next stage of the Plan	No change recommended
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1148	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Object	<p>Site 351 – South West Town Centre Fringe / Beaumont Street is close to Grade 2 listed building in Houndgate and Town Centre Conservation area.</p> <p>Before allocating the site there will need to be some evaluation of the impact the development of the site might have upon those elements that contribute to the significance of the heritage assets including their setting.</p>	A Heritage Impact assessment will be undertaken for all sites prior to the next stage of the Plan.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								This assessment should be included as part of a heritage impact assessment undertaken for all sites prior to the next stage of the Plan.		
Anna Bensky	DTVA	Mr Peter Rowe	Turley	DBDLP 1214	Policy E 2	Promotion of New Employment Opportunities	Object	<p>Modify the policy text to identify flexibility to accommodate employment generating beyond B1 B2 B8</p> <p>Widen the uses at DTVAs Sites 362</p>	<p>Table 7.3 and 7.4 show possible site specific uses as required by MHCLG which includes airport specific and related uses for Sites 361 and 362.</p> <p>The takeover of the airport by the TV major and TVCA in 2019 might specify in future which uses could replace the revised Masterplan presented by Peel Ltd in 2014 which included residential which will not be part of the Submission Local Plan any more.</p> <p>Flexibility in uses is provided against the specific site characteristics in Tables 7.3 and 7.4.</p>	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 134	Table 7.3		Neutral	Table 7.3 should be updated annually for Council	Should be part of enhanced monitoring and included in the Annual Monitoring Report which will include uptake of land on employment sites	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 222	Table 7.3		Neutral	Not convinced about 7000 fte jobs creation in Darlington	As part of evidence and ambition	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 223	Table 7.4		Neutral	Not convinced about 7000 fte jobs creation in Darlington	Target based on evidence and ambition	No change recommended
Mr Gary Swarbrick	Associate ELG Planning for Fintry Estate			DBDLP 1075	Table 7.4		Neutral	<p>Site 80 should be subject to a stand alone allocation for Mixed Use Development</p> <p>▪ B1, B2 & B8 Uses; ▪ Bulky Goods Retailing (Use Class A1); ▪ Neighbourhood Centre Uses, including convenience foodstore; local shops,</p>	Not seen as mixed use development as residential not suitable. Retail and Neighbourhood uses could be considered as with Town Centre first and retail policy and impact assessment requirement. Similar uses are foreseen on neighbouring Site 367 Link 66	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								services and community facilities; and drive thru' restaurants / coffee outlets to meet the day-to-day needs of existing and future residents, employees and passing motorists in this part of the town.	Symmetry Park in line with valid outline Planning permission. No need to change to Mixed Use	
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 668	7.1.11	Paragraph	Neutral	Question which two new sites have been allocated.	As in table 7.3 Central park South and parts of Greater Faverdale	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 132	Policy E 3	Darlington Farmers Auction Mart Relocation	Neutral	Delay of DFAM relocation	Program back on track after announcement of DFAM in Sept 18	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 671	Policy E 3	Darlington Farmers Auction Mart Relocation	Support	CPRE supports the relocation based on planning permission and small scale on Auction Mart activities.	Support noted	No change recommended
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1052	Policy E 3	Darlington Farmers Auction Mart Relocation	Support	DFAM relocation to Humbleton Farm supported on basis on benefits to neighbouring rural counties. Discussions on cross boundary implications welcome	Support noted	No change recommended
Mr Geoffrey Crute	Councillor Neasham Parish Council			DBDLP 382	Policy E 4	Economic Development in the Open Countryside	Support	Proposed policy for enhancing and diversifying the rural community through economic development activities supported	Support noted	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 135	Policy E 4	Economic Development in the Open Countryside	Object	Policy needs to be more robust in relation to future change of use and holiday homes becoming permanent residences	Policies will apply for tourist accommodation / second homes not an issue in Darlington and change of use needs planning permission	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) -			DBDLP 672	Policy E 4	Economic Development in the Open Countryside	Support	CPRE supports the policy E4 as long as the council enforces para 7.2.8. Submission of evidence for need of residential accommodation.	Support noted	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
	Darlington Group									
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Christopher Martin	WYG	DBDLP 1118	Policy E 4	Economic Development in the Open Countryside	Object	<p>We regard the approach in Policy E4 to be overly restrictive and inflexible in nature. As a result of this, we object to the policy and believe it to be <u>unsound</u> on the basis of not being positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy.</p> <p>A more logical and therefore sound approach is to assess such development on a site by site basis depending on specific circumstances. It follows that if economic development beyond settlement boundaries can be proven to be sustainable, then the NPPF would indicate that such development should be approved. As such, to make Policy E4 sound, it needs to be amended on this basis.</p>	<p>Very narrow interpretation of NPPF</p> <p>Look at site by site basis assessment of value of development on specific circumstances / If economic development beyond settlement boundaries is to be proven to be sustainable, then the NPPF could be interpreted that development could be approved. Interpretation based at application stage.</p>	No change recommended
Kieron Warren				DBDLP 286	8	TOWN CENTRE AND RETAIL	Neutral	<p>Suggestions to increase vitality of the Town Centre (Neutral)</p> <p>30 min free parking anywhere</p> <p>Shops (business space)for local business first</p>	Suggestions noted but parking charges and business rates are not planning matters.	No change recommended
Ken Walton				DBDLP 338	8	TOWN CENTRE AND RETAIL	Neutral	Suggestions for vitality retention of Town Centre including Rent / Rates reductions and cheap or free parking.	Suggestions are not Planning related but are matters that will be considered and in the update of the Town Centre Action plan by the Council and partners. Reductions in parking charges for council car parks have also recently been announced.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 895	8	TOWN CENTRE AND RETAIL	Object	Strategic Road Network Impact concern for Site 271 Commercial Street Kendrew Street	The council is working with Highways England to model and accurately understand the impact and necessary mitigation measures required for allocations proposed within the local plan. A statement of common ground is being prepared	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									with Highways England to accompany the publication draft of the plan.	
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1054	8	TOWN CENTRE AND RETAIL	Support	Darlington Town Centre and Market Town recognition as sub-regional centre outside Darlington's borders.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Patricia Newton				DBDLP 500		Darlington Town Centre	Object	Loss of shops and vitality of town centre and displacement of disposable income to other Towns	The council recognised the importance of the town Centre by setting up a new revitalised Town Centre Reference Group and appropriating funding to key elements with own money and TVCA Funds. A bid to the £675m national Future High Street has been prepared for March 2019 - Results are to be announced later in 2019.	No change recommended
Mrs H Kilcran				DBDLP 718		Darlington Town Centre	Object	Inner Darlington residential and TC would be neglected through regeneration and new housing. Closure of shops and amenities in Town Centre of concern as losing appeal	The council recognised the importance of the town Centre by setting up a new revitalised Town Centre reference Group and appropriating funding to key elements with own money and TVCA Funds. A bid has been prepared to the £675m national Future High Street for March 2019. Results are to be announced.	No change recommended
Mr Steven Drabik	Architectural Liaison Officer Durham Constabulary			DBDLP 1095		Darlington Town Centre	Neutral	Licensed premises not the saviour of the Town Centre and are in fact attracting crime and disorder. Based on revised NPPF 2018 recognises this in paragraph 95(a). 1. Licensed premises could also conflict with other town centre regeneration schemes such as the conversion of vacant buildings for residential purposes.	Noted and NPPF para 95a a valid addition and taking forward in the Councils Anti-Social Behaviour Crackdown Plan which contains the whole extend of the Planning Town Centre boundary. Durham Constabulary would welcome the opportunity to help formulate a policy on licensed premises with the LA	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr David Reed				DBDLP 1000		Darlington Town Centre	Object	Bus Station required and traffic modes on roads not co-ordinated / has a location in mind but does not name it.	There is a strong desire from bus users for bus stops to be accessible as close as possible to shopping areas, to facilitate this, buses have been incorporated into the town's road network like many other towns and cities in the Country. If a bus station were constructed then buses would not operate through the town centre.	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 224	8.1.1	Paragraph	Neutral	Suggestion of more residential in Primary Shopping Area	Increased residential use is one of the key recommendations of the plan for town centre.	No change recommended
Mrs Lisa Bramfitt				DBDLP 558	8.1.1	Paragraph	Support	Support for of policy living space in Town Centre above retail outlets	Support noted	No change recommended
Miss Madeleine Sutcliffe				DBDLP 389	8.1.3	Paragraph	Support	Support of retail and leisure focus of TC Observation that M+S is allowed moving to the Edge of Town while closing TC shop with convenience element	Support noted	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 136	Policy TC 1	Darlington - Town Centre Boundary	Object	Town Centre retailing and analysis needs to be taking into account for boundary	Evidence and analysis has been carried out to define boundary	No change recommended
Mr Paul Howell				DBDLP 320	Policy TC 1	Darlington - Town Centre Boundary	Neutral	Should include other non-retail uses for primary shopping Area like residential	Residential uses not the focus of the primary Shopping Area boundary but their consideration is welcome on upper floors.	No change recommended
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 681	Policy TC 1	Darlington - Town Centre Boundary	Neutral	Edge of Centre could be more defined spatially, consider perhaps in shape of Design SPD Zone 1.	SPD Zone one would include areas outside of the Inner ring Road while for design use the assumptions are fine for the Planning approach in particular for retail and Town Centre Vitality the area would be too wide.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Peter Eckels				DBDLP 723	Policy TC 1	Darlington - Town Centre Boundary	Object	The local plan is not current as suggestions that the town centre has to shrink and include residential opportunities	The Plan has shrunk the Town Centre and primary Shopping Area including the omission of secondary and primary shopping areas / The integration of residential use above retail and in the Town Centre is in particular supported in the Plan.	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 137	Policy TC 2	Primary Shopping Area	Neutral	Primary Shopping area needs to reflect current retail trends	Primary Shopping area based on evidence and retail trend	No change recommended
Canon Chris Beales				DBDLP 352	Policy TC 2	Primary Shopping Area	Support	Positive to support residential uses within primary Shopping Area to sustain the shopping centres in the poor national climate for TC retail.	Support noted	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 678	Policy TC 2	Primary Shopping Area	Object	Non retail usages in Primary Shopping area not supported by CPRE	There are always be Non retail Usages in Primary Shopping Areas (Banks / Post Office / Leisure / Licensed Establishments)	No change recommended
Mr Tom Clarke	National Planning Adviser Theatres Trust			DBDLP 817	Policy TC 2	Primary Shopping Area	Neutral	Supportive of policies would like to see greater flexibility for temporary permissions and pop up shops in vacant units.	Flexibility of use is supported and temporary use is more related to the letting approach of resident landlords then planning issues.	No change recommended
Mr Paul Howell				DBDLP 321	8.1.8	Paragraph	Object	Forecast for Town Centre growth is minimal - Kendrew Commercial Street area should adopt a different vision than expansion of retail	The expansion area for Town Centre uses within the plan is crucial to enable the sequential test to be applied. The Town Centre First Policy is reliant on having adequate developable sites available within or at the Edge of the Town Centre to challenge out of town retail parks which are still promoted by some developers.	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 138	Policy TC 3	Additional Site for Town Centre Uses	Object	More robust integration of old buildings to be applied for this site to retain character	Would be done with any development proposal for the site	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 935	Policy TC 3	Additional Site for Town Centre Uses	Neutral	Quoting Policy on T3 and deemed excellent from a transport connectivity point. No concern of site from Highways England.	Support noted	No change recommended

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 1150	Policy TC 3	Additional Site for Town Centre Uses	Object	Consider Impact of potential development on adjacent historic environment on Commercial and Kendrew Street. (Northgate Conservation Area) Heritage Impact Assessment needed to be mentioned in SA and Plan to include site specific mitigation.	Valid Points in relation to need for Heritage Assessment but only if change is going to be proposed as part of a Planning Application.	No change recommended
Miss Madeleine Sutcliffe				DBDLP 391	8.1.11	Paragraph	Object	Enough retail space available already in existing Primary Shopping Area / Enhancements their could fulfil the role	In current retail trend terms this would be correct however the 20 year lifetime of the plan based on Retail Strategy 2017 looks for potential extension area with the Town Centre. The extension site is also the argument used for the Town Centre First Policy which would make developers apply the sequential test set out in Policy TC 5.	No change recommended
Mr Ross Chisholm	Planning Issues Contact Campaign for Real Ale Darlington Branch / Friends of Stockton and Darlington Railway			DBDLP 307	Policy TC 4	District and Local Centres	Object	Omission of other Local District and Local Centres - only two in the plan without explanation and justification. Should be an evenly distributed in the Borough. Some were planned as local Centre for expanding communities (West Park and Whinfield), Camra happy to assist with setting appropriate Boundaries	TC 4 is a reduction of Local and District Centres from the last draft Plan and could be considered. Last plan including intermediate Planning Statement had more Centres mentioned. But the approach of the new Local Plan sets to only retain and safeguard Centres in Cockerton and Mowden due to their characteristic and safeguarding purpose.	No change recommended
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 688	Policy TC 4	District and Local Centres	Object	Object: other centres needed - local shopping opportunities and drive mixed-use development into these areas to support HNT Design principles and concepts (should be shown) Examples from Stockton plan SD4 and EG3	A valid point that other local shopping centres could be considered. But the approach of the new Local Plan sets to only retain and safeguard Centres in Cockerton and Mowden due to their characteristic and safeguarding purpose. Otherwise for all other areas within the council the Town Centre First Town policy applies and	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									a 500sqm local retail impact assessment threshold will be required.	
ASDA Stores Limited		Katherine Sneedden		DBDLP 779	Policy TC 4	District and Local Centres	Object	Omission of Whinfield and Neasham Road local centres from the retail hierarchy (as in Table 8.1) Only 2 remaining in TC4	NPPF 2018 does not re-enforce Local and District Centres The approach of the new Local Plan sets to only retain and safeguard Centres in Cockerton and Mowden due to their characteristic and safeguarding purpose.	No change recommended
Mr Steven Drabik	Architectural Liaison Officer Durham Constabulary			DBDLP 1097	Policy TC 4	District and Local Centres	Object	Inclusion of Policy for Takeaways A5 Issues of crime and disorder in all Centres not only based on A5 establishments more likely to follow density of licensed premises	What are the key issues though of A5? (can that not be achieved with licensing) Issues of crime and disorder apply to Local and District Centres as well. (Would that be a Design Chapter issue)	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 683	Policy TC 5	Retail Impact Assessment Threshold	Object	Local threshold of 500sqm is too high	Based on evidence and local knowledge 500sqm is a valid size to apply for retail impact threshold.	No change recommended
Mr Geoffrey Crute	Councillor Neasham Parish Council			DBDLP 383	Policy TC 6	Darlington - Town Centre Fringe	Support	Preference for brownfield site use for key regeneration sites like the TC Fringe / improve viability of such sites for developers through financial support and grants	Support noted	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 139	Policy TC 6	Darlington - Town Centre Fringe	Support	Preferred use in TC of brownfield sites	All sites in TC Fringe are brownfield	No change recommended
Miss Madeleine Sutcliffe				DBDLP 392	Policy TC 6	Darlington - Town Centre Fringe	Object	With High density / low cost housing Council would create gentrification of the Town Centre Fringe Mixed use preferred	Mixed use with higher densities and affordable mixed products is preferred for the Town Centre Fringe due to its exceptional transport offer. Land in TCF currently underutilised	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Dr Ellen Bekker	Lead Adviser Natural England			DBDLP 303	9	ENVIRONM NT	Object	The Plan does not safeguard the long-term capability of the best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV land). It should be clear that areas of lower quality agricultural land should be used for development in preference to BMV land, in line with NPPF paragraph 112. The plan should recognise that development (soil sealing) has an irreversible adverse (cumulative) impact on the finite national and local stock of BMV land. Avoiding loss of BMV land is the priority as mitigation is rarely possible.	When assessing potential development sites through the Sustainability Appraisal process, consideration has been given to the quality of agricultural land. In selecting allocation sites, the Council has sought to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. The revised NPPF changes the policy with regards to BMV agricultural land, stating that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other measures, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services - including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land.	No change recommended.
Ken Walton				DBDLP 339	9	ENVIRONM NT	Object	Our historic environment and associated history, heritage and natural world should be encouraged to thrive not be reduced or destroyed especially in our country parks.	Noted. Protecting and enhancing the countryside and the natural environment is one of the overarching aims of the Darlington Local Plan. The planning policies in the Environment section of the Local Plan seek to achieve this aim through specific policies designed to protect the Borough's historic environment, green spaces and biodiversity.	No change recommended.
MRS Angela Rajf-Green				DBDLP 440	9	ENVIRONM NT	Support	Blackwell Grange should be protected in the plan. It is an historic landscape forming a beautiful entrance to the town. It is values for the physical and mental health of the community. It joins the Green Wedge on the south and west of the town.	Please see officer response on Site 9 Blackwell Grange East.	No change recommended.
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 689	9	ENVIRONM NT	Neutral	Some reference could be included regarding landmarks and the importance of these for legibility in dementia friendly environments.	Draft Policy DC 2: Health and Wellbeing states that developments will be supported that integrate dementia friendly design principles, including landmark features.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1055	9	ENVIRONME NT	Neutral	With the exception of the Darlington and Stockton Railway policy (addressed below), none of these policies raise issues of strategic or local importance with County Durham. We welcome the opportunity to continue to work jointly with Darlington BC on cross-boundary projects such as the Brightwater project and Heritage Action Zone and encourage continued partnership working in this regard.	Comment noted.	No change recommended.
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1160	9.1.1	Paragraph	Support	Para 9.1.1. to 9.1.11 - Historic England welcomes the content of these paragraphs which give an overview of Darlington.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Ben Lamb	manager Tees Rivers Trust			DBDLP 29	9.1.3	Paragraph	Neutral	The town was built around the river Skerne - surely this warrants it's recognition as a heritage asset?	Comment noted. The River Skerne is not currently designated as a heritage asset but is clearly important to the setting of heritage assets along its route. The River is also afforded protection as an important element of blue infrastructure in the Borough, and as a strategic green corridor, through Policies ENV 3, ENV 4 and ENV 7.	No change recommended.
Miss Madeleine Sutcliffe				DBDLP 393	9.1.5	Paragraph	Neutral	I don't think that one could describe Darlington as 'the best market town....' anywhere at present. The outdoor market on Mondays and Saturdays is probably the worst and tackiest in the country, with a lack of interesting/intriguing stalls, and an increasing number of 'vaping' products. The vinyl stall is the only one worth visiting - also fruit & veg. stall on Mondays. Again, market stalls should sell products not readily available in the local shops.	The reference to Darlington being described as the best market town in the bishopric outside of Durham relates to the 1530s. Town centres around the country are facing a number of challenges such as the growth of online shopping, pressure from out of centre retailing and supermarkets, and reduced town centre footfall. However, the nature of town centres are changing and adapting to these pressures becoming more of a mixed shopping and leisure destination, with an increase in other land uses including residential and office use increasing activity in centres throughout the day. The level of growth around the town proposed in the Draft Local Plan, will generate increased expenditure in the town centre that will help to support local employment and the vitality and viability of the centre.	No change recommended.
Mr				DBDLP 815	9.1.5	Paragraph	Object	The town was flourishing until the Council allowed out of town retail	Town centres around the country are facing a number of challenges such as the growth of	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Neil Minto								development. We had a market in its correct place, the market place, and it was thriving. Now everything is a stop gap attempt to keep some people coming into the town centre. With large places such as Binns and M&S closing, there is going to be no reason to come into the town centre.	online shopping, pressure from out of centre retailing and supermarkets, and reduced town centre footfall. However, the nature of town centres are changing and adapting to these pressures becoming more of a mixed shopping and leisure destination, with an increase in other land uses including residential and office use increasing activity in centres throughout the day. Allocations for housing and employment growth around the town will generate increased expenditure in the town centre that will help to support local employment and the vitality and viability of the centre.	
Mr Ross Chisholm	Planning Officer Friends of the Stockton and Darlington Railway			DBDLP 572	9.1.6	Paragraph	Neutral	The S&DR is also of international significance.	Comment noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Ben Lamb	manager Tees Rivers Trust			DBDLP 30	9.1.10	Paragraph	Support	It is good to see that access to and enjoyment of the river is included.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
MR MICHAEL GREEN				DBDLP 499	9.1.11	Paragraph	Support	Borough's rural historic environment and the heritage assets integral to it (including Blackwell Parkland) should be protected, enhanced and promoted. Full comment provides information on historical references to the Blackwell area of Darlington.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 142	Policy ENV 1	Protecting, Enhancing and Promoting Darlington's Historic Environment	Support	Pleased to see a robust policy on this matter. This policy must be fully implemented and not circumventing by commercial need.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Simon	Member Barmpton and Skerningham	Mr Simon	Member Barmpton and Skerningham	DBDLP 412	Policy ENV 1	Protecting, Enhancing and Promoting Darlington's	Support	This is sound policy but it should be strictly implemented.	Support noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Bainbridge	Preservation Group	Bainbridge	Preservation Group			Historic Environment				
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 685	Policy ENV 1	Protecting, Enhancing and Promoting Darlington's Historic Environment	Neutral	<p>In the series of criteria relating to demolition of buildings in a conservation area, it is not clear whether the intent is</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “and” i.e. requiring all criteria to be met 2. “or” i.e. requiring any one of the criteria to be met <p>CPRE would favour the latter. Precision in language is essential.</p>	The wording of Policy ENV 1 A) criteria v-vii relating to the demolition of buildings or structures in a conservation area is clear that an applicant would be required to satisfy all of the criteria.	No change recommended.
Mr Ross Chisholm	Planning Officer Friends of the Stockton and Darlington Railway			DBDLP 573	Policy ENV 1	Protecting, Enhancing and Promoting Darlington's Historic Environment	Support	The FSDR welcome proposed policy ENV 1 Protecting, Enhancing and Promoting Darlington's Historic Environment. It will be the job of the Plan to ensure that the planning system serves the aims and objectives of the Rail Heritage Board and facilitates the proposals of the Programme and Delivery Plan of the Heritage Action Zone.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1345	Policy ENV 1	Protecting, Enhancing and Promoting Darlington's Historic Environment	Neutral	Our Client does not have any specific comments in relation to this policy but reserve the right to comment at a later date.	Comment noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Steven Drabik	Architectural Liaison Officer Durham Constabulary			DBDLP 756	9.1.12	Paragraph	Neutral	<p>Specific mention should be made in relation to Cemeteries, there have been well documented long term issues in North Road Cemetery which are related to the relaxation of access.</p> <p>The Local Authorities Cemeteries Order 1977 is the primary legislation for their protection.</p>	Access arrangements to cemeteries is not something that can be controlled by the Local Plan.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 143	Policy ENV 2	Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&DR)	Support	Policy should include an immediate marketing scheme in preparation for 2025.	Support noted. A marketing scheme is not something that can dealt with by the Local Plan.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 686	Policy ENV 2	Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&DR)	Support	CPRE supports Policy ENV2.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Ross Chisholm	Planning Officer Friends of the Stockton and Darlington Railway			DBDLP 574	Policy ENV 2	Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&DR)	Support	<p>The FSDR welcome proposed policy ENV 2 Stockton and Darlington Railway. It will be the job of the Plan to ensure that the planning system serves the aims and objectives of the Rail Heritage Board and facilitates the proposals of the Programme and Delivery Plan of the Heritage Action Zone.</p> <p>However, we feel that policy ENV 2 and the supporting text need to be strengthened in order that it will stand up to close examination at inquiry and appeal and also to make sure that new development proposals on or near the line make appropriate contributions to its protection, enhancement and promotion.</p> <p>We therefore suggest;</p> <p>1 'and enhance' be inserted after 'preserve' in the first sentence of the policy.</p> <p>2 The supporting text should explain that the policy does not apply just to those assets relating to the railway on the day it opened. The railway immediately started to evolve, operationally, mechanically, physically and geographically, and those assets that remain on the 1825 line and which</p>	Support noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>are significant to its heritage, public understanding and enjoyment should be protected and enhanced in relation to their significance.</p> <p>3 The supporting text should make it clear that some S&DR assets are not located on or adjacent to the route of the line itself, and that the policy applies to them also.</p> <p>4 The policy should name the Darlington Branch to Westbrook and Croft Branch and show them on the policies map. This would achieve consistency with the Local Plans for Stockton and County Durham, which name the Yarm, Haggerleases and Black Boy Branches. The Darlington Branch is fully documented in the Historic Environment Audit and a survey of the Croft Branch is proposed in the HAZ Programme and Delivery Plan.</p>		
Mr A Macnab	Middleton St George Parish Council			DBDLP 827	Policy ENV 2	Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&DR)	Support	<p>The Parish Council would like to see the conservation of the former S&D Railway, and all the heritage artifacts, and therefore agree with and support the representation by the Friends of Stockton and Darlington Railway (FSDR) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the routes of the proposed Heritage Trail for pedestrians and cyclists should be shown (and improvements are needed in places between St George's Way and the borough boundary); FSDR will be proposing the creation of a Rail Heritage Hub at Fighting Cocks; 	<p>The focus of Policy ENV 2 is the protection of the route of the Stockton & Darlington Railway, and its brachlines, and the preservation of historic remains along the route. The Heritage Action Zone initiative will be able to build on this groundwork to develop specific projects for the line.</p>	No change recommended.

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"> funding for the above will be found from various sources including the S&DR Heritage Action Zone, and contributions from developers would be appropriate as the enhanced trackbed will be enjoyed by residents. 		
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1346	Policy ENV 2	Stockton and Darlington Railway (S&DR)	Neutral	Our Client does not have any specific comments in relation to this policy but reserve the right to comment at a later date.	Comment noted.	No change recommended.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 414	9.3.1	Paragraph	Object	<p>It is difficult to see how the Skerningham Strategic Allocation can be justified having regard to the following statement in policy ENV 3 "... valued landscapes should be protected and enhanced".</p> <p>DBC is holding itself out as a protector of "valued landscapes" in its Green Infrastructure Strategy and support of The Bight Water Landscape Partnership but the proposed Skerningham Strategic Allocation in the Draft Local Plan would suggest otherwise.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 416	9.3.2	Paragraph	Object	<p>Whinfield, Harrogate Hill, Beaumont Hill, Barmpton, Great Burdon would all lose their unique identity and open space between neighbourhoods and the identity of their communities by the inclusion of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation which would effectively join all these settlements together.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Policy ENV 3 A)1. states that the rural gaps between Darlington and the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton will be retained. The Masterplan Framework for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (Figure 6.1) indicates that development on the allocation site should be set back from the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton, maintaining their separation from the main built up area of Darlington. The inclusion of Barmpton and Great Burdon in the list of rural gaps to be maintained is a reaction to the Skerningham allocation as these settlements</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									were not included in the previous iteration of this policy. Their inclusion will ensure that, following the completion of the Skerningham site, no further encroachment of development towards these rural settlements will be allowed.	
Mr Simeon Hope				DBDLP 250	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Neutral	<p>These are fine words. As a resident of Whinfield, I object to the Strategic Allocation because it would involve the substantial destruction of the "openness and green infrastructure functions... between Darlington and the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton".</p> <p>What is the point of Policy ENV 3 if, when money is involved, it is ignored?</p>	<p>The Local Plan must be read as a whole. The Masterplan Framework for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (Figure 6.1) indicates that development on the allocation site should be set back from the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton, maintaining their separation from the main built up area of Darlington. The inclusion of Barmpton and Great Burdon in the list of rural gaps to be maintained is a reaction to the Skerningham allocation as these settlements were not included in the previous iteration of this policy. Their inclusion will ensure that, following the completion of the Skerningahm site, no further encroachment of development towards these rural settlements will be allowed.</p>	No change recommended.
Alan Hutchinson	Whinfield Residents Association			DBDLP 167	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Object	<p>Re. point A, "Retaining the openness and green infrastructure functions of.....between Darlington and the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton", this is contradicted by the proposals for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation, which involve development in these areas.</p>	<p>The Local Plan must be read as a whole. The Masterplan Framework for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (Figure 6.1) indicates that development on the allocation site should be set back from the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton, maintaining their separation from the main built up area of Darlington. The inclusion of Barmpton and Great Burdon in the list of rural gaps to be maintained is a reaction to the Skerningham allocation as these settlements were not included in the previous iteration of this policy. Their inclusion will ensure that, following the completion of the Skerningahm site, no further encroachment of development towards these rural settlements will be allowed.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr Geoffrey Crute	Councillor Neasham Parish Council			DBDLP 385	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Support	<p>NPC considers that the location-specific policies in paragraphs A) - C) detracts from the importance of D). NPC suggests that para D) should give more specific guidance on both protection and enhancement, linked to the visionary aim of "cherishing,</p>	<p>Policy ENV 3 applies equal weight to each of the criteria it contains.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								protecting and celebrating" Darlington's "natural and historic environment".		
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 144	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Object	There is a contradiction in wording, how do you retain the rural gaps and at the same time accept development. Any development compromises the gaps.	<p>A gap between settlements that retains the openness and green infrastructure functions of the space can still be maintained despite a closing of the gap as a result of development. Decisions made under this policy will need to be considered on a case by case basis dependent on the specifics of the development proposed and its effect on the openness and function of the space involved.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole. The inclusion of some villages in the list of rural gaps to be maintained is in some cases a reaction to the allocations made in the plan (i.e. Barmpton and Great Burdon). Their inclusion will ensure that, following the completion of development on allocated sites, no further encroachment of development towards these rural settlements will be allowed.</p>	No change recommended.
Gerald Lee	Heighington and Coniscliffe Councillor			DBDLP 264	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Object	<p>It is noted that a number of locations are listed to 'retain the openness and green infrastructure functions'</p> <p>The locations listed do not include any of the country side or 'green wedges between any of the villages in the Heighington and Coniscliffe Ward – why?</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, and 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 set out in the 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 ENV 3 criterion A)1. when reviewing the Local Plan.</p> <p>High Coniscliffe and Heighington are separated from Darlington town by the A1(M) corridor, a significant physical and visual barrier, with Heighington located over 5 kilometres from the town and 1.5 kilometres from Newton Aycliffe.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									It was therefore not considered necessary to include these settlements under Policy ENV 3 criterion A)1.	
Mr John Rudkin				DBDLP 293	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Object	I object to the Skerningham Strategic allocation because it contradicts Policy ENV3 as openness and green infrastructure will not be retained between Darlington, Great Burdon and Whinfield.	<p>The Local Plan must be read as a whole. The Masterplan Framework for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (Figure 6.1) indicates that development on the allocation site should be set back from the village of Great Burdon, maintaining its separation from the main built up area of Darlington. The inclusion of Barmpton and Great Burdon in the list of rural gaps to be maintained is a reaction to the Skerningham allocation as these settlements were not included in the previous iteration of this policy. Their inclusion will ensure that, following the completion of the Skerningahm site, no further encroachment of development towards these rural settlements will be allowed.</p> <p>Whinfield is already part of the main built up area of the town.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 417	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Object	<p>We support the policy but much of it is in direct conflict with the Skerningham Strategic Allocation and it is difficult to see how the Skerningham Strategic Allocation can be justified having regard to the fact that the area is promoted by DBC under the Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>Re. point A, “<i>Retaining the openness and green infrastructure functions of.....between Darlington and the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton</i>”, this is contradicted by the proposals for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation, which involve development in these areas.</p>	<p>The Local Plan must be read as a whole. The Masterplan Framework for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (Figure 6.1) indicates that development on the allocation site should be set back from the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton, maintaining their separation from the main built up area of Darlington. The inclusion of Barmpton and Great Burdon in the list of rural gaps to be maintained is a reaction to the Skerningham allocation as these settlements were not included in the previous iteration of this policy. Their inclusion will ensure that, following the completion of the Skerningahm site, no further encroachment of development towards these rural settlements will be allowed.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr Colin Raine				DBDLP 634	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Neutral	Whilst I do support the principles of the Local Landscape Character, retaining openness & green infrastructure.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Character and local distinctiveness by its very nature has to be determined on a case by case</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>The character & local distinctiveness of villages and rural area seems to cover only a very small number of sites to be protected.</p> <p>The term 'character & local distinctiveness' is subjective, how is this decided?</p> <p>Are the rural gaps between Darlington, Hurworth & Neasham of importance to retain the openness & green infrastructure of Darlington Borough?</p> <p>What criteria needs to be met in order to achieve 'rural gap' status?</p> <p>I would like to see the amount of rural gap areas increased.</p>	<p>basis considering the particular history and characteristics of the site and its surrounds.</p> <p>Hurworth and Neasham are separated from Darlington by the A66 around the southern side of the town, a significant physical and visual barrier. The villages are also both over 2 kilometres from the edge of the town. It was therefore not considered necessary to include these settlements under Policy ENV 3 criterion A)1.</p>	
Judith Murray				DBDLP 529	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Object	<p>I object to the Skerningham Strategic allocation because it contradicts Policy ENV3 as openness and green infrastructure will not be retained between Darlington, Great Burdon and Whinfield.</p>	<p>The Local Plan must be read as a whole. The Masterplan Framework for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (Figure 6.1) indicates that development on the allocation site should be set back from the village of Great Burdon, maintaining its separation from the main built up area of Darlington. The inclusion of Barmpton and Great Burdon in the list of rural gaps to be maintained is a reaction to the Skerningham allocation as these settlements were not included in the previous iteration of this policy. Their inclusion will ensure that, following the completion of the Skerningahm site, no further encroachment of development towards these rural settlements will be allowed.</p> <p>Whinfield is already part of the main built up area of the town.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr A Macnab	Middleton St George Parish Council			DBDLP 820	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Object	<p>We also agree with CPRE: "CPRE feels strongly that the policy intentions expressed here and in Policy ENV3 of maintaining the distinctiveness of villages and the openness of the countryside would be best achieved by</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 around Darlington, and normal planning and</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								creating Green Belt, a designation expressly created to meet these objectives.”	development management policies (such as 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.	
Mrs Liz Knight				DBDLP 962	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Object	Re. point A, “Retaining the openness and green infrastructure functions of.....between Darlington and the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton”, this is contradicted by the proposals for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation, which involve development in these areas.	The Local Plan must be read as a whole. The Masterplan Framework for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (Figure 6.1) indicates that development on the allocation site should be set back from the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton, maintaining their separation from the main built up area of Darlington. The inclusion of Barmpton and Great Burdon in the list of rural gaps to be maintained is a reaction to the Skerningham allocation as these settlements were not included in the previous iteration of this policy. Their inclusion will ensure that, following the completion of the Skerningahm site, no further encroachment of development towards these rural settlements will be allowed.	No change recommended.
Mr Knight				DBDLP 967	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Object	Re. point A, “Retaining the openness and green infrastructure functions of.....between Darlington and the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton”, this is contradicted by the proposals for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation, which involve development in these areas.	The Local Plan must be read as a whole. The Masterplan Framework for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (Figure 6.1) indicates that development on the allocation site should be set back from the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton, maintaining their separation from the main built up area of Darlington. The inclusion of Barmpton and Great Burdon in the list of rural gaps to be maintained is a reaction to the Skerningham allocation as these settlements were not included in the previous iteration of this policy. Their inclusion will ensure that, following the completion of the Skerningahm site, no further encroachment of development towards these rural settlements will be allowed.	No change recommended.
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1031	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Object	LCMPC support the principles of policy ENV 3 (local landscape character), to protect and improve the character and local distinctiveness of the villages. However, LCMPC object to the lack of reference to retaining the openness and green infrastructure functions of the rural gaps between	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, and taking into account the South Coniscliffe Park allocation site (site ref. 41). However, the status	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								Darlington and Low Conscliffe and Merrybent. Through the preparation of the LCMNP it is clear that these matters are of significant importance to the local community.	<p>of Low Coniscliffe as a rural village distinct from Darlington town has not changed in the Local Plan, as recognised by the settlement hierarchy set out in the 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 ENV 3 criterion A)1 when reviewing the Local Plan.</p> <p>Merrybent is separated from Darlington town by the A1(M) corridor, a significant physical and visual barrier. It was therefore not considered necessary to include these settlements under Policy ENV 3 criterion A)1.</p>	
Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odamier				DBDLP 995	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Object	I object to the Skerningham Strategic allocation because it contradicts Policy ENV3 as openness and green infrastructure will not be retained between Darlington, Great Burdon and Whinfield.	<p>The Local Plan must be read as a whole. The Masterplan Framework for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (Figure 6.1) indicates that development on the allocation site should be set back from the village of Great Burdon, maintaining its separation from the main built up area of Darlington. The inclusion of Barmpton and Great Burdon in the list of rural gaps to be maintained is a reaction to the Skerningham allocation as these settlements were not included in the previous iteration of this policy. Their inclusion will ensure that, following the completion of the Skerningham site, no further encroachment of development towards these rural settlements will be allowed.</p> <p>Whinfield is already part of the main built up area of the town.</p>	No change recommended.
	Northumbrian Water Ltd	Miss Isobel Jackson	Senior Planner Lichfields	DBDLP 861	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Object	A policy which seeks to protect and improve local character and distinctiveness is welcomed, though it should be ensured that Policy ENV3 is not more stringent than the NPPF which (at Footnotes 9 and 6 respectively) is clear about which policies can indicate that development should be restricted. This includes	The NPPF is clear that the planning system should be genuinely plan-led, with succinct and up-to-date plans providing a positive vision for the future of each area; a framework for addressing housing needs and other economic, social and environmental priorities; and a platform for local people to shape their surroundings (NPPF, para 15). Paragraph 170 of the NPPF states that planning policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>habitat sites, Green Belt, Local Green Space and irreplaceable habitats.</p> <p>The current wording of ENV3 seeks to impose a level of protection which is overly restrictive given that the land is not defined as Green Belt nor does it within the locations identified within Footnotes 9 and 6 and is therefore not consistent with the NPPF.</p>	<p>environment by, amongst, other things, protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.</p> <p>Designation as a green wedge is recognition of the importance of an area of land to the character of Darlington, and the proposed conditions on development are not considered to be overly restrictive given the nature and character of the land involved (including extensive coverage of areas of open space, designated wildlife sites and flood zones 2/3).</p>	
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1089	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Neutral	<p>Policy ENV 3 seeks to protect the local landscape character of the local area for its own sake. In particular, it seeks to implement several rural gaps where development will only be limited in a set of strict circumstances.</p> <p>Gladman submit that new development can often be located in countryside gaps without leading to the physical or visual merging of settlements, eroding the sense of separation between them or resulting in the loss of openness and character. In such circumstances, we would question the purpose of these gap designations, particularly if these would prevent the development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable sites from coming forward to meet the borough's housing needs.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, if this element of the policy is to be retained then it should be justified by robust evidence and be altered to allow for a balancing exercise to be undertaken which assesses any harm to the visual or functional separation of settlements against the benefits of the proposal rather than a blanket restriction on many forms of development as is currently the case.</p>	<p>Policy ENV3 seeks to protect the character and local distinctiveness of the Borough's urban area, villages and rural area through a number of policy measures. One measure is the identification of a number of rural gaps between settlements that help to retain their landscape character, setting and individual identity.</p> <p>Policy ENV 3 does not place a blanket ban on development in rural gaps, but, in recognition of the importance of these gaps to the character and identity of the rural settlements involved, it does install a number of criteria against which development proposals will be considered in order to limit the impact of development on the character and identity of settlements.</p> <p>The identification of rural gaps has been informed by the Local Plan strategy and site selection process (including the Sustainability Appraisal), the Landscape Character Assessment of the borough and Conservation Area Appraisals where applicable.</p> <p>For example the rural gap between Middleton One Row and Middleton St George is included within Middleton one Row Conservation Area highlighting the importance of this gap to the conservation area. In addition, the Landscape Character Assessment highlights that the settlement edges around the southern part of Middleton St George and Middleton One Row display a higher sensitivity to residential development.</p>	No change recommended.

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 1347	Policy ENV 3	Local Landscape Character	Neutral	Our Client does not have any specific comments in relation to this policy but reserve the right to comment at a later date.	Comment noted.	No change recommended.
Major Frederick Greenhow MBE				DBDLP 96	9.3.3	Paragraph	Object	<p>I strongly object - If Skerningham Strategic Allocation was to go ahead - surely this is going against DBC's own policy statement above - 'Retaining the openness and green infrastructure functions of:...The rural gaps, between Middleton St George and Middleton One Row, Middleton St George and Oak Tree, Hurworth on Tees and Hurworth Place, and between Darlington and the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton';</p> <p>As there will be a huge property development of upto 1800 homes prior to 2036 between Barmpton & Burdon.</p>	The Local Plan must be read as a whole. The Masterplan Framework for the Skerningham Strategic Allocation (Figure 6.1) indicates that development on the allocation site should be set back from the villages of Great Burdon and Barmpton, maintaining their separation from the main built up area of Darlington. The inclusion of Barmpton and Great Burdon in the list of rural gaps to be maintained is a reaction to the Skerningham allocation as these settlements were not included in the previous iteration of this policy. Their inclusion will ensure that, following the completion of the Skerningahm site, no further encroachment of development towards these rural settlements will be allowed.	No change recommended.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 415	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.	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.	No change recommended.
Mr David Clark				DBDLP 73	9.3.9	Paragraph	Object	Skerningham Rural Landscape 251 Map 7 traditional field patterns, hedgerows and wetlands are not being protected through this policy?	Policy H 10 includes a number of criteria to guide the development of the site including reference to retaining and enhancing existing hedgerows on the site which would also result in the retention of field patterns. Wetlands on the site, along with other areas of biodiversity interest, will be protected under the provisions of Policies ENV 7 and ENV 8. The intention is to create a comprehensive network of green and blue infrastructure across the site that meets the Governments objective of delivering net environmental gains.	No change recommended.
Mr				DBDLP 635	9.3.9	Paragraph	Object	The rural landscape characterised by mostly open, arable farmland including	Policy ENV 7 criterion D states that that Council will seek to protect and enhance the	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Colin Raine								hedgerows around Hurworth is in need of protection, is there a map available which shows these areas of 'rural landscape' which are to be protected & how will this protection be applied?	natural quality of the rural landscape, where appropriate, reinstating traditional natural and built features. Hurworth also benefits from having a Conservation Area where maintaining the open rural setting of parts of the conservation area will be an important consideration should development proposals arise in these locations. The Council's Landscape Character Assessment is also a consideration in determining planning applications that will affect areas of high landscape sensitivity. Finally the Council has an adopted Revised Design of New Development SPD that provides advice on matters of design and local distinctiveness that is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.	
Mr Colin Raine				DBDLP 636	9.3.10	Paragraph	Support	<p>The rural landscape is vital to the Borough & should be cherished as part of Darlington's natural & historic environment.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how the rural landscape can be protected through the planning policy, with the huge amount of houses that DBC has deemed necessary, despite the lower housing estimates given by the government.</p>	Comment noted. Planning applications, including those for sites allocated in the plan, will need to demonstrate that they conform with the policies in the Local Plan.	No change recommended.
Mr Tim Ellis				DBDLP 88	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Object	<p>I do not want to see local countryside destroyed just because you hope to grab more cash from the government and more council tax. The people of the town and specifically want access to walks and areas without development great use is made for leisure and recreation.</p> <p>I would also like to remind you as a council you are supposed to carry out the express wishes of the town's people not developers and money grabbers.</p>	Darlington Borough Council, as the local planning authority for the area, are required to prepare a Local Plan that meets the needs of the Borough over the long term. In line with the NPPF, the Council has sought to make effective use of land in prioritising the development of previously developed land where land is available, and it is suitable and viable to do so. In selecting allocation sites on the urban edge, the Council has sought to avoid areas of highest landscape, environmental and agricultural value as considered in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and other related evidence.	No change recommended.
Dr Ellen	Lead Adviser			DBDLP 297	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Support	Natural England welcomes policy ENV4 on Green Infrastructure (GI) and the emphasis on its multi-functional	Support noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Bekker	Natural England							character, including links to other relevant policies, such as on biodiversity and sustainable drainage and to the GI Strategy.		
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 419	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Object	<p>The policy states planning permission would be refused for development that would result in the loss of existing green space.</p> <p>Skerningham Community Woodland is identified on the Darlington Green Infrastructure Network plan as a Designated Wildlife Area. How can there be a suggestion that Darlington Golf Club could relocate to Skerningham Community Woodland where that woodland has a formal designation which should protect it.</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 690	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Support	<p>CPRE welcomes Policy ENV4, but we are puzzled by the phrase in Clause F i) “surplus of green infrastructure” which goes on to suggest that Green Infrastructure can be quantified as “enough to meet the needs of residents”</p> <p>However, as Policy ENV 5 spells out there are at least five purposes for Green Infrastructure only three of which could be considered to be about meeting the needs of residents.</p> <p>We suggest that this clause is thought through more clearly and redrafted.</p> <p>In addition, who decides if there is a surplus, surely the reason for the Local Plan is to pre-allocate usage! And can there be a surplus of any type of Green Infrastructure? ENV 5 is about creating GI where possible, so why can there be a surplus.</p>	<p>Policy ENV 4 reflects the provisions of paragraph 97 of the NPPF regarding the conditions under which the loss of open space can be considered acceptable.</p> <p>Even if the conditions of Policy ENV 4 and the NPPF are met, there may be other functions or features of an open space that would mean that development would not be appropriate or permissible under another policy in the Local Plan or National Policy. Each case must be considered on its individual merits.</p> <p>The council are in the process of updating its information on the quantity and quality of open space in the Borough.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr	Planning Officer			DBDLP 575	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Support	Figure 9.1 of the plan shows Darlington’s Green Infrastructure	The list of routes provided in paragraph 10.1.21 makes it clear that this is not a comprehensive	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Ross Chisholm	Friends of the Stockton and Darlington Railway							<p>Network. The line of the S&DR is shown as a strategic/local green corridor, to be protected and enhanced by Policy ENV 4, which we support. It also proposes the creation of a recreation route from the edge of the town to Piercebridge along the track of the former 1856 railway to Barnard Castle, operated by the S&DR. We support this proposal also and suggest it be added to the list of routes in paragraph 10.1.21.</p> <p>The S&DR footpath and cycle route follows the Fighting Cocks Branch alongside Tornado Way, between Haughton Road and the A66 Bypass. Unfortunately this is a 2.5 km long wide, bleak and featureless traffic and highway dominated element in the green corridor network. The landscaping proposals intended to accompany the construction of the road have not been implemented. A new planting scheme should be prepared to soften the impact of the road, improve the outlook of residents and create a pleasant experience for those using the path. Significant tree planting was proposed here by the former Tees Forest initiative and this should be resurrected. Development adjacent to the corridor should be required to contribute.</p> <p>The protection of the S&DR green corridor by Policy ENV 4 will impact on some development sites within 50 metres of the line (Policy ENV 2). Clear guidance should be set out for each affected allocated site so that developers are aware of the requirements of the Plan. For example, development at Greater Faverdale (site 185) and Faverdale East Business Park (site 342) should be required to provide</p>	<p>list but includes examples that area likely to be delivered during the plan period. Whilst the Council supports the delivery of the route from the town to Piercebridge, there is less certainty that this route will come forward during the plan period.</p> <p>Landscaping of the route between Haughton Road and the A66 Bypass is not an issue that can be addressed by the Local Plan.</p> <p>Where appropriate, reference to the S&DR has been made in the development guidelines for each Local Plan allocation. Policy H 11 for the Greater Faverdale strategic allocation includes a reference to the S&DR and Policy ENV 2 in the policy text and also indicates that the development should create a new pedestrian route alongside the railway line on the Masterplan Framework plan (Figure 6.3). The site south of Bowes Court (site ref 42) was granted planning permission in 2016 and therefore predated the draft Local Plan.</p>	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								an appropriately landscaped minimum 15 metres corridor, carrying the footpath and cycle route Heritage Trail alongside the operational line. In contrast, the Railway Housing Association's development at Haughton Road (South of Bowes Court Site 042) over the green corridor directly conflicts with policy ENV 4 and the proposed extension of building eastwards to Barton Street must be in question.		
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 841	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Object	<p>Policy ENV 4 requires green and blue infrastructure to be protected. Skerningham Estates Ltd supports the protection of such features given their importance to the quality of life, as well as for biodiversity. However, there could be cases where the loss of such infrastructure could be justified should appropriate mitigation or compensation be provided. Skerningham Estates Ltd suggests the following amendments to this policy in accordance with the NPPF 2018 (paragraphs 92 and 170):</p> <p><i>“Green and blue infrastructure will be protected wherever possible, and where appropriate, improved and extended to provide a quality, safe and accessible network of well connected, multifunctional open spaces for recreation and play and to enhance visual amenity, biodiversity, landscape and productivity.”</i></p>	Criterion F of Policy ENV 4 identifies the circumstances under which the loss of existing green spaces can be justified as a result of development proposals. This reflects the position set out at paragraph 97 of the NPPF.	No change recommended.
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1032	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Support	LCMPC support the principles of policy ENV4 (green infrastructure), however the policy or supporting text should clearly set out that communities, through their neighbourhood plans, have a role in identifying important green infrastructure within their areas.	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Whilst communities can choose to identify green infrastructure within a neighbourhood plan it is not considered necessary to include a reference to this in the Local Plan.</p>	No change recommended.
N/A		Mr	WYG	DBDLP 1120	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Neutral	The wording of this policy should be amended to allow an assessment of GI	Criterion F of Policy ENV 4 identifies the circumstances under which the loss of existing	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Christopher Martin						to establish the quality of the GI and whether any loss would need to be compensated.	green spaces can be justified as a result of development proposals. This reflects the provisions set out at paragraph 97 of the NPPF.	
Thoroton and Croft Estate		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1261	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Support	We support Policies ENV4 and ENV5, which are consistent with national policy and will have far reaching benefits to the environmental, social and economic needs of the community as set out in paragraph 9.4.3. To be deliverable <u>all</u> stakeholders, including landowners will need to be involved.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1348	Policy ENV 4	Green Infrastructure	Neutral	<p>Whilst our Client notes that the provision of Green Infrastructure is important to provide quality places, this needs to be balanced with the requirement to use development land efficiently and to ensure new development can be viable and deliverable.</p> <p>It is noted that all Bellway schemes integrate carefully planned green infrastructure and ecological mitigation within a robust landscape framework etc. This can only happen where viability is not unduly affected, and our Client therefore seeks flexibility in terms of any requirements for Green Infrastructure provision contained in the Local Plan.</p>	Comment noted.	No change recommended.
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 146	Policy ENV 5	Green Infrastructure Standards	Support	We require robust and full implementation of this policy during planning which will offset some of the decline identified in ENV4.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Simon Bainbridge				DBDLP 402	Policy ENV 5	Green Infrastructure Standards	Object	<p>The Skerningham Masterplan is at odds with the Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy and standards.</p> <p>Any development on this area, including the golf club will be severely</p>	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>detrimental to the wildlife and contribute to the national devastation of woodland and farmland bird numbers.</p> <p>Darlington Council's designations such as Skerningham Countryside park, Green Infrastructure strategy, Skerningham Community Woodland, Designated Wildlife Area and Green Corridors all seem to be forgotten.</p>		
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 420	Policy ENV 5	Green Infrastructure Standards	Support	We support this policy but it must be robustly defended.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 692	Policy ENV 5	Green Infrastructure Standards	Support	CPRE supports Policy ENV5.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Mrs Laura Roberts	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 741	Policy ENV 5	Green Infrastructure Standards	Support	<p>Northumbrian Water undertakes many roles in its duty to provide water and waste water services to the region. As a statutory undertaker in the provision of these services we are a formal consultee on all emerging planning policy. Our New Development department provides a planning service which seeks to protect our assets and supports new development through ensuring our network and facilities have capacity to accommodate sustainable growth. We work closely with Local Authorities to monitor proposed development and track growth, and our consultation responses to emerging planning policies reflect this. We also seek to promote sustainable design in drainage and water conservation as part of tackling flooding. Separately, our Estates department is responsible for land and estate issues associated with our</p>	Support noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								operational, non-operational and surplus land. They act in the interests of Northumbrian Water by producing and submitting LDF representations to safeguard or release any operational or surplus land. They also seek opportunities to redevelop our redundant sites. Consequently, you will see two separate responses submitted from Northumbrian Water for this emerging plan. These responses should be read individually with an understanding of the two different planning roles Northumbrian Water undertakes. We welcome the use of Green Infrastructure on development sites and we support the high prioritisation of green space types associated with flood and water management systems.		
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1198	Policy ENV 5	Green Infrastructure Standards	Neutral	There appears to be no justification for the use of the threshold of 20 dwellings or more.	The requirement for on-site provision of green infrastructure is taken from the Council's adopted Planning Obligations SPD.	No change recommended.
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Christopher Martin	WYG	DBDLP 1121	Policy ENV 5	Green Infrastructure Standards	Neutral	DFAM recognises the importance of GI and its role in creating sustainable places, our concern with the approach in Policy ENV5 is the assumption that all development of a certain size needs to provide GI. GI requirements should be assessed on a site by site basis depending on the local context.	The standards referred to in Policy ENV 5 are based on an assessment of the quantity and quality of open space in the Borough to determine locally derived standards and are set out in the Council's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). As set out at paragraph 9.4.15 of the Local Plan 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 that the outcome of this work may result in an update to the provision standards contained in the Planning Obligations SPD.	No change recommended.
Thoroton and Croft Estate		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1262	Policy ENV 5	Green Infrastructure Standards	Support	We support Policies ENV4 and ENV5, which are consistent with national policy and will have far reaching benefits to the environmental, social and economic needs of the community as set out in paragraph 9.4.3. To be	Support noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								deliverable <u>all</u> stakeholders, including landowners will need to be involved.		
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1349	Policy ENV 5	Green Infrastructure Standards	Neutral	Our Client does not have any specific comments in relation to this policy but reserve the right to comment at a later date.	Comment noted.	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 226	9.4.7	Paragraph	Neutral	How will Skerningham and any new roads fit with the Brightwater Project outputs for the River Skerne?	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 842	9.4.7	Paragraph	Neutral	Skerningham Estates Ltd recognises that paragraph 9.4.7 expects the development of the Skerningham Strategic Allocation to include enhancements of the river corridor to the north of the town. Skerningham Estates Ltd is supportive of this policy and recognises the important benefits that the enhancement of the river corridor can bring to the quality of life and biodiversity. Skerningham Estates Ltd would like to work with the Council and the Environment Agency to bring forward an appropriate programme of enhancements.	Comment noted.	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 225	9.5.1	Paragraph	Neutral	Green infrastructure should include "homes for nature". Current design of buildings discourages nesting birds but the provision of nest boxes for example may well remedy this problem, not just encouraging wildlife back into our urban areas but also potentially benefit our own health and well-being. Green spaces should also be for nature and not just for leisure purposes. Wildlife needs to be able to feed, breed and disperse with disturbance kept to a minimum.	The Council's adopted Revised Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) includes a number of suggested 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 referred to under several policies in the emerging Local Plan. The Council intends to retain and update this SPD following the adoption of the Local Plan.	No change recommended.
Gerald Lee	Heighington and Coniscliffe Councillor			DBDLP 266	Policy ENV 6	Local Green Space	Support	It is good to see that permission will not be granted for any development on the areas listed under Policy ENV6 which includes Merrybent Community	Support noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								Woodland which I assume is the woodland planted next to Devonshire Court and designated woodland by the CO Op who sold the land for the housing development.		
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1199	Policy ENV 6	Local Green Space	Neutral	Policy ENV6 identifies the Local Green Spaces within Table 9.1, and refers to Local Green Spaces being identified within the Policies Map; however the Policies Map does not identify these areas.	Local Green Space designations are shown on the Policies Map.	No change recommended.
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1350	Policy ENV 6	Local Green Space	Neutral	Our Client does not have any specific comments in relation to this policy but reserve the right to comment at a later date.	Comment noted.	No change recommended.
Gerald Lee	Heighington and Coniscliffe Councillor			DBDLP 265	9.5.6	Paragraph	Neutral	<p>In response to 9.5.6 page 90 I wish to nominate the following for local Green Spaces:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heighington and the AIM • Heighington and Redworth • Heighington and the Chestnuts • Killerby and Summerhouse • Summerhouse and Denton • Piercebridge and High Coniscliffe • High Coniscliffe and Merrybent • Merrybent and low Coniscliffe • Low Coniscliffe and the Cocker beck pub • And all hamlets in between. 	<p>Areas of this size are not suitable for Local Green Space designation.</p> <p>Development Limits (Draft Policy H3) is the more appropriate mechanism of protecting areas of open countryside.</p>	No change recommended
Ken Walton				DBDLP 341		Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Object	Building excessive development does not protect nor enhance biodiversity!	Noted. Protecting and enhancing the countryside and the natural environment is one of the overarching aims of the Darlington Local Plan. The Environment section of the Local Plan seek to achieve this aim through specific	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									policies designed to protect the Borough's historic environment, green spaces and biodiversity. In selecting allocation sites the Council has sought to avoid areas of highest landscape, environmental and agricultural value as considered in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and other related evidence.	
Mrs Wilma Campbell				DBDLP 395	9.6.1	Paragraph	Object	<p>With housing pressure mounting, DBC need to be taking a more proactive stance in protecting and improving habitats for wildlife, where housing developments have been planned. The council's planners and ecologists should be insisting that housing developers include feasible wildlife friendly features to show that new housing isn't bad news for wildlife.</p> <p>These features of course depend on each individual site however many of the ideas can be achieved with little or no extra cost to the builder but with great benefits to the new community and wildlife. Hedgehog highways, bat and swift boxes, wildflower verges, fruit trees planted, extensive native hedges, bat friendly lighting, avenues of trees and green corridors through the built environment, permeable paving etc.</p> <p>Example given of how nature is being integrated with nature at Kingsbrook in Aylesbury Vale District.</p>	<p>The intention is to create a comprehensive network of green and blue infrastructure across the site that meets the Governments objective of delivering net environmental gains.</p> <p>The Council's adopted Revised Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) includes a number of suggested 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 referred to under several draft policies in the Draft Local Plan. The Council intends to retain and update this SPD following the adoption of the Local Plan.</p>	No change recommended.
Mrs Wilma Campbell	Chair EPICH			DBDLP 679	9.6.1	Paragraph	Neutral	E.P.I.C.H. (Eco People in Croft and Hurworth) would like more specific information on what strategies DBC have put in place to implement the Government's 25 Year plan to improve the environment 2018.	Protecting and enhancing the countryside and the natural environment is one of the overarching aims of the Darlington Local Plan. The Environment section of the Local Plan seek to achieve this aim through specific policies designed to protect the Borough's historic environment, green spaces and biodiversity. In selecting allocation sites the Council has sought to avoid areas of highest landscape, environmental and agricultural value as	No change required.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>Example given of how nature is being integrated with nature at Kingsbrook in Aylesbury Vale District.</p> <p>DBC should set clear goals to future housing developers to ensure that wildlife friendly features are achievable in almost any development.</p>	<p>considered in the Council's Sustainability Appraisal and other related evidence.</p> <p>The Council's adopted Revised Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) includes a number of suggested 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 referred to under several draft policies in the Draft Local Plan. The Council intends to retain and update this SPD following the adoption of the Local Plan.</p>	
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 148	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Neutral	How many SSSI's need protection?	Information on designated sites in Darlington is available on the Tees Valley Nature Partnership website. The Borough contains four SSSI sites (Newton Ketton Meadow, Redcar Field, Neasham Fen and Hell Kettles) covering some 9 hectares in total.	No change recommended.
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 232	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Object	How will Skerningham and any new roads fit with the Brightwater Project outputs for the River Skerne?	Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.	No change recommended.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 423	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Support	<p>We support this policy but it must be robustly implemented.</p> <p>If even only part of the Skerningham Countryside Park/Skerningham Community Woodland were lost, biodiversity would be adversely affected in contradiction to this policy.</p>	<p>Support and comments on implementation noted.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	No change recommended
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 425	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Object	The loss of Skerningham Community Woodland to a relocated golf club is in conflict with clauses D and H of Policy ENV 7.	<p>Policy ENV 7 allows for circumstances where the loss of woodland would be permissible provided that the benefits clearly outweigh the loss and suitable replacement planting can be undertaken.</p> <p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Colin Raine				DBDLP 637	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Support	<p>How specifically will developers be adhering to the policy on wildlife corridors & the protection of wildlife on the whole?</p> <p>Could developers with a proven track record in Ecological enhancement be looked upon more favourably for planning consent?</p> <p>Could these requirements be retrospectively introduced where practical, to developments that have had planning permission granted but have not yet commenced the work?</p> <p>Could developers be encouraged to plant hedges between gardens instead of fences for instance, as this would help the now endangered hedgehog population. Small undertakings like these would only help to improve the image of some developers & raise the profile of the Planning Dept.</p>	<p>Draft Policy ENV 8 sets out the requirements for assessing the impact of development proposals on biodiversity through the planning application process and how necessary measures to avoid, mitigate and/or compensate for impacts will be secured. Planning conditions and/or planning obligations are used to secure any mitigation required.</p> <p>Planning applications have to be determined on their individual merits irrespective of the applicant.</p> <p>Requirements cannot be retrospectively introduced to development proposals where planning permission has already been granted.</p> <p>Measures such as those suggested could be required to mitigate the impact of a development where appropriate and practical to do so.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr A Macnab	Middleton St George Parish Council			DBDLP 826	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Neutral	<p>Also vitally important, are the green areas such as The Whinnies Nature Reserve and the Water Park. We would like to see the Water Park also listed as a Nature Reserve.</p>	<p>The Council has recognised the importance of the Water Park to the local community in its proposed designation as a Local Green Space under draft Policy ENV 6.</p> <p>In order to designate the Water Park as a Local Nature Reserve (based on its community and wildlife value) or Local Wildlife Site (wildlife value only) the site will require an up-to-date ecological survey. The community can explore either of these options with Natural England (for Local Nature Reserves) or the Tees Valley Nature Partnership (for Local Wildlife Sites). The Council's ecologist can provide advice on the scope of an ecological survey and what is required to designate the site.</p>	No change recommended.
Mr Neil	Senior Director	Mr Neil	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 844	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Neutral	Skerningham Estates Ltd recognises that Policy ENV 7 (B) encourages improvements to the value and	Comment noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	Westwick				and Development		ecological mix of the River Skerne Strategic Corridor through undertaking activities including restoring the natural river course and systems and character (e.g. meanders and earth bank sides). Skerningham Estates Ltd would propose to work with the Council in relation to these activities.		
Jo-Anne Garrick	Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Parish Council			DBDLP 1035	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Support	LCMPC support the principles of policy ENV 7 (biodiversity and geodiversity and development), however the policy or supporting text should clarify that communities, through their neighbourhood plans, have a role in identifying important areas of biodiversity networks/ wildlife corridors within their areas.	Support noted. Whilst communities can choose to identify areas of biodiversity networks/wildlife corridors within a neighbourhood plans it is not considered necessary to include a reference to this in the Local Plan.	No change recommended.
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1351	Policy ENV 7	Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Development	Neutral	Our Client does not have any specific comments in relation to this policy but reserve the right to comment at a later date.	Comment noted.	No change recommended.
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 149	Policy ENV 8	Assessing a Developments Impact on Biodiversity	Object	The policy appears to firmly regulate the impact of developments yet offers a commercial solution to avoid the regulations. Not acceptable.	Policy ENV 8 complies with national policy and guidance and should be read in conjunction with Policy ENV 7. If significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.	No change recommended.
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 426	Policy ENV 8	Assessing a Developments Impact on Biodiversity	Object	This appears to be a process rather than a policy and requires redrafting. This policy allows a developer to massage other policies aside if it happens to interfere with the process/progress of a development. The policy is drafted from the viewpoint of development not the point of view of Biodiversity which is surely what this policy is promoting.	The policy follows the 'mitigation hierarchy' set out in paragraph 175a of the NPPF.	No change recommended.
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner	DBDLP 1352	Policy ENV 8	Assessing a Developments	Neutral	Our Client does not have any specific comments in relation to this policy but	Comment noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
			Barton Willmore			Impact on Biodiversity		reserve the right to comment at a later date.		
Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	Mr Simon Bainbridge	Member Barmpton and Skerningham Preservation Group	DBDLP 427	9.6.6	Paragraph	Object	<p>The Skerningham Strategic Allocation would not allow improved connectivity along the Skerne particularly if Darlington Golf Club were moved into Skerningham Community Woodland.</p> <p>Reference is made to the decline in 2 bird species. This does not do enough to reflect the major decline in bird populations countryside and this needs to be much more robust. Observations of bird species in Skerningham Community Woodland amount to the presence of 58 species of which 13 are on the British Trust for Ornithology's "RED" list and 10 are on the "AMBER" list as being of conservation concern.</p>	<p>Please see officer response on the Skerningham Strategic Allocation.</p> <p>Protecting and enhancing the countryside and the natural environment is one of the overarching aims of the Darlington Local Plan. Policy ENV 8 requires applicants to assess a developments impact on biodiversity and determine how impacts can be avoided, or failing that, adequately mitigated.</p>	No change recommended.
Dave McGuire	Sport England (North East)			DBDLP 101		Outdoor Sports Facilities	Neutral	<p>A central tenet of Plan-making remains that the plan must be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence.</p> <p>For a playing pitch strategy (PPS) to be considered "up to date", it should have been undertaken within the last three years. For a built facilities strategy to be considered "up to date" it should have been carried out within the last five years. Darlington's PPS and Built Facilities Strategy were undertaken in 2014/5, so that former is now technically out of date whilst the latter is still within time. Sport England are amenable to extending the lifespans of both strategies if the supply and demand data that underpins them has been kept up to date on a regular basis. Unfortunately we have no evidence to suggest that Darlington Council has been successful in this task.</p>	<p>Comments noted. In discussion with Sport England, the Council are undertaking an update of the 2015 Darlington Playing Pitch and Sports Facility Strategy.</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>Paragraph 9.7.7 of the Draft Local Plan states that the Council is currently in the process of updating the 2015 Darlington Playing Pitch and Sports Facility Strategy along with the accompanying needs assessment and evidence base.</p> <p>Sport England (and the respective sports' National Governing Bodies) would welcome clarification on the work that has been undertaken / commenced in order to reach a point where we are agreed that the Council has a robust evidence base for sport in good time for the Plan's submission.</p> <p>We noted that the last PPS and Sports Facilities Strategy were based on population growth that was small scale, with an impact on facility demand that was largely off-set by the overall ageing of the population. The population growth planned for in consultation draft Plan is more significant and is likely to upset this equilibrium. Moreover it is mostly taking place on greenfield sites that are not always served by the Borough's current network of sports provision.</p> <p>We note that a number of the proposed major greenfield allocations include an acknowledgement that they will need to make provision sport, and indeed provided the schools are suitably designed this could be part of the education provision that is proposed. However until such time as the PPS and Sports Facility Strategy are reviewed and updated we are concerned that this may be guesswork.</p> <p>See full response for further details.</p>		

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Dave McGuire	Sport England (North East)			DBDLP 105	Policy ENV 9	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Support	Policy ENV 9 Outdoor Sports Facilities – Support	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 150	Policy ENV 9	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Object	Recent history demonstrates the need for much more robust protection of residential amenity and greater weight needs to be considered in planning reports.	Draft Policy ENV 9 stipulates that proposals for the development of new outdoor sports facilities should protect the amenity of existing users of neighbouring land and buildings in line with Policy DC 3: Safeguarding Amenity. Policy DC 3 includes for consideration of matters including the potential noise, disturbance and artificial lighting from the proposed use of land and buildings. This is considered a sufficiently robust policy basis under which each development proposal can be considered on their merits.	No change recommended.
Ken Walton				DBDLP 340	Policy ENV 9	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Neutral	I support not having to access these facilities by means of transport, more places should be on our door step and exercise and recreation should be encouraged for all age groups and disabilities.	Comment noted. The policy stipulates that proposals for new outdoor sports facilities should not give rise to significant traffic congestion and be accessible by walking, cycling and public transport.	No change recommended.
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 698	Policy ENV 9	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Support	CPRE supports Policy ENV9.	Support noted.	No change recommended.
Doris Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 952	Policy ENV 9	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Object	Outdoor and indoor sporting facilities are essential for the wellbeing of the village community at every age group, this needs to be in the centre of the village for fair access to everyone (i.e. <i>redevelop the cricket club to accommodate a full sporting hub. This area can be accessed by walking or cycling in line with Policy IN 2).</i>	Comment noted. The plan recognises the importance of sport to people's health and wellbeing. Policy ENV 9 would allow a proposal to redevelop the cricket club as a sporting hub to happen provided that it satisfied the other policies in the Local plan, and subject to consultation with Sport England.	No change recommended.
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1353	Policy ENV 9	Outdoor Sports Facilities	Neutral	Our Client does not have any specific comments in relation to this policy but reserve the right to comment at a later date.	Comment noted.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Simon Nicholson				DBDLP 25	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Object	Seeking improved cycling provision. Speed limit reduction on all residential streets.	Cycling provision is encouraged in all developments as part of the plan including provision of new routes, enhancement of existing and providing improved connections. Speed limits are a highways matter and can be altered where there are justified concerns over safety.	No change recommended
Mr Paul Hollyer				DBDLP 244	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Neutral	Traffic Calming measures not mentioned for Roads like Yarm, North and Neasham Road .	Comment is noted but traffic calming is not a matter for the local plan and could be implemented by the Highway Authority if they see fit.	No change recommended
Mr Paul Howell				DBDLP 322	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Object	Timing of delivery of highway infrastructure key.	Agree timing and delivery of infrastructure is key however it is often difficult to provide highway infrastructure in advance of the development that is contributing to it's funding. Development often has to take place in tandem.	No change recommended
Ms Julie Nixon				DBDLP 327	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Object	Housing impact on traffic congestion. Also environmental issues of creating new road.	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.	No change recommended
Ms Julie Nixon				DBDLP 328	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Object	Concern raised over impact of development on highway safety	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.	No change recommended
Mr Ralph Bradley				DBDLP 450	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Object	Primarily a Skerningham objection. Local plan does not deal adequately with development pressure on road 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.	No change recommended
Mrs Jennifer Bradley				DBDLP 449	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Object	Primarily a Skerningham Objection. Local Plan does not deal adequately with pressure on roads from developments. Same as comment 450.	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.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher	Highways England			DBDLP 880	10	TRANSPORT AND	Object	Highways England need to understand both the individual and cumulative impact upon the Strategic Road	Overview of approach noted and requirement to continue to work with Highways England is supported. In addition evidence will be	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Bell						INFRASTRUCTURE		<p>Network (SRN) of all sites that are identified within the Plan and whether mitigation measures are likely to be required at any SRN location. Should it be likely that a development will have a severe impact at the SRN, Highways England would need to work with the developer and the local highway authority to ensure that the impact is appropriately managed down and/or mitigated. In addition, should the proposed development cumulatively, within the Plan have a severe impact on the SRN, then Highways England would wish to see appropriate mitigation in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan [IDP] along with appropriate identification of how this will be delivered.</p> <p>Appendix A of the technical memorandum (Which can be viewed in full online) identifies whether each of the individual sites are likely to be a concern for Highways England with regards to their potential impact at the SRN.</p> <p>Several of the larger sites identified within the Plan are likely to be a concern for Highways England and mitigation may be required at the SRN in order to cater for the potential development traffic associated with these sites.</p> <p>Highways England would welcome the opportunity to continue to work with Darlington Borough Council to identify the potential impact of the Plan sites on the SRN, in order to ensure that their impact is fully understood and if necessary mitigated through appropriate inclusions within individual site details and/or the IDP.</p>	provided to demonstrate that potentially severe impacts on the SRN can be adequately mitigated.	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 881	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Neutral	Background on the context of the Highways England response.	Noted. No action required.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 897	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	Highways England welcomes DBC's aims in working together in partnership and is committed to an ongoing partnership, to ensure the safe and functional operation of the SRN. General support for the aims and content of this section and approach to modelling highway impacts.	General support for approach and need for ongoing working noted.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 900	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Neutral	Outlining that location of housing, employment and retail is Highways England's main interest and these will require further consideration should they be deemed likely to have an impact on the Strategic Road Network. Comments have been provided on individual proposed allocations and not commitments. Sites have been split into three categories 'of concern', 'of possible concern' or 'of no concern'.	Approach to commenting has been noted and we will continue to liaise with Highways England on highway matters prior to publication of the plan.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 936	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE	Object	Summary of cumulative totals of development proposed in the local plan. Reiteration that sites have been categorised as being either 'of concern', 'of possible concern' and 'of no concern'. Given the cumulative total of development proposed it is concluded that impact on the Strategic Road Network could be significant in some areas and Highways England will need to see adequate mitigations demonstrated to adequately deal with potentially adverse impacts.	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.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1057	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRU CTURE	Support	Support noted.	No action required.	No change recommended
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1059	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRU CTURE	Support	Support noted. Ongoing discussions over connected rail network encouraged.	Agreed and will continue to be a duty to cooperate matter.	No change recommended
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1060	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRU CTURE	Support	Support for improvements to freight movement by road and rail.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Mr Derek Dodwell	Darlington Association of Parish Councils			DBDLP 1066	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRU CTURE	Neutral	Importance of delivering necessary transport and highway enhancements in a timely fashion.	<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>An infrastructure plan is being prepared to support the Local Plan and will identify infrastructure required to support new development.</p> <p>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>	No change recommended
Ms Michelle Saunders	North Yorkshire County Council			DBDLP 1071	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRU CTURE	Support	Support to maintain the levels of cross boundary passenger transport.	Support noted	No change recommended
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1137	10	TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRU CTURE	Support	Support for promoted rural site which is likely to have less impact on highways congestion than urban sites.	Highways is one of a number of factors to consider in assessing sustainability of sites.	No change recommended

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 1409		Delivering a sustainable transport network	Support	Sustainable transport network vital to encourage multi modal transport and choices The Infrastructure Development Plan should clearly articulate measures required to support public transport provision.	Support noted and issues taken up in the Darlington Infrastructure Development Plan	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 233	10.1.1	Paragraph	Object	Concern about proposed road building and environmental impacts.	New highway infrastructure will need to be subject to more detailed environmental consideration in due course. The plan does priorities sustainable transport methods in accordance with the NPPF (Chapter 9).	No change recommended
Mrs A E Reed				DBDLP 82	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Neutral	Bus Station and Tourist information required.	Buses are an essential element of every town's economy and in Darlington they provide people with access direct into the heart of the town centre to shop and access services. Integrating bus services into the town centre was a specific feature of the Pedestrian Heart during the design stages over 10 years ago. Safety checks were made during the design to consider pedestrian safety. There is a strong desire from bus users for bus stops to be accessible as close as possible to shopping areas, to facilitate this, buses have been incorporated into the town's road network like many other towns and cities in the Country. If a bus station were constructed then buses would not operate through the town centre. Provision of Tourist Information is likely to be reconsidered as part of the town centre strategy.	No change recommended
Mr Tim Ellis				DBDLP 83	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Object	Concern over traffic congestion and growth of the town.	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.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Tim Ellis				DBDLP 86	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Object	Complaint about traffic management.	Objection noted.	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 151	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Object	Private vehicles will remain the dominant form of transport of the foreseeable future and the plan should recognize that.	Objection noted however the NPPF (Chapter 9) requires plans to favour the use of sustainable transport methods.	No change recommended
Anne Rudkin				DBDLP 258	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Object	Primarily a Skerningham Objection. Local Plan does not deal adequately with pressure on roads from developments. Loss of parkland and impact on public footpaths an issue.	Footpaths would be protected or potentially rerouted if necessary. A loss of parkland can be permissible provided that adequate re-provision is provided within the vicinity. 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.	No change recommended
Mr John Rudkin				DBDLP 294	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Object	Primarily a Skerningham Objection. Local Plan does not deal adequately with pressure on roads from developments. Loss of parkland and impact on public footpaths an issue.	Footpaths would be protected or potentially rerouted if necessary. A loss of parkland can be permissible provided that adequate re-provision is provided within the vicinity. 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.	No change recommended
Judith Murray				DBDLP 530	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Object	Primarily an objection to Skerningham Strategic Allocation. Local Plan does not deal adequately with pressure on roads from developments. Loss of parkland and impact on public footpaths an issue.	Footpaths would be protected or potentially rerouted if necessary. A loss of parkland can be permissible provided that adequate re-provision is provided within the vicinity. 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.	No change recommended
Mr Ross Chisholm	Planning Officer Friends of the Stockton and			DBDLP 577	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Support	Support for S&DR cycling and walking enhancements.	Support noted.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
	Darlington Railway									
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council			DBDLP 731	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Support	Support for ongoing work to seek improvements to the strategic road network.	As part of our duty to cooperate we will continue to work with neighbouring authorities on such matters.	No change recommended
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 845	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Support	Support for highway works.	Support Noted.	No change recommended
Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odahamier				DBDLP 996	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Object	Primarily a Skerningham Objection. Local Plan does not deal adequately with pressure on roads from developments. Loss of parkland and impact on public footpaths an issue.	Footpaths would be protected or potentially rerouted if necessary. A loss of parkland can be permissible provided that adequate re-provision is provided within the vicinity. 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.	No change recommended
Mr G Raistrick		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1253	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Support	Support for statement on sustainable transport.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Mr David Atkinson				DBDLP 1285	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Neutral	Option of creating north bound slips at Junction 57 of the A1(M).	This junction is outside of the borough but it is an option that has been discussed previously with Highways England but they currently have no intention to pursue the project. We continue to engage with Highways England on strategic highways matters.	No change recommended
David Fishwick				DBDLP 1284	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Neutral	Alternative highway mitigations suggested.	Alternative mitigations have been considered as part of highway modelling work. Suggestions have been passed to highways for further consideration.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1354	Policy IN 1	Delivering a Sustainable Transport Network	Neutral	Broadly supported but caveated on viability.	Noted	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Alan Marshall	Mowden Ward Councillor			DBDLP 90	10.1.2	Paragraph	Object	Objection relating to congestion and road infrastructure particularly around the Cockerton and Carmel Road Area.	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.	No change recommended
Mr Neil Minto				DBDLP 823	10.1.2	Paragraph	Object	Concern over congestion and highway safety particularly around West Auckland Road, Staindrop Road and Mowden.	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.	No change recommended
Doris Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 957	10.1.4	Paragraph	Neutral	Efforts should be made to improve public transport connections to villages.	The council is supportive of improved public transport provision to villages however services have to operate as commercially viable routes. We continue to liaise with public transport providers.	No change recommended
Mr Steven Drabik	Architectural Liaison Officer Durham Constabulary			DBDLP 757	10.1.17	Paragraph	Neutral	Good design of cycle routes.	Agree with design principles for new provision and is also covered in the existing Design of New Development SPD. Town Centre use is an existing situation that will be kept under review.	No change recommended
Mr Ross Chisholm	Planning Officer Friends of the Stockton and Darlington Railway			DBDLP 576	10.1.21	Paragraph	Support	Support for improved access to S&DR and Hurworth. Should be extended to include Piercebridge.	Support noted. Should funding be in place improvements to the Barnard Castle Trackbed (including Piercebridge) would be supported but at the moment it is not a priority. It is also stated that the list in paragraph 10.1.21 is not exhaustive. The plan will be subject to review at least every 5 years so should delivery become more likely it could be included at this point.	No change recommended
Mr Neil Minto				DBDLP 828	10.1.25	Paragraph	Object	Improvements to rail services should be sought to reduce reliance on roads and road infrastructure.	Agree with the principle of supporting all sustainable transport methods as a priority but road infrastructure also needs to be improved also.	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 234	10.1.26	Paragraph	Support	Support for Darlington Station and gauge enhancements on rail network.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Mr Neil				DBDLP 830	10.1.27	Paragraph	Object	Considers there to be no need for additional external platforms to be created at Darlington Station as it is	Trains often have to stop some distance from the station to wait for platforms to be clear. Network Rail have identified capacity at	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Minto								rarely congested. Improvements to timetabling would be a more appropriate solution.	Darlington Station as an issue for a considerable time now. We will continue to engage with partners on rail transport matters.	
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 235	10.1.38	Paragraph	Object	Concern over impacts and requirement for road infrastructure. Concern over outdated forecasts for traffic growth as based on outdated trends. The plan should be doing more to encourage sustainable transport methods and encourage people to live in the town without owning a car.	Impacts of road infrastructure will be subject to more detailed assessment in due course. The plan aims to prioritise sustainable transport throughout the plan period however some appropriate expansion of the road network will be required to support the plans growth aspirations.	No change recommended
Mr Brian Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 984	10.1.41	Paragraph	Neutral	Efforts should be made to improve public transport connections to villages.	The council is supportive of improved public transport provision to villages however services have to operate as commercially viable routes. We continue to liaise with public transport providers.	No change recommended
Steve York	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 993	10.1.41	Paragraph	Neutral	Efforts should be made to improve public transport connections to villages.	The council is supportive of improved public transport provision to villages however services have to operate as commercially viable routes. We continue to liaise with public transport providers.	No change recommended
Mr Simon Nicholson				DBDLP 26	10.1.49	Paragraph	Object	Concern over congestion levels on West Auckland Road particularly with new development.	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.	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 152	Policy IN 2	Improving Access and Accessibility	Object	Private vehicles will remain the dominant form of transport of the foreseeable future and the plan should recognize that.	Objection noted however the NPPF (Chapter 9) requires plans to favour the use of sustainable transport methods.	No change recommended
Mr David Atkinson				DBDLP 1282	Policy IN 2	Improving Access and Accessibility	Object	Concerns raised about impact of developments to the North West of Darlington on congestion. Suggested improvements are provided including electric vehicle charging points and a park and ride facility at Faverdale. Importance of a connection between Newton Lane and Staindrop Road.	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. Research has been undertaken previously into park and ride and this has not proved economically viable for a town the size of	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									Darlington with relatively abundant parking. this will be kept under review. The link between Newton Lane and Staindrop Road is a priority and is being modelled. It is reflected on the Key Diagram rather than the policies map.	
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1355	Policy IN 2	Improving Access and Accessibility	Neutral	No comment at this time.	Noted.	No change recommended
Mr Simon Nicholson				DBDLP 27	10.2.2	Paragraph	Support	Comment on tougher on street parking restrictions.	Comment is noted but parking restrictions are not a matter for the local plan and could be implemented by the Highway Authority if they see fit.	No change recommended
Mr Paul Hollyer				DBDLP 193	10.2.2	Paragraph	Neutral	Where Cycle network not in place / pavement cycling causes risks for pedestrians and parked cars.	Comment is noted but parking restrictions are not a matter for the local plan and could be implemented by the Highway Authority if they see fit.	No change recommended
Mr Geoffrey Crute	Councillor Neasham Parish Council			DBDLP 386	10.2.3	Paragraph	Support	Impact of increased traffic on rural settlements requires greater consideration.	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.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 898		Transport Assessments and Travel Plans	Support	Support for Transport Assessments and Travel Plans.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 153	Policy IN 3	Transport Assessments and Travel Plans	Object	Importance of cars for transport.	Objection noted however the NPPF (Chapter 9) requires plans to favour the use of sustainable transport methods.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1356	Policy IN 3	Transport Assessments and Travel Plans	Neutral	No comments at this time.	Noted.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 154	Policy IN 4	Parking Provision including Electric Vehicle Charging	Neutral	Importance of cars for transport.	Noted however the NPPF (Chapter 9) requires plans to favour the use of sustainable transport methods.	No change recommended
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1203	Policy IN 4	Parking Provision including Electric Vehicle Charging	Object	Persimmon Homes object to the current wording of Policy IN4. IN4 to be amended and worded as such "Every new residential property should aim to provide, unless evidenced otherwise, an electrical socket suitable for charging electric vehicles.(60) An exemption would be made for residential apartments and residential care homes with communal parking areas".	Residential apartments may be able to provide charging points so need not be specifically excluded as there are a number of potential solutions that could be considered to help delivery. The onus would be on the developer in such circumstances to demonstrate why it is not achievable. Residential care homes could have staff vehicles that would benefit from charging points so this type of development should also not automatically be excluded.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1357	Policy IN 4	Parking Provision including Electric Vehicle Charging	Neutral	No comment at this time.	Noted	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 707	Policy IN 5	Airport Safety	Support	Support.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Mr Brian Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 983	Policy IN 5	Airport Safety	Object	Requesting landscape buffer to prevent coalescence of the Airport and Middleton St George.	The Airport and its surroundings are excluded from limits to development (Draft Policy H 3) which is the appropriate planning tool to prevent coalescence.	No change recommended
Doris Jones	Sadberge and Middleton St George Councillor			DBDLP 956	Policy IN 5	Airport Safety	Object	Requesting landscape buffer to prevent coalescence of the Airport and Middleton St George.	The Airport and its surroundings are excluded from limits to development (Draft Policy H 3) which is the appropriate planning tool to prevent coalescence.	No change recommended
Steve York	Sadberge and Middleton St			DBDLP 992	Policy IN 5	Airport Safety	Object	Requesting landscape buffer to prevent coalescence of the Airport and Middleton St George.	The Airport and its surroundings are excluded from limits to development (Draft Policy H 3)	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
	George Councillor								which is the appropriate planning tool to prevent coalescence.	
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1061	Policy IN 5	Airport Safety	Support	Support for safeguarding and protection zones associated with airport.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1358	Policy IN 5	Airport Safety	Neutral	No comment at this time.	Noted.	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 708	Policy IN 6	Utilities Infrastructure	Support	Support for policy.	Support noted.	No change recommended
Mrs Laura Roberts	Northumbrian Water			DBDLP 742	Policy IN 6	Utilities Infrastructure	Support	Support of Policy IN6 as drafted and will continue to work with the local authority to ensure sufficient service coverage.	Support noted and we will continue to work with Northumbrian Water throughout the plan development process.	No change recommended
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 846	Policy IN 6	Utilities Infrastructure	Neutral	Acknowledge that new utility provision will be required to serve the Skerningham area and will continue to work with utilities companies to ensure timely provision.	Approach welcomed and further detail will be incorporated in the infrastructure plan.	No change recommended
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1291	Policy IN 6	Utilities Infrastructure	Neutral	Should consider approach to location and limiting electricity peaking plants. Policy should also be broadened to reduce existing flood risk from utilities such as sewers	Northern Powergrid already has a peaking plant working as a national demonstrator in Rise Carr area since 2017. If there may be the requirement for peaking plants to be allocated via the Local Plan process we will reconsider the need for a policy approach otherwise Policy DC 3 would offer protection to amenity. The Flood risk issues from Utilities for new development is captured in DC 4 on Flood Risk and SUDS in new developments.	No change recommended

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 1359	Policy IN 6	Utilities Infrastructure	Neutral	No comment.	Noted.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1360	Policy IN 7	Telecommunication Masts	Neutral	No comment.	Noted.	No change recommended
Mr Fishdog Fisher				DBDLP 19	10.6.15	Paragraph	Object	Connection speeds in some existing developments are really poor.	Valid comment that upgrade did not happen everywhere in Darlington - and we look through different programmes for 100% superfast coverage by 2022 in Darlington BC	No change recommended
Gillan Gibson	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) - Darlington Group			DBDLP 712	Policy IN 8	Broadband Infrastructure	Support	Support for policy as drafted but question that the 50 house threshold is too high.	A minimum of 50 housing units for any Broadband Infrastructure provider makes a new installation commercially viable - below that external connection would have to be paid for by the developer.	No change recommended
Judith Murray				DBDLP 531	Policy IN 8	Broadband Infrastructure	Object	There are an existing broadband connectivity problems on Barmpton Lane and in Barmpton Village. These areas should be prioritised for improvement over providing connections for new development.	Barmpton Village and Barmpton Lane in Whinfield have been identified by the Council as targets for improvement in the BDUK / TVCA supported Phase 2 programme for Superfast Upgrade which should be operational by 2020. The entire Urban Barmpton Lane within Whinfield ward can receive Virgin Media Broadband via cable up to 350 mb/sec.	No change recommended
Joanne Harding	Home Builders Federation			DBDLP 807	Policy IN 8	Broadband Infrastructure	Object	Policy as drafted is considered to be unnecessary 'red tape'. Part R of building regulations should apply and it is not considered appropriate to have local standards. It is acknowledged that digital infrastructure is important but its delivery is not directly in the control of the development industry. The council should work proactively with telecommunications providers.	Part R is for connectivity within the home / this policy is related to connectivity to in the new Estate/ 50 homes make installation viable for the Broadband Infrastructure Providers / Households without connectivity cannot be sold in todays time. HBF and DCMS Openreach as well as MHCLG have further agreed <i><u>in 2016 to include</u></i> high speed future broadband into any new development. DCMS FUTURE TELECOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW Mar 2018. Includes guarantee full fibre connections to new build developments. The onus is now on the developer not the council. 50 new homes in Darlington is the commercially	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									feasible threshold to require Developers and Infrastructure Provider to work together. No location of this size in Darlington suggested by the Draft Local Plan is in hard to reach area to provide Superfast connectivity to Broadband.	
Amy ward	Planning Manager Barratt Homes			DBDLP 1015	Policy IN 8	Broadband Infrastructure	Object	Policy should be deleted as represents an unnecessary burden. Building regulations part R should be all that is required.	Part R is for connectivity within the home / this policy is related to connectivity to in the new Estate/ 50 homes make installation viable for the Broadband Infrastructure Providers / Households without connectivity cannot be sold in todays time. HBF and DCMS Openreach as well as MHCLG have further agreed <i>in 2016 to include</i> high speed future broadband into any new development. DCMS FUTURE TELECOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW Mar 2018. Includes guarantee full fibre connections to new build developments. The onus is now on the developer not the council. 50 new homes in Darlington is the commercially feasible threshold to require Developers and Infrastructure Provider to work together. No location of this size in Darlington suggested by the Draft Local Plan is in hard to reach area to provide Superfast connectivity to Broadband.	No change recommended
Mr Roger Fitzpatrick-Odhamier				DBDLP 997	Policy IN 8	Broadband Infrastructure	Object	Issue with existing connections around the Whinfield area should be sorted first.	Within the BDUK / TVCA programme Phase 2 Superfast speeds will be delivered via Barmpton Lane to the village of Barmpton by 2020. New developments will be now also required to provide connectivity based on Government policies.	No change recommended
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1204	Policy IN 8	Broadband Infrastructure	Object	Whilst, paragraphs 43 to 46 of the NPPF establishes that local planning authorities should seek support the expansion of electronic communications networks it does not seek to prevent development that does not have access to such networks. The house building industry is fully aware of the benefits of having their homes connected to super-fast broadband and what their customers will demand.	Part R is for connectivity within the home / this policy is related to connectivity to in the new Estate/ 50 homes make installation viable for the Broadband Infrastructure Providers / Households without connectivity cannot be sold in todays time. HBF and DCMS Openreach as well as MHCLG have further agreed <i>in 2016 to include</i> high speed future broadband into any new development. DCMS FUTURE TELECOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW Mar 2018. Includes guarantee full fibre connections to new build developments. The onus is now on the developer not the council. 50 new homes in Darlington is the commercially feasible threshold to require Developers and	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									Infrastructure Provider to work together. No location of this size in Darlington suggested by the Draft Local Plan is in hard to reach area to provide Superfast connectivity to Broadband.	
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Christopher Martin	WYG	DBDLP 1125	Policy IN 8	Broadband Infrastructure	Neutral	Policy over the top and too arduous	Part R is for connectivity within the home / this policy is related to connectivity to in the new Estate/ 50 homes make installation viable for the Broadband Infrastructure Providers / Households without connectivity cannot be sold in todays time. HBF and DCMS Openreach as well as MHCLG have further agreed <u>in 2016 to include</u> high speed future broadband into any new development. DCMS FUTURE TELECOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW Mar 2018. Includes guarantee full fibre connections to new build developments. The onus is now on the developer not the council. 50 new homes in Darlington is the commercially feasible threshold to require Developers and Infrastructure Provider to work together. No location of this size in Darlington suggested by the Draft Local Plan is in hard to reach area to provide Superfast connectivity to Broadband.	No change recommended
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd		Steven Longstaff		DBDLP 1246	Policy IN 8	Broadband Infrastructure	Object	Policy should be removed as it represents an unnecessary technical standard.	Part R is for connectivity within the home / this policy is related to connectivity to in the new Estate/ 50 homes make installation viable for the Broadband Infrastructure Providers / Households without connectivity cannot be sold in todays time. HBF and DCMS Openreach as well as MHCLG have further agreed <u>in 2016 to include</u> high speed future broadband into any new development. DCMS FUTURE TELECOMS INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW Mar 2018. Includes guarantee full fibre connections to new build developments. The onus is now on the developer not the council. 50 new homes in Darlington is the commercially feasible threshold to require Developers and Infrastructure Provider to work together. No location of this size in Darlington suggested by the Draft Local Plan is in hard to reach area to provide Superfast connectivity to Broadband.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner	DBDLP 1361	Policy IN 8	Broadband Infrastructure	Neutral	No comments.	N/A	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
			Barton Willmore							
Mr Geoffrey Crute	Councillor Neasham Parish Council			DBDLP 384	10.6.18	Paragraph	Neutral	Existing service to parts of Neasham Parish poor or none existent. Requirement should not only apply to new development but improving existing coverage.	Phase 2 of the BDUK programme by TVCA will be rolled out by 2020 and will cover solutions for existing rural areas and gaps such as Neasham. This policy is for new builds and in some places such as Hurworth might help surrounding rural areas	No change recommended
Mr Timothy Crawshaw	Built and Natural Environment Manager Darlington Borough Council / Healthy New Towns			DBDLP 703	Policy IN 9	Renewable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure	Neutral	Needs to have a criteria based approach that assess wind power potential (NP too restrictive as a criteria) Major developments over 300 should have DH integration secured at Outline stage and taking into account cumulative applications in the same area or neighbourhood. Viability testing (open book) required.	Comments noted for outline stages and the issue of viability testing required.	No change recommended
Mr Neil Westwick	Senior Director Skerningham Estates Ltd	Mr Neil Westwick	Skerningham Estates Ltd	DBDLP 847	Policy IN 9	Renewable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure	Object	Objection for major development of over 300 require looking at District heating. It should be made clear that connection to a district heating system is not a policy requirement. Alternative wording for the policy has been suggested.	Ambition for development of over 300 when numbers get economically viable to at least consider district heating and outline / demonstrate that scheme for their site is not viable or feasible. Suggested alternative text by developer does not reflect councils ambition to prove that district heating is not feasible.	No change recommended
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1206	Policy IN 9	Renewable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure	Object	Object to the inclusion of District Heating. It is noted there is no national requirement for District Heating Systems to be provided for large scale development. It does not appear that the financial implications of this requirement have been fully assessed in the anticipated viability assessment. Accordingly Persimmon Homes suggest that IN9 d is deleted or amended such that district heating shall only be promoted rather than required.	Ambition for development of over 300 when numbers get economically viable to at least consider district heating and outline / demonstrate that scheme for their site is not viable or feasible.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisa tion	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1273	Policy IN 9	Renewable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure	Neutral	District heating should be implemented through planning condition.	Comments noted in regards of planning condition but a feasibility test by the developer for District Heating should come first before any planning condition can be attached	No change recommended
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1292	Policy IN 9	Renewable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure	Neutral	Other pollutants not just carbon should be targeted. Peaking plants would benefit from a policy.	There are a number of policies in the Draft Local Plan which seek to influence the location, form and design of new development in order to minimise its impact on different forms of pollution. All new development will be required to adhere to relevant national standards on construction, materials, energy efficiency of building and water use. The Sustainability Appraisal which informed the Council's decisions on site selection also considered the potential for noise, vibration, odour and light pollution resulting from different site options, seeking to avoid locations that would be more susceptible. New development will have an impact on greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. through the use of energy and vehicle emissions) but the Draft Local Plan seeks to minimise this through its locational strategy and a number of complimentary policy requirements. The strategy looks to locate development in sustainable locations reducing the need to travel to access services, facilities and employment, maximising opportunities for people to use sustainable methods of travel, consequently reducing emissions from private vehicles. In terms of peaking plans Darlington has one of the most advanced peaking plants via battery storage by Northern Powergrid installed at its Rise Carr site since 2017. It will be mentioned in the Infrastructure Development Plan as "consumer demand led options of network development" We are not aware of any intention for locating peaking plants but we will continue to engage with Northern Powergrid in preparing an infrastructure plan.	No change recommended

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) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1321	Policy IN 9	Renewable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure	Object	It is considered there is a lack of clarity over the 'enabled' requirement for district heating. Causes concerns over deliverability of the actual heating system and viability of schemes.	Comments noted: enabled means to include the whole infrastructure system into the build (this includes the large centralised energy centre which houses renewable technologies (such as CHP engines/ biomass boilers, heat pumps) lateral pipeworks to each property which can provide higher efficiencies and better pollution control. the system of District Heating can be included in the viability options and should at least be tested by developers commercially. Public sector organisation find the District Heating option very viable and district heating networks in the Tees Valley are created.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1362	Policy IN 9	Renewable and Energy Efficient Infrastructure	Neutral	No comments.	N/A	No change recommended
Ms Julie Nixon				DBDLP 329		Community and Social Infrastructure	Object	Impact on education and emergency services of new population.	The planning authority continue to work with the Local Education Authority to forecast demand for school places. Developer Contributions will be sought from developments that are close to capacity which will be used to fund additional provision either at existing schools or on new sites where appropriate. Emergency services have been consulted as part of this consultation so are aware of the amount and locations of proposed new development over the next 20 years.	No change recommended
Mr Tim Ellis				DBDLP 85	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Object	Objection to selling leisure facilities to build more housing.	The merger of Stressholme and Blackwell Golf Clubs was necessary to retain a golf club facility in the area amid difficult financial conditions. There was no place in the market for two clubs in such close proximity so merger was beneficial. Strategic new development will include new provision for an increasing population.	No change recommended
Dave McGuire	Sport England (North East)			DBDLP 106	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Support	Support for policy as drafted.	Support noted.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Charles Johnson	Conservative Group			DBDLP 155	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Object	Infrastructure should have more emphasis.	Infrastructure is integral to the plan and when submitted as part of the evidence base will be an infrastructure delivery plan.	No change recommended
Mr Ross Chisholm	Planning Issues Contact Campaign for Real Ale Darlington Branch / Friends of Stockton and Darlington Railway			DBDLP 308	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Support	General support for Policy IN 10 as drafted but seeking clarification if 'local communities' extends to the main urban area as well as villages. Durhams policy approach to 'last pub' recommended.	Defining local communities within urban areas prove difficult to define and often subjective. Drinking establishments will continue to be considered acceptable uses in principle within the Town Centre and District/Local Centres within the main urban area. We therefore do not consider it necessary to extend this protection to the main urban area of Darlington.	No change recommended
Patricia Newton				DBDLP 498	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Object	Increased pressure on local services (including health and education) as a result of additional development.	The provision of new health facilities including GP's is an area where planning has limited influence. The local authority continues to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other partners to identify challenges facing the borough in terms of improving health and providing sufficient services for residents of the borough. The local plan looks to safeguard land in key growth zones however delivery of new facilities will be dependent on NHS/private funding. Education capacity is to be kept under review throughout the plan period. Developers will be expected to make financial contributions in areas where there is insufficient capacity and certain sites are to safeguard land to enable the delivery of new schools.	No change recommended
Paul Littleton				DBDLP 509	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Object	Increased pressure on local services and education as a result of additional development.	Education capacity is to be kept under review throughout the plan period. Developers will be expected to make financial contributions in areas where there is insufficient capacity and certain sites are to safeguard land to enable the delivery of new schools.	No change recommended
Mr Steven	Architectural Liaison Officer			DBDLP 1098	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community	Neutral	Advising that owing to our high concentrations we should consider having a policy for Childrens Care	If change of use is required for a proposal then a range of policies would apply within the plan to refuse proposals in unacceptable	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Drabik	Durham Constabulary					and Social Infrastructure		Homes and Residential Institutions. It is suggested the Durham's policy would be an appropriate approach.	locations. These policies would include: DC1 - Sustainable design Principles, DC2 - Health and Wellbeing, DC3 - Safeguarding Amenity, H8 - Housing Intensification, IN2 - Improving Access and Accessibility and IN 4 Parking Provision.	
Mr Mike Allum	Durham County Council			DBDLP 1058	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Support	Support for Policy IN 10 as drafted. It is acknowledged that there will need to be ongoing discussions between education departments where sites may be located closest to a school in the respective authorities.	Support noted and education authorities will continue to liaise with each other.	No change recommended
Paul Hunt	Persimmon Homes			DBDLP 1208	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Object	Object to the requirement for safeguarded land to be made available for alternative community uses in the event no firm plans for a school are in place by the given trigger point. Also Education should be considered on a borough wide basis.	The policy wording still allows for the land to be used for residential use should another community use not be required final triggers would be agreed on a case by case basis. Although Darlington does not operate on catchment areas there are still statutory suitable walking distances set out in DfE guidance that are applicable and that is what the criteria have been based on.	No change recommended
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Christopher Martin	WYG	DBDLP 1126	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Neutral	Content and structure of policy is considered unnecessarily complicated and would be better in an SPD to allow periodic updating.	The policy is worded as simply as possible and we have had no other comments to the contrary. in relation to review it is acknowledged the figures will change which is why the formula sets out where the information will be sourced and these figures will be updated annually either by DfE or the council respectively. The plan will require review every 5 years and it is unlikely SPD's would be reviewed much more frequently than that.	No change recommended
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1322	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Object	Methodology of developer contributions model towards education questioned. Further explanation as to the inputs requested.	The calculation set out in the policy is in line with a recent DfE consultation on developer contributions for education. https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/supporting-housing-delivery-through-developer-contributions	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>The figures used in the calculation reflect the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pupil yield factor generated by the development (TVC projections), • Available capacity/deficit of places at the relevant school (Provided in the LEA annual school placement plan), and • DfE place generation figure (nationally agreed figure for new education provision). <p>This calculation is much more straightforward than the process previously involved in the Councils Planning Obligations SPD (which it would replace) and enables figures to adjust for changes in capacities and costs.</p>	
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1363	Policy IN 10	Supporting the Delivery of Community and Social Infrastructure	Neutral	No comment at this time.	N/A	No change recommended
ms yvonne richardson				DBDLP 22	10.7.19	Paragraph	Object	Concerns regarding the loss of the community and heritage value of the library in Crown Street. Commented that the Council's decision to close the library should be reversed.	It has been announced that the library will remain at Crown Street. Further details can be found in the Cabinet report dated 11 September 2018.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 899	11	MONITORING	Support	AMR and Local Plan indicator monitoring supported and monitoring of some crucial policies is recommended and HE should be consulted	Support noted	No change recommended
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1091	11	MONITORING	Neutral	<p>Comments noted and importance to effectiveness of the plan.</p> <p>There is no policy mechanism included within the Plan to ensure that any potential housing shortfall will be addressed as quickly as possible a suggestion has been given.</p>	The AMR will identify pressure on the plan delivery and will indicate how successful policies are being. Pressures such as those mentioned in NW Leicestershire are unlikely to be encountered in Darlington.	No change recommended

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) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1323	11	MONITORING	Object	<p>Identified significant concerns with the means of monitoring 5 year housing land supply within these representations, and objected to the measure being against the 422 minimum requirement figure.</p> <p>The 5 year supply review mechanism must to enshrined in future policy and be consistent with the plan objective</p>	Monitoring of those issues and others will be provide in the Submission Draft	No change recommended
Irene Ord	Listed Property Owner			DBDLP 865	11.0.1	Paragraph	Neutral	Local List of Historic Asset are the records being scrutinised before submission and who conducts the impact assessment. Balance of historic and environmental assets and development need to be ensured at Planning Committee.	Comments noted: DBC Conservation Officer and Historic England will update the asset list and will assess and scrutinise subsequent impact assessment.	No change recommended
Amy Ward	Planning Manager Barratt Homes			DBDLP 1006	APPENDIX A	HOUSING TRAJECTORY	Object	<p>Comments and concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council to review commitments to ensure still deliverable, whether there is a house builder on board and whether there are any constraints preventing development coming forward. Apply 20% lapse rate to existing commitments. Sites with no permission or outline permission must be supported by clear evidence that housing completions will being on site within 5 years. Increase housing requirement to account for this and provide further flexibility in the Plan. Review proposed delivery of site allocations as set out in the housing trajectory 	<p>Comments noted.</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. In view of this it has not been considered necessary to apply a 20% lapse rate to commitments.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to have a number of the proposed allocations within the five year supply as there is clear evidence to support that these sites will be delivered within the five year period. A Court of Appeal decision confirmed that planning permission is not required for a site to be realistically deliverable over the next five years and sites which are allocated in an emerging local plan can be suitable for inclusion in the supply figures. The likelihood that an authority will grant some planning</p>	No change recommended.

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"> • Push all sites without planning permission outside of 5YLS. • Ensure potential allocations deliverable in light of policy obligations in Local Plan. • Allocate more sites to come forward in 5 years or justify potential allocations will deliver in 5 years. • Amend the trajectory to reflect an average build out rate of 35 houses per annum. • Apply a 20% buffer to the overall housing requirement 	<p>permissions during the period was acknowledged in this decision.</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. There is also sufficient land to deliver an additional 5,700 (approx) dwellings beyond the plan period, post 2036. A contribution 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>The housing trajectory has an average build out rate of 30 dwellings per annum on most sites. This has been increased where there is known to be more than one builder developing a site or more than one builder with an interest in a site.</p>	
Frances Nicholson	Bellway Homes Limited (Durham)			DBDLP 1171	APPENDIX A	HOUSING TRAJECTORY	Object	Site 392 'Elm Tree Farm' is capable of being delivered in the short term as outlined on the housing trajectory. It should be recognised that 'indicative site yields' are not upper limits and a flexible approach should be allowed due to the 'historic low supply of housing delivery in the Borough'.	Comments noted. Policy H 2 Housing Allocations states that yields identified are for indicative purposes only and the final number of homes to be delivered on site will be determined by the planning application process. Paragraph 6.2.1 also confirms that housing trajectory is an estimate and does not place phasing restrictions on sites.	No change recommended.
Nick McLellan	Story Homes	Alastair Willis	Technical Director (Planning) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1412	APPENDIX A	HOUSING TRAJECTORY	Object	Concerns raised with the assumed delivery rate for Faverdale and doubts that the site will deliver 810 homes by 2036. No evidence of an application becoming forthcoming, no known developer commitment and significant infrastructure requirements for the scheme. Multiple outlets rarely results in a simple doubling of outputs. The plan places too much reliance on the delivery of large strategic sites to achieve housing numbers.	The Council has been and is continuing to engage with the main landowner and developer at Faverdale, in order to identify all of the constraints and opportunities involved, and to prepare a masterplan for the area. A substantial amount of work has been undertaken by the landowner on the site, including but not limited to a masterplan framework, heritage assessment, archaeology assessment, ecology surveys and report, flood risk assessment, landscape assessment, highways assessment and utilities assessment. A visioning document and delivery strategy have also been prepared to support the masterplan. A pre-application enquiry has also been submitted to the Council and discussions	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>are ongoing. Evidence on the anticipated delivery rates of the site has been obtained from developers and it is expected that there will be multiple house builders on the site. Despite this, delivery for this site over the plan period has been reduced for the next stage of plan preparation given latest information. It is considered that the estimated delivery in the trajectory is appropriate, allowing for suitable lead in times.</p> <p>A range of sites are proposed for allocation to meet housing needs. Paragraph 72 of the NPPF (2019) also supports the Council's approach in allocating large urban extensions as it states, "The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities." Allocating large strategic sites rather than a number of smaller sites also ensures that the area is planned as a single cohesive sustainable development fully supported by the necessary infrastructure.</p>	
Miss Jennifer Earnshaw	Project Secretary Banks Property			DBDLP 1410	APPENDIX A	HOUSING TRAJECTORY	Object	<p>Skerningham Strategic Allocation can deliver housing completions within the next five years. There are early phases of development that can provide enabling infrastructure without prejudicing the wider masterplanning of the area. Banks Property request that land to the East of Beaumont Hill is included as its own site as per our comments on Policy H2 with housing completions programmed from 2021 at a rate of 30 per annum rising to 50 per annum from 2024.</p> <p>Site proposed at School Aycliffe for allocation</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Banks Property are committed to bringing forward a development which complies with policy H 10 and the Skerningham Masterplan Framework. It is however not considered appropriate to create a stand alone housing proposal with its own red line boundary for the site proposed as Banks Property have been involved in the masterplanning process from the start and the land is critical to the delivery of the wider masterplan area with regards to highway infrastructure. A separate site could also lead to the fragmentation of the masterplan area and the strategic allocation. There is nothing to prevent distinct parts of the site coming forward in advance of others provided that they adhere with the masterplan and deliver the necessary</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								Site 95 Beech Crescent East - site yield should be increased to 30 dwellings and delivery to begin in 2020.	<p>infrastructure to support development as set out in Policy H10.</p> <p>The Elm Tree Farm site is different in that the landowners/developers have not been involved in the masterplanning process and the site is subject to a current planning application. Although it has been emphasised with the landowners/developers that any application at Elm Tree Farm would have to be well integrated with the masterplan area and accord with the principles set out in Policy H 10.</p> <p>Please see officer response to policy H 2 ref DBDLP870 on alternative site proposed.</p> <p>It is considered that the yield for site 95 Beech Crescent East, Heighington is appropriate. The yield is lower than the standard density multiplier in the HELAA due to site constraints - site shape and location adjacent to the bypass. No evidence has been submitted to justify the higher yield other than referring to the adjacent site which has a different context. Reference has been made to a higher figure in the HELAA however this was a drafting error. It is not considered appropriate to estimate delivery starting on this site from 2020 as planning permission is still required. It is important to note that the site yields are indicative and will be finalised at the planning application stage. The housing trajectory does not place any phasing restrictions on the sites and they may come forward sooner than indicated.</p>	
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 901		Site 3 - South of Burtree Lane	Object	Site of possible concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A1 at Junctions 58 and 59 and the A66 at Little Burdon.	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.	No change recommended
Amy ward	Planning Manager			DBDLP 1012		Site 3 - South of Burtree Lane	Support	Supported for the proposed allocation is reiterated on the following grounds:	Support is noted for the promoted site and additional detailed consideration and assessment	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
	Barratt Homes							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability No heritage impacts Not within a flood zone Not Subject to other environmental designations No indication from initial surveys of protected species. No adverse impact on highways. 	will take place throughout the planning process.	
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 902		Site 8 - Berrymead Farm	Object	Site of possible concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A1 at Junctions 58 and 59 and the A66 at Little Burdon.	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.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 903		Site 20 - Great Burdon	Object	Site of concern to Highways England owing to the significant number of dwellings located within close proximity to the A66.	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.	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 1390		Site 20 - Great Burdon	Object	<p>Darlington Friends of the Earth object to the allocation of Great Burdon. Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in traffic congestion and degradation of air quality. 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 	<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>Impacts of air pollution have been considered via the sustainability appraisal process. There are a number of planning policies in the Draft Local Plan which aim to prevent new development from contributing to unacceptable levels of air pollution. For example 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 efficient thereby reducing carbon emissions. The locational strategy of Draft Local Plan also</p>	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								Modelling justifies the housing allocation.	<p>looks to locate development in sustainable locations reducing the need to travel to access services, facilities and employment, maximising opportunities for people to use sustainable methods of travel, consequently reducing emissions from private vehicles.</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). The statement for the site within Appendix B also sets out that a part of the site is within flood zone 2 and 3 and that development should be directed away from this area.</p> <p>The statement for the site in Appendix B sets out that the Skerne corridor along the western boundary should be protected and enhanced including significant new green infrastructure provision. 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>	
Marion Williams	Environment Agency			DBDLP 1293		Site 20 - Great Burdon	Neutral	The Environment Agency are keen to work with developers on the Great Burdon site on enhancement of the River Skerne to achieve Water Framework Directive objectives.	Collaborative approach to working noted and welcomed.	No change recommended
Bellway Homes Ltd		Rachel Gillen	Senior Planner Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1364		Site 20 - Great Burdon	Support	<p>Supported for the proposed allocation is reiterated on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to the site and existing transport infrastructure is good. Aiming to provide net gains for nature conservation. The development would be designed to respond to the site and surrounding landscape. 	Support is noted for the promoted site and additional detailed consideration and assessment will take place throughout the planning process.	No change recommended

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"> Flood risk can be mitigated and will integrate SUDS. Existing archaeological assessment indicates a low potential for archaeological finds. Noise (mainly from the A66) could be mitigated. 		
Hallworth				DBDLP 493		Site 41 - South Coniscliffe Park	Object	<p>As part of combined objection to Sites 100, 249 and 41.</p> <p>Objection is raised on the grounds of impact on services including sport, health and education.</p> <p>Impact on highways congestion particularly around Cockerton are also of concern.</p>	<p>A number of sites within the area including West Park and North Coniscliffe Park will reserve land to enable the future provision of education facilities. Additional sports provision is also part of the West Park Garden Village Masterplan. Funding will be sought via developer contributions.</p> <p>The provision of new health facilities including GP's is an area where planning has limited influence. The local authority continues to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other partners to identify challenges facing the borough in terms of improving health and providing sufficient services for residents of the borough. The local plan looks to safeguard land in key growth zones however delivery of new facilities will be dependent on NHS/private funding.</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>	No change recommended
Mrs C Everington				DBDLP 563		Site 41 - South Coniscliffe Park	Object	<p>Objection raised on the grounds of loss of green space.</p>	<p>There are a number of brownfield sites proposed for allocation in the Draft Local Plan and the Council is supportive of development on brownfield land. The Local Plan does however have to be deliverable and if there are doubts that a site will come forward over the plan period it should not be included or relied upon in the plan to meet housing needs. Brownfield sites can be more difficult and costly to develop as such their deliverability is</p>	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									sometimes questionable. Local Plan's which have relied on these sites in the past have failed as the sites have not come forward for development. As such there is not an over reliance on these sites in the Draft Local Plan and for these reasons the town centre fringe regeneration area has not been included in the proposed allocations. This is not to say that the Council would not be supportive of this area coming forward for development or any other brownfield site providing it is a suitable location for housing development.	
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 904		Site 41 - South Coniscliffe Park	Object	Site of concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A1 at Junctions 58 and 59 and the A66 at Blands Corner.	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.	No change recommended
Mr David Phillips	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 1389		Site 41 - South Coniscliffe Park	Object	<p>Objection to Coniscliffe Park. 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 Baydale Beck. • It is not clear that the Highways Authority Traffic Modelling justifies the housing allocation or the provision of new roads. 	<p>The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection has been 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>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>Impacts of air pollution have been considered via the sustainability appraisal process. There are a number of planning policies in the Draft Local Plan which aim to prevent new development from contributing to unacceptable levels of air pollution. For example DC 1 (Sustainable Design Principles) requires developments to demonstrate that the layout,</p>	No changes recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>orientation and design of buildings helps to reduce the need for energy consumption and how buildings have been made energy efficient thereby reducing carbon emissions. The locational strategy of Draft Local Plan also looks to locate development in sustainable locations reducing the need to travel to access services, facilities and employment, maximising opportunities for people to use sustainable methods of travel, consequently reducing emissions from private vehicles.</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). The statement for the site within Appendix B also sets out that a small part of the site is within flood zone 2 and 3 and that development should be directed away from this area.</p> <p>The statement for the site in Appendix B sets out that Baydale Beck and wildlife friendly open space runs along the eastern boundary of the site and this part of the green infrastructure network should be protected and enhanced. 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>	
Mr Ken Maddison				DBDLP 1405		Site 41 - South Coniscliffe Park	Object	<p>Objection raised to Coniscliffe Park development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other areas should be fully developed before new areas are considered, particularly brownfield land. The site on Whessoe road is mentioned as an example of a site that should be brought forward for development before greenfield sites. Proximity to Water Treatment Works and Chlorine store. 	<p>There are a number of brownfield sites proposed for allocation in the Draft Local Plan and the Council is supportive of development on brownfield land. The Local Plan does however have to be deliverable and if there are doubts that a site will come forward over the plan period it should not be included or relied upon in the plan to meet housing needs. Brownfield sites can be more difficult and costly to develop as such their deliverability is sometimes questionable. Local Plan's which have relied on these sites in the past have failed as the sites have not come forward for development. As such there is not an over reliance on these sites in the Draft Local Plan and for these reasons the town centre fringe</p>	No change recommended

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"> Impact on traffic congestion particularly around Cockerton and the Woodland Road roundabouts. Flooding concerns from Baydale Beck. Presence of strategic water mains. Impact on ecology particularly on open farmland and Merrybent Community Woodland. 	<p>regeneration area has not been included in the proposed allocations. This is not to say that the Council would not be supportive of this area coming forward for development or any other brownfield site providing it is a suitable location for housing development.</p> <p>Constraints around the proximity to the Waste Water Treatment Works, mains sewers and flood risk are known and will have to be adequately mitigated within the design of the scheme in due course.</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>The sites proposed in the local plan have been selected to minimise impacts on biodiversity. For more information on the assessment of the biodiversity of sites see the relevant site assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal. Where necessary, appropriate mitigation will be required. Prior to granting planning permission further assessment work would be required to establish the likely presence of protected species. The presence of protected species would require developers to obtain a licence before development could commence. Developers would also have to submit a Phase II Habitat Survey with any planning application for development. The Phase II Survey aims to establish the size of populations of the protected species, to maintain conservation status and ensure that no statutory offence is committed during site development. National policy also requires development to demonstrate net gains to biodiversity.</p> <p>Merrybent Community Woodland has been proposed as a Local Green Space within the Local Plan and therefore offered greater protection.</p>	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Hallworth				DBDLP 491		Site 100 - Hall Farm, Branksome	Object	<p>As part of combined objection to Sites 100, 249 and 41.</p> <p>Objection is raised on the grounds of impact on services including sport, health and education.</p> <p>Impact on highways congestion particularly around Cockerton are also of concern.</p>	<p>A number of sites within the area including West Park and North Coniscliffe Park will reserve land to enable the future provision of education facilities. Additional sports provision is also part of the West Park Garden Village Masterplan. Funding will be sought via developer contributions.</p> <p>The provision of new heath facilities including GP's is an area where planning has limited influence. The local authority continues to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other partners to identify challenges facing the borough in terms of improving health and providing sufficient services for residents of the borough. The local plan looks to safeguard land in key growth zones however delivery of new facilities will be dependent on NHS/private funding.</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>	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 905		Site 100 - Hall Farm, Branksome	Object	Site of possible concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A1(M) at Junction 58.	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.	No change recommended
	Church Commissioners for England (CCE)	Ms Lucie Jowett	Barton Willmore	DBDLP 1162		Site 100 - Hall Farm, Branksome	Support	<p>Supported for the proposed allocation is reiterated on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is located in a sustainable location near to a number of existing local facilities and services. Close proximity to existing public transport and offers the opportunity for further improvement. 	Support is noted for the promoted site and additional detailed consideration and assessment will take place throughout the planning process.	No change recommended

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"> • Opportunities to promote sustainable linkages to footpaths, cycleways and the PROW network. • The agricultural land is considered to be of low ecological value. • The majority of the site is not at risk of flooding. • No heritage assets within the boundary although there are some assets within the wider vicinity. • Some existing utilities infrastructure including overhead power lines may need further consideration. <p>An indicative masterplan has been submitted to support the proposed application.</p>		
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 907		Site 243 - Snipe Lane, Hurworth Moor	Object	Site of concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A66/A67/A167.	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.	No change recommended
N/A Darlington Farmers Auction Mart N/A		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1371		Site 243 - Snipe Lane, Hurworth Moor	Support	<p>DFAM supports the Draft Local Plan and strongly supports Policy H2 – Housing Allocation, Site ref. 243 – Snipe Lane, Hurworth Moor. The proposed allocation includes 21.94 hectares of land in DFAM's control (Appendix 1). However, DFAM have further land to the south of the A66 which would also be suitable for development.</p> <p>The site is a sustainable location for development and will provide many benefits:</p>	Support noted. With regards to the alternative sites proposed please see officer response to policy H 2 ref DBDLP1127.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisa tion	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
								<p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">House building will boost the local economy and help to attract business.Boost support for local services.House building results in job creation and training opportunities.Expenditure associated with moving house.New homes bonus payments. <p>Social</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The site is well located and in close proximity to a wide range of shops, essential services and leisure facilities.House building will sustain the existing community.Provide a mix of housing stock to meet needs. <p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The site is in accessible and sustainable location close to public transport services.Surveys undertaken with regard to the biodiversity, ground conditions and service water drainage so impacts can be mitigated.Modern, sustainable construction will be adhered to.		

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) Stephenson Halliday	DBDLP 1311		Site 243 - Snipe Lane, Hurworth Moor	Object	Part of wider response logged against Policy H 2. Issues raised with suggested delivery rate and yield being too ambitious on site 243 Snipe Lane, Hurworth Moor. Overall numbers are high and the start date seems ambitious with no application being imminent. Density proposed also seems too high.	The site is in Council ownership and delivery is to be pursued quickly on the site. There will be more than one house builder on site, the Council being one, therefore higher rates of delivery are justified. The site yield and potential start for delivery has been adjust for the Proposed Submission Draft of the Local Plan to reflect latest information. The yield has been reduced and delivery estimated to commence later in the plan period.	No change recommended.
Mr Anthony Scarre				DBDLP 33		Site 249 - Coniscliffe Park, North	Object	Objection raised on the grounds that development of the site would change the semi rural character of the area. It is also used as an area for leisure activities by a large number of local residents including walking, cycling and running. Wildlife habitats will also be lost.	<p>It is acknowledged that development will result in a loss agricultural land and that the character of the area will be altered. In order to fulfil the council's housing requirement this has inevitably required the allocation of green field sites for development. There are a number of brownfield sites proposed for allocation in the Draft Local Plan and the Council is supportive of development on brownfield land. The Local Plan does however have to be deliverable and if there are doubts that a site will come forward over the plan period it should not be included or relied upon in the plan to meet housing needs. Brownfield sites can be more difficult and costly to develop, as such their deliverability is sometimes questionable. Local Plan's which have relied on these sites in the past have failed as the sites have not come forward for development. Therefore there is not an over reliance on these sites in the Draft Local Plan and for these reasons the Town Centre Fringe regeneration area has not been included in the proposed allocations. This is not to say that the Council would not be supportive of this area coming forward for development or any other brownfield site providing it is a suitable location for housing development.</p> <p>The sites proposed in the local plan have been selected to minimise landscape impacts and are typically constrained by existing features such as roads and rivers. For more information on the assessment of landscape consideration of sites see the relevant site assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal. Where necessary, appropriate landscape mitigation will be</p>	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									required. Impact on landscape character will be assessed further through the planning application process and will need to take into account the Darlington Landscape Character Assessment.	
Hallworth				DBDLP 492		Site 249 - Coniscliffe Park, North	Object	<p>As part of combined objection to Sites 100, 249 and 41.</p> <p>Objection is raised on the grounds of impact on services including sport, health and education.</p> <p>Impact on highways congestion particularly around Cockerton are also of concern.</p>	<p>A number of sites within the area including West Park and North Coniscliffe Park will reserve land to enable the future provision of education facilities. Additional sports provision is also part of the West Park Garden Village Masterplan. Funding will be sought via developer contributions.</p> <p>The provision of new health facilities including GP's is an area where planning has limited influence. The local authority continues to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and other partners to identify challenges facing the borough in terms of improving health and providing sufficient services for residents of the borough. The local plan looks to safeguard land in key growth zones however delivery of new facilities will be dependent on NHS/private funding.</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>	No change recommended
Mrs C Everington				DBDLP 564		Site 249 - Coniscliffe Park, North	Object	Coniscliffe Park and Skerningham would result in loss of greenfield.	<p>It is acknowledged that development will result in a loss agricultural land and that the character of the area will be altered. In order to fulfil the council's housing requirement this has inevitably required the allocation of green field sites for development. There are a number of brownfield sites proposed for allocation in the Draft Local Plan and the Council is supportive of development on brownfield land. The Local Plan does however have to be deliverable and if there are doubts that a site will come forward over the plan period it should not be included or relied upon in the plan to meet housing needs. Brownfield sites can be more difficult and costly to develop as such their deliverability is sometimes questionable. Local Plan's which</p>	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									have relied on these sites in the past have failed as the sites have not come forward for development. As such there is not an over reliance on these sites in the Draft Local Plan and for these reasons the town centre fringe regeneration area has not been included in the proposed allocations. This is not to say that the Council would not be supportive of this area coming forward for development or any other brownfield site providing it is a suitable location for housing development.	
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 908		Site 249 - Coniscliffe Park, North	Object	Site of concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A1(M) at Junctions 58 and the A66.	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.	No change recommended
Mr John Fleming	Gladman Developments			DBDLP 1092		Site 249 - Coniscliffe Park, North	Support	<p>Supported for the proposed allocation is reiterated on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site will offer a range of services including land for a school, sports pitches, open space and local convenience retail. Deliver a local distributor road between Staindrop Road and Consiccliffe Road. <p>Documents submitted with the planning applications demonstrate how this proposal would represent sustainable development and that the site is available, suitable and deliverable. There are no technical constraints which would preclude its delivery.</p>	Support is noted for the promoted site and additional detailed consideration and assessment will take place throughout the planning process.	No change recommended
Mr David	Darlington Friends of the Earth			DBDLP 1388		Site 249 - Coniscliffe Park, North	Object	Objection to Coniscliffe Park. Concerns raised.	The Draft Local Plan has proposed allocations which the Council considers to be the most suitable and sustainable for housing development over the plan period. Site selection	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Phillips								<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 Baydale Beck. • It is not clear that the Highways Authority Traffic Modelling justifies the housing allocation or the provision of new roads. 	<p>has been 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>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>Impacts of air pollution have been considered via the sustainability appraisal process. There are a number of planning policies in the Draft Local Plan which aim to prevent new development from contributing to unacceptable levels of air pollution. For example 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 efficient thereby reducing carbon emissions. The locational strategy of Draft Local Plan also looks to locate development in sustainable locations reducing the need to travel to access services, facilities and employment, maximising opportunities for people to use sustainable methods of travel, consequently reducing emissions from private vehicles.</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). The statement for the site within Appendix B also sets out that a small part of the site is within flood zone 2 and 3 and that development should be directed away from this area.</p> <p>The statement for the site in Appendix B sets out that Baydale Beck and wildlife friendly</p>	

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									open space runs along the eastern boundary of the site and this part of the green infrastructure network should be protected and enhanced. 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.	
Mr Ken Maddison				DBDLP 1366		Site 249 - Coniscliffe Park, North	Object	<p>Objection raised to Coniscliffe Park development on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other areas should be fully developed before new areas are considered, particularly brownfield land. The site on Whessoe road is mentioned as an example of a site that should be brought forward for development before greenfield sites. Proximity to Water Treatment Works and Chlorine store. Impact on traffic congestion particularly around Cockerton and the Woodland Road roundabouts. Flooding concerns from Baydale Beck. Presence of strategic water mains. Impact on ecology particularly on open farmland and Merrybent Community Woodland. 	<p>It is acknowledged that development will result in a loss agricultural land and that the character of the area will be altered. In order to fulfil the council's housing requirement this has inevitably required the allocation of green field sites for development. There are a number of brownfield sites proposed for allocation in the Draft Local Plan and the Council is supportive of development on brownfield land. The Local Plan does however have to be deliverable and if there are doubts that a site will come forward over the plan period it should not be included or relied upon in the plan to meet housing needs. Brownfield sites can be more difficult and costly to develop as such their deliverability is sometimes questionable. Local Plan's which have relied on these sites in the past have failed as the sites have not come forward for development. As such there is not an over reliance on these sites in the Draft Local Plan and for these reasons the town centre fringe regeneration area has not been included in the proposed allocations. This is not to say that the Council would not be supportive of this area coming forward for development or any other brownfield site providing it is a suitable location for housing development.</p> <p>Constraints around the proximity to the Waste Water Treatment Works, mains sewers and flood risk are known and will have to be adequately mitigated within the design of the scheme in due course.</p> <p>Transport modelling work is ongoing to test highway mitigation schemes to ensure</p>	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>developments do not have an unacceptable impact on local and strategic highway network.</p> <p>The sites proposed in the local plan have been selected to minimise impacts on biodiversity. For more information on the assessment of the biodiversity of sites see the relevant site assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal. Where necessary, appropriate mitigation will be required. Prior to granting planning permission further assessment work would be required to establish the likely presence of protected species. The presence of protected species would require developers to obtain a licence before development could commence. Developers would also have to submit a Phase II Habitat Survey with any planning application for development. The Phase II Survey aims to establish the size of populations of the protected species, to maintain conservation status and ensure that no statutory offence is committed during site development. National policy also requires development to demonstrate net gains to biodiversity.</p> <p>Merrybent Community Woodland has been proposed as a Local Green Space within the Local Plan and therefore offered greater protection.</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). The statement for the site within Appendix B also sets out that a small part of the site is within flood zone 2 and 3 and that development should be directed away from this area.</p>	
Mr Ken Maddison				DBDLP 1368		Site 249 - Coniscliffe Park, North	Object	<p>Copy of previous objection to application 17/00636/OUT submitted.</p> <p>Primarily objecting to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> loss of greenfield 	<p>It is acknowledged that development will result in a loss agricultural land and that the character of the area will be altered. In order to fulfil the council's housing requirement this has inevitably required the allocation of green field sites for development. There are a number of brownfield sites proposed for allocation in the</p>	No change recommended

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"> lack of need conflict with existing policies 	<p>Draft Local Plan and the Council is supportive of development on brownfield land. The Local Plan does however have to be deliverable and if there are doubts that a site will come forward over the plan period it should not be included or relied upon in the plan to meet housing needs. Brownfield sites can be more difficult and costly to develop as such their deliverability is sometimes questionable. Local Plan's which have relied on these sites in the past have failed as the sites have not come forward for development. As such there is not an over reliance on these sites in the Draft Local Plan and for these reasons the town centre fringe regeneration area has not been included in the proposed allocations. This is not to say that the Council would not be supportive of this area coming forward for development or any other brownfield site providing it is a suitable location for housing development.</p> <p>Please see officer response on housing requirement and standard method.</p> <p>Policies in existing and saved plans would be replaced by the local plan when adopted.</p>	
Mr M Gardner				DBDLP 190		Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm	Object	<p>Objection is raised on the grounds of increased traffic, particularly on Sparrowhall Drive and Winbush Way. This additional traffic could also have safety implications for pedestrians crossing and already busy road. An increase in traffic will also lead to an increase in pollution.</p> <p>Town Centre and brownfield sites would be preferable to greenfield sites.</p> <p>Loss of green space would result in negative impacts on mental and physical health as well as ecology.</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>There are a number of brownfield sites proposed for allocation in the Draft Local Plan and the Council is supportive of development on brownfield land. The Local Plan does however have to be deliverable and if there are doubts that a site will come forward over the plan period it should not be included or relied upon in the plan to meet housing needs. Brownfield sites can be more difficult and costly to develop as such their deliverability is sometimes questionable. Local Plan's which have relied on these sites in the past have failed as the sites have not come forward for development. As such there is not an over</p>	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>reliance on these sites in the Draft Local Plan and for these reasons the town centre fringe regeneration area has not been included in the proposed allocations. This is not to say that the Council would not be supportive of this area coming forward for development or any other brownfield site providing it is a suitable location for housing development.</p> <p>The sites proposed in the local plan have been selected to minimise impacts on biodiversity. For more information on the assessment of the biodiversity of sites see the relevant site assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal. Where necessary, appropriate mitigation will be required. Prior to granting planning permission further assessment work would be required to establish the likely presence of protected species. The presence of protected species would require developers to obtain a licence before development could commence. Developers would also have to submit a Phase II Habitat Survey with any planning application for development. The Phase II Survey aims to establish the size of populations of the protected species, to maintain conservation status and ensure that no statutory offence is committed during site development. National policy also requires development to demonstrate net gains to biodiversity.</p>	
Mrs Anne Bland				DBDLP 553		Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm	Object	Objection raised on the grounds of loss of green space and unnecessary urban sprawl. Loss of green space for recreation and ecology in the Whinfield area is of concern.	<p>Please see officer response paper for further detail on loss of green space, urban sprawl and detail on the wider Skerningham area.</p> <p>The sites proposed in the local plan have been selected to minimise impacts on biodiversity. For more information on the assessment of the biodiversity of sites see the relevant site assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal. Where necessary, appropriate mitigation will be required. Prior to granting planning permission further assessment work would be required to establish the likely presence of protected species. The presence of protected species would require developers to obtain a licence before development could commence.</p>	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									<p>Developers would also have to submit a Phase II Habitat Survey with any planning application for development. The Phase II Survey aims to establish the size of populations of the protected species, to maintain conservation status and ensure that no statutory offence is committed during site development. National policy also requires development to demonstrate net gains to biodiversity.</p> <p>The Bellway application referred to has been formally submitted for consideration and will be determined on its merits.</p>	
Mrs Anne Bland				DBDLP 555		Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm	Object	Objection to loss of green Sparrow Hall Drive. Area is of visual amenity as well as offering local recreation space.	<p>Loss of open space is considered as part of the site assessment process in the Sustainability Appraisal. Sites resulting in a loss are scored negatively however where opportunities for re-provision or mitigation exists this is also factored in.</p> <p>Elm Tree Farm forms part of the wider Skerningham Masterplan Area so opportunities exist for wider enhancements. See also Skerningham Officer Response Paper.</p>	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 910		Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm	Object	Site of possible concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A1(M) at Junction 59 and the A66.	<p>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.</p>	No change recommended
Frances Nicholson	Bellway Homes Limited (Durham)			DBDLP 1163		Site 392 - Elm Tree Farm	Support	Supported for the proposed allocation however request minor changes to the overall housing policy elsewhere in the representation (Comment DBDLP1172).	Support is noted for the promoted site and additional detailed consideration and assessment will take place throughout the planning process.	No change recommended
Gerald Lee	Heighington and Coniscliffe Councillor			DBDLP 267		Site 11 - Cattle Mart	Neutral	Clarification as to if this is the existing or proposed Cattle Mart site.	Officers have already confirmed this is the existing Darlington Farmers Market located on Clifton Road.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 913		Site 11 - Cattle Mart	Neutral	Site of no concern to Highways England.	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.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 914		Site 51 - Mowden Hall	Neutral	Site of no concern to Highways England.	The site now has planning permission. Highways and traffic will have been considered through the application process.	No change recommended
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1119		Site 51 - Mowden Hall	Object	Potential harm to Grade II listed Mowden Hall 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 site now has planning permission. Impacts on heritage assets will have been considered through the application process.	No change recommended.
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 915		Site 59 - Rear of Cockerton Club	Neutral	Site of no concern to Highways England.	The site now has planning permission. Highways and traffic will have been considered through the application process.	No change recommended
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1133		Site 59 - Rear of Cockerton Club	Object	Potential harm to adjacent Grade II listed heritage assets and Cockerton Village 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 mitigation measures to minimise harm.	The site now has planning permission. The impact on heritage assets will have been considered through the application process.	No change recommended.
Miss Madeleine Sutcliffe				DBDLP 388		Site 228 - Northgate House, Town Centre	Neutral	Northgate House should be demolished and replaced, not converted.	There are limited planning powers to insist on demolition of buildings unless they are structurally unsound or form part of wider regeneration schemes. Conversions are often encouraged by national policy.	No change recommended
Mr	Highways England			DBDLP 916		Site 228 - Northgate	Neutral	Site of no concern to Highways England.	The site has prior approval for conversion to residential use.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Christopher Bell						House, Town Centre				
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1134		Site 228 - Northgate House, Town Centre	Object	Potential harm to Northgate and Town Centre Conservation Area's 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.	Prior approval has been granted for the site for conversion to residential use.	No change recommended.
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 917		Site 244 - Lingfield Point East	Object	Site of concern to Highways England owing to the proximity to the A66. Trip generation rates and the scale of impact requires further clarification.	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.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 918		Site 318 - N. Allington Way	Object	Site of possible concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A66.	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.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 919		Site 89 - Land West of Oak Tree, MSG	Object	Site of possible concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A66/A67.	The site now has planning permission. Highways and traffic will have been considered through the application process.	No change recommended
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1136		Site 89 - Land West of Oak Tree, MSG	Object	Potential harm to Grade II listed Middleton Hall and S&DR HAZ 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 site now has planning permission. The impact on heritage assets will have been considered through the application process.	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 920		Site 91 - Walworth Road, Heighington	Object	Site of possible concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A1(M) at Junctions 58 and 59.	The site now has planning permission. Highways and traffic will have been considered through the application process.	No change recommended
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1138		Site 91 - Walworth Road, Heighington	Object	Potential harm to Heighington Conservation Area and it's various heritage assets 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 site now has planning permission. Heritage assets will have been considered through the application process	No change recommended.
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 921		Site 95 - Beech Crescent East, Heighington	Neutral	Site of possible concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A1(M) at Junctions 58 and 59 and the A66 at Little Burdon.	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.	No change recommended
Mr G Raistrick		Mr Joe Ridgeon		DBDLP 1247		Site 95 - Beech Crescent East, Heighington	Object	Heighcroft House would be a preferable site to Beech Crescent east as it is considered to have less heritage impact.	Support is noted for the promoted site. Please see officer response to policy H 2 and promoted site (ref DBDLP1245)	No change recommended.
Miss Jennifer Earnshaw	Project Secretary Banks Property			DBDLP 1407		Site 95 - Beech Crescent East, Heighington	Neutral	<p>Increase the yield for site 95 from 20 to 30 to show a more appropriate level of density as suggested in the latest HELAA and to reflect the density of the adjacent development.</p> <p>Reference in statement from where vehicular access should be taken should be removed as detailed assessment needed.</p>	It is considered that the yield for site 95 Beech Crescent East, Heighington is appropriate. The yield is lower than the standard density multiplier in the HELAA due to site constraints - site shape and location adjacent to the bypass. No evidence has been submitted to justify the higher yield other than referring to the adjacent site which has a different context. Reference has been made to a higher figure in the HELAA however this was a drafting error. It is not considered appropriate to estimate delivery starting on this site from 2020 as planning permission is still required. It is important to note that the site yields are indicative and will be finalised at the planning application stage. The housing trajectory does not place any	No change recommended.

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
									phasing restrictions on the sites and they may come forward sooner than indicated. Vehicular access statement in point a) remains on basis of Highways advice	
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 922		Site 99 - Maxgate Farm, MSG	Object	Site of possible concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A66/A67.	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.	No change recommended
Nick McLellan	Story Homes			DBDLP 1043		Site 99 - Maxgate Farm, MSG	Neutral	Propose to amend proposals for site to omit the school and continue to liaise with the council and other stakeholders.	Comments noted.	No change recommended.
Nick McLellan	Story Homes			DBDLP 1046		Site 99 - Maxgate Farm, MSG	Support	Supported for the proposed allocation is reiterated.	Support is noted for the promoted site and additional detailed consideration and assessment will take place throughout the planning process.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 923		Site 146 - Land south of railway line, MSG	Object	Site of concern to Highways England with potential impact on the A66.	The site now has planning permission. Highways and traffic will have been considered through the application process.	No change recommended
Ms Emily Hrycan	Historic England			DBDLP 1140		Site 146 - Land south of railway line, MSG	Object	Potential harm to Middleton One Row Conservation area and Grade II listed Middleton Hall 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 site now has planning permission. Heritage assets will have been considered through the application process.	No change recommended.
Mrs				DBDLP 312		Site 333 - East of Roundhill	Support	Support for provision of additional housing in Hurworth.	Support noted.	No change recommended

Full Name	Organisation	Agent	Organisation	ID	Number	Title	Nature of response	Officer's summary	Officer's response	Action / change recommended
Catherine Noble						Road, phase 2, Hurworth				
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 925		Site 384 - Oak Tree, MSG	Neutral	Site of no concern to Highways England.	The site now has planning permission. Highways and traffic will have been considered through the application process.	No change recommended
Mr Christopher Bell	Highways England			DBDLP 926		Site 386 - Land between Yarm Road and railway line, East, MSG	Neutral	Site of no concern to Highways England.	The site now has planning permission. Highways and traffic will have been considered through the application process.	No change recommended
MR MICHAEL GREEN				DBDLP 457	APPENDIX C	DARLINGTON'S HERITAGE ASSETS	Support	<p>Support for Appendix C 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>The council is aware of the heritage and environmental interests on the Blackwell Grange East site and this has informed (along with a arboricultural report and two statements of significance - one on the Listed Buildings and one for the Historic Park and Garden) the scale and location of development proposed on this site.</p> <p>Where necessary, the Council will undertake 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. This work will be undertaken prior to their inclusion in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Once completed, appropriate mitigation measures identified will be included within the policy and/or supporting text.</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.