

Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Statement

March 2021

Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Background to the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan	4
3. Early Engagement	5
4. Pre-Submission Engagement	6
5. Conclusions	7
Appendix 1 Early engagement leaflet	8
Appendix 2 MSGPC website and Facebook notification	9
Appendix 3 Key stakeholders	10
Appendix 4 Early engagement notification email/ letter	11
Appendix 5 Consultation bodies	12
Appendix 6 Pre-submission engagement leaflet	21
Appendix 7 Notification email/ letter	22
Appendix 8 Press release	23
Appendix 9 Website and Facebook notices	25
Appendix 10 Response form	32
Appendix 11 Pre-submission engagement – comments and responses	39

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations set out in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) of the regulations, define that a consultation statement must contain:
- Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - An explanation of how the persons and bodies were consulted;
 - A summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - A description of how those issues and concerns have been considered and where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
- 1.2 In order to meet the requirements of the Regulations, this consultation statement sets out:
- The background to the preparation of the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan ('the MSGNP');
 - A summary of the publicity, engagement and consultation that has helped to shape and inform preparation of the MSGNP;
 - Details of those consulted about the MSGNP during plan preparation and the extent to which efforts were made to ensure the MSGNP was prepared with support and input from the local community; and
 - A description of the changes made to the MSGNP in response to consultation and engagement.
- 1.3 Middleton St George Parish Council (MSGPC) consider that the extent of engagement meets the obligations set out in the regulations.
- 1.4 The consultation statement is intended to help the independent examiner review the process of the preparation of the MSGNP and make any appropriate recommendations in relation to the MSGNP.

2. Background to the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan

- 2.1 Following parish boundary changes in January 2016, the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Area was designated on 14 May 2019. A draft plan had been prepared by the former parish council and subject to consultation. At a special meeting of the new MSGPC in July 2018, it was resolved that work on the neighbourhood plan should recommence and in September 2018 MSGPC established a small working group of parish councillors to take forward the work on the plan. Progress on the plan preparation process was discussed at MSGPC meetings.
- 2.2 The preparation of the MSGNP has involved inclusive engagement, all of which will be discussed further in this document.
- 2.3 Early engagement took place during May 2019. The feedback informed the preparation of the Middleton St George Pre-Submission Draft Plan, which was subject to consultation for 8 weeks from 28 September 2020 to 23 November 2020. The draft plan identified:
- The context in which the plan was prepared – an overview of Middleton St George Parish and the opportunities and challenges for the plan to address;
 - A positive vision and objectives for the future of the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan area; and
 - How the vision of the plan will be delivered through planning policies that will be used to determine planning applications for new development within the plan area - providing a framework for sustainable development; and
 - How the vision and objectives of the plan will be delivered through community actions, which are measures intended to encourage action and influence decisions taken by relevant bodies.
- 2.4 The Submission Draft Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan (March 2021) is a revised version of the Pre-Submission Draft Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan (September 2020). It is supported by an updated evidence base and has been modified to take into account representations received.
- 2.5 The key stages in the preparation of the plan can be summarised as:

14 May 2019	Designation of the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Area
May 2019	Early engagement
28 September – 23 November 2020	Pre-Submission Draft Plan engagement
March 2021	Submission

3. Early Engagement

- 3.1 In order to inform the preparation of the draft MSGNP, in May 2019 MSGPC invited local residents and other stakeholders to input to a draft vision, objectives and planning policy themes for the plan. These were informed by the work undertaken by the former parish council on their draft plan. The invitation to participate in the consultation was included within a leaflet which was delivered to all addresses within the parish (appendix 1) a notice was also placed on the MSGPC website and Facebook page (appendix 2), an online survey was available for people to submit comments. Key stakeholders (appendix 3) were notified by email (appendix 4).
- 3.2 Awareness of the early engagement was also raised during the Parish Assembly, which took place on 18 May 2019. This was attended by seven community groups and 40-50 members of the public.
- 3.3 Only three written responses to the consultation were received. Issues identified included:
- Traffic flow and parking issues;
 - Solar panels;
 - The importance of keeping footpaths maintained and not encroached upon;
 - Preserving green areas (including nature reserves);
 - More play areas for all ages;
 - Full review and action regarding school, church, doctors' surgery etc. (in terms of size to allow for expansion); and
 - Safety and security, especially for the vulnerable.
- 3.4 As a result of feedback, the following amendments were made to the vision and objectives:
- Vision amended to include mention of transport management;
 - Objective one amended to include reference to incorporate sustainable construction, sustainable/renewable energy;
 - Objective two to include more specific mention of infrastructure; and
 - Objective four to include more specific mention of transport management.

4. Pre-Submission Engagement

- 4.1 Consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft MSGNP took place between 28 September and 23 November 2020. As the engagement took place during the COVID-19 pandemic it was not possible to have a drop-in event. However, the parish council provided contact details for anyone wanting to discuss the plan and request to view a hard copy.
- 4.2 The local community, consultation bodies and other interested parties (appendix 5) were informed of the consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft MSGNP and the opportunity to comment on the plan in the following ways:
- A leaflet was sent to all addresses in the parish (appendix 6);
 - A notification email/ letter was set to the consultation bodies (appendix 7);
 - A press release was provided to the Northern Echo which was published on 29 September 2020 (appendix 8);
 - Notices were placed on MSGPC website and Facebook pages (appendix 9);
 - A response form (appendix 10) was available to capture feedback from those that did not want to complete the online form; and
 - The draft plan and supporting documents were available online at <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan/>
- 4.3 Responses to the pre-submission consultation were received from:
- Darlington Association on Disability;
 - Healthwatch Darlington;
 - The Coal Authority;
 - Sadberge Parish Council;
 - National Grid;
 - Historic England;
 - Darlington Borough Council;
 - Friends of the Stockton and Darlington Railway;
 - Teesside International Airport;
 - Environment Agency;
 - Middle Oak Management Ltd;
 - St. George's Academy;
 - Middleton Hall Retirement Village;
 - 20 residents; and
 - Four developers/ landowners - Albert Hill Properties; Gladman; Miller Homes; and Story Homes.
- 4.4 The responses and details of how they have been taken account of in the Submission Draft MSGNP are included in appendix 11. Following engagement on the Pre-Submission Plan, the plan was amended where necessary.

5. Conclusions

- 5.1 The submission version of the MSGNP is the outcome of broad engagement since May 2019. Throughout that time, guidance, input and support has been obtained from various sources, all of which has been afforded due consideration in the preparation of the plan.
- 5.2 This has resulted in a submission MSGNP that reflects the community's aspirations for the area and the advice of stakeholders, whilst being in general conformity with local and national planning policy and that meets the basic conditions.
- 5.3 This consultation statement demonstrates that the publicity, consultation and engagement on the plan has been meaningful, effective, proportionate and valuable in shaping the plan, which will benefit current and future communities in Middleton St George by promoting sustainable development.

Appendix 1 Early engagement leaflet

Your feedback

Q1: Do you support the draft vision for the neighbourhood plan? Yes ☐ No ☐
If you have any comments on the draft vision or have answered 'no' please explain below.

Q2: Do you support the draft objectives for the neighbourhood plan? Yes ☐ No ☐
If you have any comments on the draft objectives or have answered 'no', please explain below.

Q3: Do you support the draft planning policy themes? Yes ☐ No ☐
If you have any comments, or have answered 'no' please explain below.

Q4: Do you feel the neighbourhood plan should identify any areas for development or protection e.g. for housing or employment or protected green space. If so, please explain why you feel the area/ site should be identified and also describe its location, it would be helpful if you could attach a map to your response.

Q5: Are there any other issues that you feel the neighbourhood plan should cover?

It would be helpful if you could include your email address so we can keep you informed of progress with the neighbourhood plan and discuss your response in more detail if needed.

Please use additional pages if you would like to provide a fuller response.

middleton-st-george.org.uk


MIDDLETON ST GEORGE PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Middleton St George Parish Council is leading the preparation of a neighbourhood plan for Middleton St George Parish

We need your views to help us shape the future of your parish!

What is a Neighbourhood Plan?

- The opportunity for local communities to prepare a neighbourhood plan was introduced in 2011. It enables people living and working in an area to guide where and how future development happens;
- Neighbourhood plans are prepared by the local communities through their town and parish councils, rather than being prepared by Darlington Borough Council;
- The Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan will be used to make decisions on planning applications, giving it genuine influence on the future of our area;
- Plans can include a range of policies, including those which: guide new development; conserve and enhance the environment; and support the provision of community facilities;
- Plans can also include community actions, which could be delivered by the parish council as well as other local groups and organisations.



Plan preparation progress...

Prior to the boundary changes in 2016 the former parish council prepared a draft neighbourhood plan. As a result of the change in the parish boundary we have needed to review the previous work to ensure a new plan both reflects the new parish boundary as well as changes in planning policy. The engagement and evidence work that was previously undertaken will inform the preparation of the new neighbourhood plan.


The previous work and feedback from the local community has helped us to develop a draft vision and objectives for your neighbourhood plan.

We need your feedback to ensure that the neighbourhood plan reflects your views.

How to get involved...

This leaflet contains the draft vision and objectives and also provides information on the types of planning issues the plan could look to address. You can submit comments in the following ways:

- By completing the form on the back of this leaflet and sending it to us at: Middleton St George Parish Council, 5 Whitebridge Drive, Darlington, DL1 3TY;
- Online by completing the survey on the parish council website: middleton-st-george.org.uk; or
- By emailing your comments to: msgclerk@aol.com



Middleton St George Parish

Your feedback will be used to help inform the preparation of a Draft Neighbourhood Plan, we therefore need your views on the Draft Vision and Objectives by 31 May 2019.

MIDDLETON ST GEORGE PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Draft Vision

The draft vision sets out what the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan intends to achieve over the plan period to 2036, it will inform all of the draft planning policies and community actions contained in the emerging plan:

By 2036 the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan Area will comprise a sustainable and cohesive community. Improvements will have been made to the local environment which enhance the quality of life of residents.

Middleton St George will provide accessible local facilities and its communities will be well-connected, via sustainable transport routes, to Darlington Town Centre and the wider Tees Valley area, whilst remaining visually distinct and separate from the conurbation.

The important historic and environmental character of the area will have been maintained and enhanced for future generations by ensuring new development is of an appropriate scale and design.

Draft Objectives

Objective 1 - Quality of life

- Ensuring new development is sustainable, maintains and enhances local distinctiveness and contributes positively to the built, historic and natural environment of the plan area.

Objective 2 - Community well-being

- Building on the diverse needs of existing and future residents. Supporting the provision of different types of housing that people can afford and meet identified needs and ensuring the local community have access to the services and facilities they need.

Objective 3 - Sustainable economy

- Supporting the economy of the plan area, particularly small-scale enterprises.

Objective 4 - Connectivity

- Promoting access to sustainable modes of transport, which connect people effectively and efficiently to the social, economic, educational, recreational and cultural facilities which they require on a day to day basis.



middleton-st-george.org.uk

MIDDLETON ST GEORGE PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Draft Planning Policy Themes

Quality of life

- Promoting good quality design in new development to ensure new development: reflects the character of the area;
- Defining a settlement boundary – to manage the location of new development and identify what development can take place in the open countryside;
- Protecting and enhancing the important green infrastructure and biodiversity of the parish;
- Identifying areas of green space that are important to the community to protect them from inappropriate development;
- Conservation and enhancement of heritage assets.

Community well-being

- Supporting the provision of the type of housing that is needed by the local community. This could also include the allocation of sites for development or identification of settlement boundaries;
- Resisting the loss of existing services and supporting the provision of new local services;
- Ensuring new development provides the required infrastructure.

Sustainable economy

- Supporting sustainable economic and tourism development.

Connectivity

- Ensuring the impact of traffic from new development is effectively managed;
- Providing appropriate levels of parking within new development;
- Supporting the development, protection and enhancement of active travel routes e.g. established pathways and cycle routes, public rights of way, bridleways and informal paths.



Next steps...

- Comments on the draft vision, objectives and planning policy themes will be used to inform the preparation of a draft neighbourhood plan;
- We will be asking for your feedback on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan later in 2019;
- We will then make changes to the Plan following feedback and submit the plan to Darlington Borough Council;
- The plan will then be examined by an independent examiner;
- There will then be a local referendum - if the majority of those voting are in favour of the plan, it will be brought into legal force by Darlington Borough Council and used in the determination of planning applications.

middleton-st-george.org.uk

Appendix 2 MSGPC website and Facebook notification

NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT VISION AND OBJECTIVES

Dear Resident,

The Parish Council would like your views on the Draft Vision and Objectives for the new Neighbourhood Plan.

Prior to the boundary changes in 2016 the former MSG Parish Council prepared a draft neighbourhood plan. As a result of the change in the parish boundary we have needed to review the previous work to ensure a new plan both reflects the new parish boundary as well as changes in planning policy. The engagement and evidence work that was previously undertaken will inform the preparation of the new neighbourhood plan.

The previous work and feedback from the local community has helped us to develop a draft vision and objectives for your neighbourhood plan.

We need your feedback to ensure that the neighbourhood plan reflects your views.

We have produced a leaflet which contains the draft vision and objectives and also provides information on the types of planning issues the plan could look to address.

You can find the leaflet here: *(Alan – can you put upload the leaflet to the website, and put the link here?)*

You can submit comments in the following ways:

- By completing the form on the back of this leaflet and sending it to us at: Middleton St George Parish Council, 5 Whitebridge Drive, Darlington, DL1 3TY;

- Online by completing the survey on the parish council website: <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/>

(You can access the simple Survey Monkey here: <http://bit.ly/MSGNeighbourhoodPlan>);

or

- By emailing your comments to: msgclerk@aol.com

Your feedback will be used to help inform the preparation of a Draft Neighbourhood Plan. We therefore need your views on the Draft Vision and Objectives by **31 MAY 2019**.

Your comments are greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions, please contact me at the email address below.

May thanks,

Cllr Catherine Gilsenan
Chairman, Middleton St George Parish Council
catherine.gilsenan@yahoo.com

Appendix 3 Key stakeholders

Organisation	Contact	Email
Darlington Borough Council	Dave Coates Planning Development Manager	dave.coates@darlington.gov.uk
CPRE	Gillan Gibson	gillan_gibson@yahoo.co.uk
Durham Wildlife Trust		mail@durhamwt.co.uk
Natural England		consultations@naturalengland.org.uk
County Durham & Darlington NHS Foundation Trust		cd-da-tr.Foundation@nhs.net
St George's Medical Practice		stgeorges.medical@nhs.net
DBC PROW Officer	Steve Petch	steve.petch@darlington.gov.uk
Neasham Parish Council	Parish Clerk – John Walker	NeashamPC@gmail.com
Darlington Ramblers		l_r_king@btinternet.com david.l.reed@btinternet.com
St Laurence's Church		admin@stlmsg.org,
FoS&DR	Trish Pemberton	trish@technologytrish.co.uk
Police and Crime Commissioner	Mr Ron Hogg	Jodie.Dunlavy@durham.pnn.police.uk
MSG Community Association		msgcommunitycentre@gmail.com
MSG Local History Group		msglocalhistory@hotmail.co.uk
St George's Academy	Ann Williams, Director of Board of Govenors	a.williams@stgeorges.darlington.sch.uk
Local Walkers	Barbara Shorney	malcolm.shorney@btinternet.com

Appendix 4 Early engagement notification email

NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT VISION AND OBJECTIVES

Dear.....,

The Parish Council are working on a Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Context

Prior to the boundary changes in 2016, the former MSG Parish Council prepared a draft neighbourhood plan. As a result of the change in the parish boundary we have needed to review the previous work to ensure a new plan both reflects the new parish boundary as well as changes in planning policy. The engagement and evidence work that was previously undertaken will inform the preparation of the new neighbourhood plan.

The new Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan

The previous work and feedback from the local community has helped us to develop a Draft Vision and Objectives to commence the work on the new Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan.

We have produced a leaflet which contains the Draft Vision and Objectives and also provides information on the types of planning issues the plan could look to address (copy attached).

We launched the consultation at our Parish Assembly on 18th May, where copies of the consultation leaflet were available for residents to take, complete, and return.

Cllr Catherine Gilsenan
Chairman, Middleton St George Parish Council
catherine.gilsenan@yahoo.com

Appendix 5 Consultation bodies

Consultation Body	Organisation	Contact
Local Planning Authority	Darlington Borough Council	Dave Coates (Planning Development Manager) DBC, Town Hall, Darlington dave.coates@darlington.gov.uk
The Coal Authority	The Coal Authority	Planning and Local Authority Liaison, The Coal Authority, 200 Lichfield Lane, Berry Lane, Mansfield, Nottinghamshire, NG18 4RG planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk
Homes England	Homes England	Homes and Communities Agency, St George's House, Kingsway, Team Valley, Gateshead, NE11 0NA enquiries@homesengland.gov.uk
Natural England	Natural England	Consultation Service, Natural England, Hornbeam House, Electra Way, Crewe Business Park, Crewe, CW1 6GJ consultations@naturalengland.org.uk
The Environment Agency	The Environment Agency	Planning Consultations, Environment Agency, Tyneside House, Skinnerburn Road, Newcastle Business Park, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE4 7AR enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk planning.nane@environment-agency.gov.uk
Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England	Historic England	Historic England, 41-44 Sandgate, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 3JF e-neast@HistoricEngland.org.uk northeast@HistoricEngland.org.uk
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited, George Stephenson House, Toft Hill, York, YO1 6JT Townplanning.lne@networkrail.co.uk
Highways England	Highways England	Asset Development Team – Yorkshire and North East Highways Agency, Lateral, 8 City Walk, Leeds, LS11 9AT planningYNE@highways.gsi.gov.uk
The Marine Management Organisation	The Marine Management Organisation	Stakeholder and Networks Officer, Marine Management Organisation, PO Box 1275, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE99 5BN consultations.mmo@marinemanagement.org.uk
Relevant Primary Care Trust	County Durham & Darlington NHS Foundation Trust	Sue Jacques, Chief Executive County Durham & Darlington NHS Foundation Trust, Memorial Hospital, Hollyhurst Road, Darlington DL3 6HX sue.jacques@nhs.net cdda-tr.Foundation@nhs.net

Consultation Body	Organisation	Contact
Any person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986	Northern Gas Networks	Northern Gas Networks, 1100 Century Way, Thorp Business Park, Colton, Leeds, LS15 8TU validation@northerngas.co.uk
Any persons who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority, and any person to whom the electronic communications code applies	British Telecommunications plc	British Telecommunications plc, Openreach Newsites PP 4AB, 21-23 Carliol Square, Newcastle CTE, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 1BB Robert.thorburn@openreach.com
	Virgin Media Limited	Virgin Media Limited, St James Court, Great Park Road, Almonsbury Park, Bradley Stoke, Bristol, BS32 4QJ Luke.pattison@virginmedia.co.uk
Any person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) and (c) of the Electricity Act 1989	Northern Power Grid	Northern Power Grid, Records and Information, Manor House, Station Road, Penshaw, Houghton le Spring, County Durham, DH4 7LA
	National Grid	National Grid, National Grid House, Warwick, Warwickshire, CV34 6DA Nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com
Sewage Undertaker	Northumbrian Water Limited	Laura Kennedy , New Development Team (Planning) Northumbrian Water Limited, Leat House, Pattinson Road, Washington, Tyne & Wear, NE38 8LB laura.kennedy@nwl.co.uk 0191 419 6767
Water Undertaker	Northumbrian Water Limited	Laura Kennedy , New Development Team (Planning) Northumbrian Water Limited, Leat House, Pattinson Road, Washington, Tyne & Wear, NE38 8LB laura.kennedy@nwl.co.uk 0191 419 6767
Adjoining Parish Councils	Neasham Parish Council (Darlington)	John Walker (Parish Clerk) NeashamPC@gmail.com
	Sadberge Parish Council (Darlington)	Tony Delderfield (Parish Clerk) clerktoSPC@gmail.com
	Longnewton Parish Council (Stockton)	Mrs M Whitehead (Clerk) 8 The Yew Walk, Long Newton, Stockton-on-Tees TS21 1PA 01642 580584

Consultation Body	Organisation	Contact
		longnewtonpc@btinternet.com
	Over Dinsdale Parish Meeting (Hambleton, North Yorkshire)	Mr Geoffrey Turnbull, Girsby Hall Farm, Girsby, Darlington DL2 1PP 01609 881228 anita.geoffturnbull@yahoo.co.uk
	Aislaby and Newsham Parish Council (Stockton)	(NB. This Parish Council is still in existence – has not been abolished – but is currently not functioning as it has no Clerk and no Mmembers)
Adjoining Local Planning Authorities	Hambleton District Council	Hambleton District Council, Civic Centre Stonecross Rotary Way, Northallerton DL6 2UU planning_policy@hambleton.gov.uk
	Stockton Borough Council	spatialplans@stockton.gov.uk
	North Yorkshire County Council	Head of Planning Policy Team mwdf@northyorks.gov.uk General Development Management planning.control@northyorks.gov.uk
Voluntary Bodies, some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area	CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England)	gillan_gibson@yahoo.co.uk
	Darlington Friends of the Earth	Simon.bowens@foe.co.uk Kendra Ulliyart 19 Woodvale Road, Darlington, DL3 8HA darlingtonfoe.blogspot.com
	Sustrans	Sustrans.northeast@sustrans.org.uk Sustrans, 2 Cathedral Square, College Green, Bristol, BS1 5DD
	Darlington Ramblers	l_r_king@btinternet.com david.l.reed@btinternet.com dave.hardaker@btinternet.com
	Durham Wildlife Trust	Jim Cokill, Director, Durham Wildlife Trust jcokill@durhamwt.co.uk mail@durhamwt.co.uk Tel. 0191 584 3112 Laura Tedstone Living Landscapes Officer (South) Durham Wildlife Trust ltedstone@durhamwt.co.uk 01388 488728 Mobile: 07912 281142

Consultation Body	Organisation	Contact
Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area	St George and St Laurence	Hazel Bullock, Church Administrator, admin@stlmsg.org Rodger Sansom, Church Warden, rodgersansom@icloud.com
Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area	North East England Chamber of Commerce National Farmers Union Civil Aviation Authority	info@neechamber.co.uk County Adviser: Samantha Davies samantha.davies@nfu.org.uk ¹ webmaster@caa.co.uk
Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons living in the neighbourhood area	Disability North Darlington Association on Disability (DAD)	The Dene Centre, Castle Farm Road, Newcastle Upon Tyne, Tyne & Wear, NE3 1PH reception@disabilitynorth.org.uk 1P, Enterprise House, Valley St North, Darlington DL1 1GY mail@darlingtondisability.org Gordon.pybus@darlingtondisability.org
Bodies which have requested to be notified of neighbourhood plan		
Other neighbouring bodies		Teesside International Airport Darlington, Tees Valley, DL2 1LU enquiries@TeessideInternational.com Tees Valley Combined Authority (Ben Houchen, Tees Valley Mayor) Stobart Group csr@stobartgroup.com Healthwatch Darlington Officer m.thompson@healthwatchdarlington.co.uk Tees Valley Clinical Commissioning Group tvccg.enquiries@nhs.net

Local Community Groups

Consultation Body	Organisation	Contact
Friends of Stockton & Darlington Railway	Friends of Stockton & Darlington Railway	Trish Pemberton (Chair) trish@technologytrish.co.uk

¹ Note – consultation email bounced back and unable to follow up or to forward to alternative representative

Consultation Body	Organisation	Contact
MSG S&DR Heritage Steering Group	MSG S&DR Heritage Steering Group	Cllr Catherine Gilsenan (Chair of MSG Parish Council) catherine.gilsenan@yahoo.com
Middleton St George Community Association	Middleton St George Community Association	msgcommunitycentre@gmail.com
Middleton St George Local History Group	Middleton St George Local History Group	msglocalhistory@hotmail.co.uk
MSG Wildlife Group and MSG Walks for Health	MSG Wildlife Group and MSG Walks for Health	Barbara Shorney malcolm.shorney@btinternet.com
Middleton St George Allotments Association	Middleton St George Allotments Association	Les Foggett (Secretary) lesfoggett@gmail.com
Middleton St George Womens Institute	Middleton St George Womens Institute	Margaret Williams mjanewilliams1946@gmail.com
MSG in Bloom	MSG in Bloom	msginbloom@gmail.com
Middleton St George Village Show	Middleton St George Village Show	Gail Braithwaite gailieb@hotmail.com
Middleton St George Cricket Club	Middleton St George Cricket Club	middletonstgeorgecc@gmail.com

Other Bodies, some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area

Consultation Body	Organisation	Contact
Public Right of Way Officer	PROW Officer, Darlington Borough Council	steve.petch@darlington.gov.uk
St George's Medical Practice	St George's Medical Practice	stgeorges.medical@nhs.net
Durham Police and Crime Commissioner	Durham Police and Crime Commissioner	Jodie.Dunlavey@durham.pnn.police.uk general.enquiries@durham.pcc.pnn.gov.uk
St George's Academy (Primary School)	St George's Academy (Primary School)	Ann Williams, Director of Board of Governors a.williams@stgeorges.darlington.sch.uk
Dinsdale Court (Local Authority Sheltered Housing)	Dinsdale Court (Local Authority Sheltered Housing)	
Cocks Memorial Homes		Martin Walker martinkwalker@hotmail.com
Middleton Hall Retirement Village	Middleton Hall Retirement Village	Jeremy Waltham, Managing Director Middleton St George, Darlington, Co. Durham, DL2 1HA info@mhrv.co.uk
RSPB Durham	RSPB Durham	https://ww2.rspb.org.uk/groups/durham/ ²

² Unable to find postal or email address therefore not contacted.

Consultation Body	Organisation	Contact
Woodland Trust	Woodland Trust	enquiries@woodlandtrust.org.uk
Tees Valley Wildlife Trusts	Tees Valley Wildlife Trusts	info@teeswildlife.org
Capability North East (Environment Consultancy)	Capability North East	Ouseburn Farm Offices, Ouseburn Rd, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 2PA office@capabiliyne.org.uk ³

Other Landowners within the parish

Local Green Space

Site ref	Name	Owner
LGS1	Water Park, Station Road	Parish council
LGS2	The Whinnies	Owned by DBC and managed by Durham Wildlife Trust Guy Metcalfe, Estates and Property Officer, Darlington Borough Council. guy.metcalfe@darlington.gov.uk
LGS3	Former Stockton and Darlington Railway Route and Trackbed in MSG	DBC Guy Metcalfe, Estates and Property Officer, Darlington Borough Council. guy.metcalfe@darlington.gov.uk
LGS5	Haxby Road Play Area and former cornmill site	DBC Guy Metcalfe, Estates and Property Officer, Darlington Borough Council. guy.metcalfe@darlington.gov.uk
LGS6	Tower Hill to The Front, Middleton One Row	Private ownership – 5 landowners
LGS7	64 Middleton Lane (Mown Meadows)	Private ownership Chris Brockbank Mown Meadows 64 Middleton Lane Middleton St George DL2 1AD chris.brockbank@ashbankgroup.co.uk

³ Note – consultation email bounced back and unable to follow up or forward to alternative representative

Site ref	Name	Owner
LGS8	The War Memorial and Garden	Parish council owns the war memorial and the land is owned by the church CofE (Parochial Church Council of St George and St Laurence) Contact the Parish Administrator (admin@stlmsg.org)
LGS9	The Front, Middleton One Row	Parish council
LGS10	Station Road Playing Field and Playground	Parish council
LGS12	St George's Church and Grounds	CofE (Parochial Church Council of St George and St Laurence) Contact the Parish Administrator (admin@stlmsg.org)
LGS13	Belle Vue Allotments, Belle Vue Terrace	Julia Storey 28 The Oaklands, Middleton One Row juliastorey@virginmedia.com
LGS14	Killinghall Row Allotments, Killinghall Row	- Dr Marshall (And doctors' consortium) adrian-marshall@outlook.com Dr. Adrian Marshall, Felix House, 75 Middleton Lane Middleton St George Darlington DL2 1AA
LGS15	Sadberge Road Allotments	Parish council
LGS16	Land off Middleton Lane, after Pine Tree Grove	Private ownership Land Owner: Wooler Estates Land Agent: Simon Bainbridge (Savills, Tel: 01325 370501 / 0191 917 1444) Mr. Simon Bainbridge, Land Agent, Wooler Estates, Savills, 26, Coniscliffe Road, Darlington. sbainbridge@savills.com Simon Bainbridge, Director, Rural, Savills,

Site ref	Name	Owner
		Eastfield House, Main Street, Corbridge, Northumberland. sbainbridge@savills.com
LGS17	Virginia Estate	Residents cooperative – (a not for profit company No.2789632) Middle Oak Management Ltd Email: directors@virginiaestate.co.uk Website: www.virginiaestate.co.uk Bill Pike, 32 Washington Avenue Tel: 07789 785934 billpikecommunityservices@gmail.com Linda Griggs, 46 Washington Avenue Tel: 07729 447873 msgvirginia6@gmail.com Kennedy Clear, 7 The Spinney Tel. 07963 562390
LGS18	Almora Hall field, off Middleton Lane	Private ownership Land Owner: Wooler Estates Land Agent: Simon Bainbridge (Savills, Tel: 01325 370501 / 0191 917 1444) Mr. Simon Bainbridge, Land Agent, Wooler Estates, Savills, 26, Coniscliffe Road, Darlington. Simon Bainbridge, Director, Rural, Savills, Eastfield House, Main Street, Corbridge, Northumberland. NB. The estate land is managed by the above. The inhabitants of the properties on the land are as follows: Almora Hall (split into 3 properties) Owned by: - Mrs Sheila Nichols, - Mr Alec Cowan - Mr Barry Binks. Almora Cottage (at entrance on Middleton Lane):

Site ref	Name	Owner
		- Owned by Mr Chris Hemmings


Protected Open Space

Site ref	Name	Owner
POS1	The green at the Greenway	Residents
POS2	The green at Grendon Gardens	DBC
POS3	The green at Hunters Green	DBC
POS4	The green at Woolsington Drive	DBC
POS5	The green at Ropner Gardens	Residents
POS6	The Cricket Field and Pavillion	<p>Trustees of MSG Cricket Club</p> <p>Mr. N. Johnston, Chairman, Middleton St. George Cricket Club middletonstgeorgecc@gmail.com</p> <p>Nev Johnston 5 Belle Vue Terrace Middleton St George DL2 1BN</p>
POS8	St Georges' C of E Academy playing fields	<p>Academy trust</p> <p>Mrs. J. Gleeson, Headteacher, St. George's CE Academy, Neasham Road, Middleton St. George. admin@stgeorges.darlington.sch.uk</p>

Appendix 6 Pre-submission engagement leaflet

MIDDLETON ST GEORGE PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Community actions



Community action 1: Highway safety and traffic management

- Work with DBC to improve the safety of roads in the parish.

Community action 2: Integrated approach to bus service provision

- Work with DBC, public transport providers and others to develop schemes to improve access to key services and facilities.

Community action 3: Play area improvements

- Explore options for improvements to the current play area.

Community action 4: Dog fouling

- Work with DBC to better control dog fouling across the parish.

Community action 5: Wildflower meadow

- Explore options to create a wildflower meadow along Sadberge Road.

Community action 6: Footpaths

- Work with DBC to deliver footpath improvements.

Community action 7: Road improvements

- Explore options to improve the unadopted road from Station Road to the cricket club.

Community action 8: Waterpark improvements

- Including lighting, clearance of undergrowth, extend and improve trails and road surface enhancements.

Community action 9: Stockton and Darlington Railway

- Contribute to the delivery of a heritage action zone around the former railway line.

Community action 10: Interpretation boards

- Explore options to install information boards at key parts of the parish.

Community action 11: Overhead cables

- Work with DBC to seek the removal of overhead cables throughout the village.

Community action 12: Facilities for young people


- Explore options to provide more facilities for young people.

Community action 13: Facilities for older people

- Explore options to provide more facilities for older people.

Community action 14: Improvements to the multi-use games area

- Explore options to make improvements to the area, including lighting and security.



Next steps...

- We will make changes to the plan following feedback and submit it to Darlington Borough Council;
- There will be more consultation undertaken by Darlington Borough Council;
- The plan will then be examined by an independent examiner who will decide if it meets the various legal requirements;
- There will then be a local referendum - if the majority of those voting are in favour of the plan, it will be brought into legal force by Darlington Borough Council and used in the determination of planning applications.

Thank you for taking the time to read this leaflet and we look forward to hearing your views.

middleton-st-george.org.uk

MIDDLETON ST GEORGE PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Middleton St George Parish Council is leading the preparation of a neighbourhood plan for Middleton St George Parish

WE NEED YOUR VIEWS ON OUR DRAFT PLAN

What is a Neighbourhood Plan?

- The opportunity for local communities to prepare a neighbourhood plan was introduced in 2011. It enables people living and working in an area to guide where and how future development happens;
- Neighbourhood plans are prepared by the local communities through their town and parish councils, rather than being prepared by Darlington Borough Council;
- Our plan will be used to make decisions on planning applications, giving it genuine influence on the future of our area;
- Plans can include a range of policies, including those which guide new development; conserve and enhance the environment; and support the provision of community facilities;
- Plans can also include community actions, which could be delivered by the parish council as well as other local groups and organisations.



Plan preparation progress...

In May last year we ask you for your help to agree a vision and objectives for our plan. Informed by this feedback, as well as lots of extra work we have now prepared a draft neighbourhood plan. The draft plan includes 19 planning policies covering a range of issues which seek to protect what make our area special, as well as 14 community actions.

We need your feedback to ensure that our neighbourhood plan reflects your views.

How to get involved...

This leaflet contains a summary of the draft plan. The draft plan and supporting information is available on the parish council website: middleton-st-george.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan/

If you do not have access to the internet, a hard copy of the plan, policies map and response form can be provided on request. Hard copies of the supporting documents are available to view at the parish council office. However, given the need to maintain social distancing, you will need to contact the parish council to make an appointment to view the documents. You can do this by emailing the parish council msgclerk@aol.com or phoning 07722705008.

You can submit comments on the draft plan in the following ways:

- Online, by completing the survey on the parish council website;
- Sending comments to us in writing to Middleton St George Parish Council, 5 Whitebridge Drive, Darlington, DL1 3TY; or
- By emailing your comments to: msgclerk@aol.com.



We need your comments on the draft neighbourhood plan by 23 November 2020

MIDDLETON ST GEORGE PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Vision

The vision sets out what the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan intends to achieve over the plan period to 2036, it informs all of the draft planning policies and community actions contained in the emerging plan:

By 2036 the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan Area will comprise a sustainable and cohesive community. Improvements will have been made to the local environment and the management of traffic which enhance the quality of life of residents.

Middleton St George will provide accessible local facilities and its communities will be well-connected, via sustainable transport routes, to Darlington Town Centre and the wider Tees Valley area, whilst remaining visually distinct and separate from the conurbation.

The important historic and environmental character of the area will have been maintained and enhanced for future generations by ensuring new development is of an appropriate scale and design.

Objective 1 - Quality of life

Policy MSG1: Sustainable development

- Identifies the importance of using brownfield land before green-field, protecting residential amenity, protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment, as well as infrastructure.

Policy MSG2: Design

- Requires new development to conserve local distinctiveness by responding to the character of the area.

Policy MSG3: Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy

- Highlights the importance of incorporating sustainable design into new developments.

Policy MSG4: General location of new development

- Identifies settlement boundaries for Middleton St George, Middleton One Row and Oak Tree.

Policy MSG5: Green Infrastructure


- Requires new development to protect the existing green infrastructure network within the parish.

Policy MSG6: Green wedge

- Identifies a green gap to protect the Middleton One Row Conservation Area, as well as prevent the coalescence of Middleton St George and Middleton One Row.

Policy MSG7: Biodiversity

- Requires new development to protect and enhance biodiversity.



Policy MSG8: Local green space


- Proposes the allocation of 18 sites to be protected from development in accordance with national green belt policy.

Policy MSG9: Protected open space

- Proposes the allocation of 8 sites which will be protected from development unless specific criteria are met.

Policy MSG10: Heritage assets

- Requires new development to protect heritage assets.



middleton-st-george.org.uk

MIDDLETON ST GEORGE PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Objective 2 - Community well-being

Policy MSG11: Housing mix

- Seeks to ensure that new housing meets identified local needs, not what housebuilders want to build.

Policy MSG12: Affordable housing

- Requires the provision of affordable housing on sites of 10 or more dwellings.

Policy MSG13: Community services and facilities

- Supports the provision of new services and facilities and seeks to resist the loss of existing facilities.



Policy MSG14: Allotments

- Protects the three allotment sites from future development.

Policy MSG15: Infrastructure

- Requires new development to provide the infrastructure that is related to it.



Objective 3 - Local economy

Policy MSG16: Employment and economic growth

- Supports proposals for the creation or protection of jobs.

Policy MSG17: Tourism and leisure

- Supports the development of new visitor attractions and leisure facilities.

Objective 4 - Connectivity

Policy MSG18: Transport and new development

- Requires new development to be safely accessed, not significantly impact on traffic flows and provide appropriate parking provision.

Policy MSG19: Active travel routes

- Protects the walking and cycling network within the parish and supports opportunities for its enhancement.

middleton-st-george.org.uk

Appendix 7 Notification email/ letter

September 2020

Dear xxxx

**Middleton St George Neighbourhood Development Plan
Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended): Regulation 14 consultation and
publicity**

Middleton St George Parish Council has completed the preparation of the Pre-Submission Draft Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan.

In accordance with the Regulations, the Parish Council invites comments on the pre-submission draft plan. Any comments you wish to make about the draft plan must be made in writing.

The Regulations require that consultation must take place for a period of not less than six weeks starting on the date the draft plan is first publicised. Comments are therefore invited between 28th September 2020 and 12 noon on 23rd November 2020. This is a period of eight weeks, to allow additional time to comment on the draft plan as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The draft and other supporting documents can be viewed on the Parish Council website at <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan/>.

As a result of COVID-19 hard copies of the plan are not available for inspection and a drop-in event cannot be held. However, if you do not have internet access, a hard copy can be requested from the Parish Council.

Representations may be made by in the following ways:

- By completing the online questionnaire available on the website;
- By email to: msgclerk@aol.com
- By letter to: Middleton St George Parish Council, 5 Whitebridge Drive, Darlington DL1 3TY.

The Parish Council would be pleased to receive any written representations you may wish to make on the plan and other supporting documents **before 12 noon on 23rd November 2020**.

All comments will be publicly available and will be considered by the parish council in producing the final plan which will then be submitted to Darlington Borough Council for independent examination.

If you have any questions about this consultation, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Appendix 8 Press release – published in Nother Echo

The Northern Echo

Darlington village residents urged to air views to help shape developments



29 September, 2020

By [Stuart Minting](#) Local Democracy Reporter



Middleton St George, which some residents claim is being over-developed

0 comment

COMMUNITY leaders in a village where it has been claimed a series of housing developments being approved has eroded its identity are urging residents to voice their views.

Middleton St George Parish Council said its Neighbourhood Plan would help guide development to 2036 and draft proposals highlighted the importance of protecting the heritage and environment of the area and remaining a separate village.

The plan aims to aid quality of life, community wellbeing, the local economy and connectivity and **features** policies stating where development should be located, the environment protected, affordable housing provided and community services and facilities enhanced.

It also identifies 26 sites as open spaces that should be protected.

The parish council is inviting residents to voice their views on the draft proposals before submitting it for independent examination.

A leaflet summarising the proposals is being sent to all residents, who have until November 23 to lodge their comments.

If the plan passes examination, it will be subject to a referendum where residents will be able to vote on it.

For details, visit middleton-st-george.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan or email the parish council on msgclerk@aol.com.

<https://www.thenorthernecho.co.uk/news/18756895.darlington-village-residents-urged-air-views-help-shape-developments/?ref=eb>

Appendix 9 Website and Facebook notices

(28th September 2020 – posted on Parish Council Website and Parish Council Facebook Page):

Middleton St George Parish Council

Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan
Middleton St George Parish Council has prepared a draft neighbourhood development plan for the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Area. The plan proposes a number of planning policies which, once adopted, must be used in the determination of planning applications within the parish.

In accordance with the planning regulations, the Parish Council is required to publicise the draft plan and invite comments. The plan and supporting documents will be available for feedback for eight weeks commencing on 28 September 2020 and ending at 12 noon on 23 November 2020.

The draft plan can be viewed below:

Draft Plan – <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-Plan...>

Draft Policies Map –

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-policies-map...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-policies-map...>

The draft plan has been informed by the following background papers and supporting documents which are also available for comment:

Settlement Boundary – <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Settlement-boundary...>

Design Guide – Please note the file is large and has had to be split – http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Design-Guide1_Part1...

- http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Design-Guide1_Part2...

Local Green Space and Protected Open Space – Background Paper Please note the file is large and has had to be split

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

Local Green Space and Protected Open Space –Map:

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../09/LGS-and-POS-Map.pdf>

Housing needs assessment – <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Housing-needs...>

A leaflet is being distributed to all residents of the parish to summarise the plan –

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../2020/09/Leaflet.pdf>

Comments can be made in the following ways:

By completing the online questionnaire available at... MSG Online Response Form:

<https://docs.google.com/.../1FAIpQLSeaP.../viewform>

By completing the feedback form and either printing it and returning a hard copy to us or emailing it (if you want to do this rather than complete the online questionnaire)

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../09/Response-form.pdf>

(A version in Word format is also available from the Parish Council Website)

By email to: msgclerk@aol.com

By letter to: Middleton St George Parish Council, 5 Whitebridge Drive, Darlington
Whitebridge Drive, Darlington, DL1 3TY; DL1 3TY

Any person or organisation may comment on the plan.

All comments must be received by the parish council no later than 12 noon on 23 November 2020.

All comments will be publicly available and will be considered by the Parish Council in producing the final plan which will then be submitted to Darlington Borough Council for independent examination.

MIDDLETON-ST-GEORGE.ORG.UK

middleton-st-george.org.uk

(11th October 2020 – posted on Parish Council Facebook Page):

Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan

A reminder that we are current consulting the residents of MSG parish for your views.

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan/>

(20th October 2020 – posted on Parish Council Facebook Page):

Middleton St George Parish Council

Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft Middleton St George

Neighbourhood Plan

A reminder that we are currently consulting the residents of MSG parish for your views.

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan/>

For example:

Policy MSG4 proposes settlement boundaries for Middleton St George, Middleton One Row and Oak Tree – these are illustrated on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Policy MSG5 seeks to protect and where practical improve and extend the green infrastructure network within the parish. The existing green infrastructure network is shown on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Middleton St George Parish Council has prepared a draft neighbourhood development plan for the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Area. The plan proposes a number of planning policies which, once adopted, must be used in the determination of planning applications within the parish.

In accordance with the planning regulations, the Parish Council is required to publicise the draft plan and invite comments. The plan and supporting documents will be available for feedback for eight weeks commencing on 28 September 2020 and ending at 12 noon on 23 November 2020.

The draft plan can be viewed below:

Draft Plan – <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-Plan...>

Draft Policies Map –

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-policies-map...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-policies-map...>

The draft plan has been informed by the following background papers and supporting documents which are also available for comment:

Settlement Boundary – <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Settlement-boundary...>

Design Guide – Please note the file is large and has had to be split – http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Design-Guide1_Part1...

- http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Design-Guide1_Part2...

Local Green Space and Protected Open Space – Background Paper Please note the file is large and has had to be split

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

Local Green Space and Protected Open Space –Map:

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../09/LGS-and-POS-Map.pdf>

Housing needs assessment – <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Housing-needs...>

A leaflet has been distributed to all residents of the parish to summarise the plan – <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../2020/09/Leaflet.pdf>

Comments can be made in the following ways:

By completing the online questionnaire available at... MSG Online Response Form:

<https://docs.google.com/.../1FAIpQLSeaP.../viewform>

By completing the feedback form and either printing it and returning a hard copy to us or emailing it (if you want to do this rather than complete the online questionnaire)

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../09/Response-form.pdf>

(A version in Word format is also available from the Parish Council Website)

By email to: msgclerk@aol.com

By letter to: Middleton St George Parish Council, 5 Whitebridge Drive, Darlington Whitebridge Drive, Darlington, DL1 3TY; DL1 3TY

Any person or organisation may comment on the plan.

All comments must be received by the parish council no later than 12 noon on 23 November 2020.

All comments will be publicly available and will be considered by the Parish Council in producing the final plan which will then be submitted to Darlington Borough Council for independent examination.

Thank you.

(21st October 2020 – posted on Parish Council Facebook Page):

Middleton St George Parish Council

Neighbourhood Plan

It appears there have been some problems when trying to access the Neighbourhood Plan Section of the Parish Council Website, and the Neighbourhood Plan documents and online questionnaire.

We have refreshed the links below, and hopefully now they will work ok. But if you are still encountering problems, please let us know.

Apologies for this. We don't know if it was a glitch with the website or whether it was something beyond our control.

Consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan

A reminder that we are currently consulting the residents of MSG parish for your views.

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan/>

For example:

Policy MSG4 proposes settlement boundaries for Middleton St George, Middleton One Row and Oak Tree – these are illustrated on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Policy MSG5 seeks to protect and where practical improve and extend the green infrastructure network within the parish. The existing green infrastructure network is shown on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Middleton St George Parish Council has prepared a draft neighbourhood development plan for the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Area. The plan proposes a number of planning policies which, once adopted, must be used in the determination of planning applications within the parish.

In accordance with the planning regulations, the Parish Council is required to publicise the draft plan and invite comments. The plan and supporting documents will be available for feedback for eight weeks commencing on 28 September 2020 and ending at 12 noon on 23 November 2020.

The draft plan can be viewed below:

Draft Plan – <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-Plan...>

Draft Policies Map –

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-policies-map...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-policies-map...>

The draft plan has been informed by the following background papers and supporting documents which are also available for comment:

Settlement Boundary –

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Settlement-boundary...>

Design Guide – Please note the file is large and has had to be split:

http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Design-Guide1_Part1...

http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Design-Guide1_Part2...

Local Green Space and Protected Open Space – Background Paper Please note the file is large and has had to be split

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

Local Green Space and Protected Open Space –Map:

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../09/LGS-and-POS-Map.pdf>

Housing needs assessment:

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Housing-needs...>

A leaflet has been distributed to all residents of the parish to summarise the plan:

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../2020/09/Leaflet.pdf>

Comments can be made in the following ways:

By completing the online questionnaire available at... MSG Online Response Form:

<https://docs.google.com/.../1FAIpQLSeaP.../viewform>

By completing the feedback form and either printing it and returning a hard copy to us or emailing it (if you want to do this rather than complete the online questionnaire)

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../09/Response-form.pdf>

(A version in Word format is also available from the Parish Council Website)

By email to: msgclerk@aol.com

By letter to: Middleton St George Parish Council, 5 Whitebridge Drive, Darlington Whitebridge Drive, Darlington, DL1 3TY; DL1 3TY

Any person or organisation may comment on the plan.

All comments must be received by the Parish Council no later than 12 noon on 23 November 2020.

All comments will be publicly available and will be considered by the Parish Council in producing the final plan which will then be submitted to Darlington Borough Council for independent examination.

Thank you.

(28th October 2020 – posted on Parish Council Facebook Page):

Middleton St George Parish Council

Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation on the Pre-Submission Draft Middleton St George

Neighbourhood Plan

A reminder that we are currently consulting the residents of MSG parish for your views.

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan/>

For example:

Policy MSG4 proposes settlement boundaries for Middleton St George, Middleton One Row and Oak Tree – these are illustrated on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Policy MSG5 seeks to protect and where practical improve and extend the green infrastructure network within the parish. The existing green infrastructure network is shown on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Middleton St George Parish Council has prepared a draft neighbourhood development plan for the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Area. The plan proposes a number of planning policies which, once adopted, must be used in the determination of planning applications within the parish.

In accordance with the planning regulations, the Parish Council is required to publicise the draft plan and invite comments. The plan and supporting documents will be available for feedback for eight weeks commencing on 28 September 2020 and ending at 12 noon on 23 November 2020.

The draft plan can be viewed below:

Draft Plan – <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-Plan...>

Draft Policies Map –

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-policies-map...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-policies-map...>

The draft plan has been informed by the following background papers and supporting documents which are also available for comment:

Settlement Boundary –

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Settlement-boundary...>

Design Guide – Please note the file is large and has had to be split:

http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Design-Guide1_Part1...

http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Design-Guide1_Part2...

Local Green Space and Protected Open Space – Background Paper Please note the file is large and has had to be split

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

Local Green Space and Protected Open Space –Map:

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../09/LGS-and-POS-Map.pdf>

Housing needs assessment:

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Housing-needs...>

A leaflet has been distributed to all residents of the parish to summarise the plan:

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../2020/09/Leaflet.pdf>

Comments can be made in the following ways:

By completing the online questionnaire available at... MSG Online Response Form:

<https://docs.google.com/.../1FAIpQLSeaP.../viewform>

By completing the feedback form and either printing it and returning a hard copy to us or emailing it (if you want to do this rather than complete the online questionnaire)

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../09/Response-form.pdf>

(A version in Word format is also available from the Parish Council Website)

By email to: msgclerk@aol.com

By letter to: Middleton St George Parish Council, 5 Whitebridge Drive, Darlington Whitebridge Drive, Darlington, DL1 3TY; DL1 3TY

Any person or organisation may comment on the plan.

All comments must be received by the Parish Council no later than 12 noon on 23 November 2020.

All comments will be publicly available and will be considered by the Parish Council in producing the final plan which will then be submitted to Darlington Borough Council for independent examination.

Thank you.

(6th November 2020 – posted on Parish Council Facebook Page):

Middleton St George Parish Council

With the month of lockdown, now is a good time to check out the draft Neighbourhood Plan (the Pre-Submission Draft) and submit your comments.

Consultation is open until noon on 23rd November.

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan/>

The Parish Council are hoping to protect as much of the village as possible.

For example:

Policy MSG4 proposes settlement boundaries for Middleton St George, Middleton One Row and Oak Tree – these are illustrated on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Policy MSG5 seeks to protect and where practical improve and extend the green infrastructure network within the parish. The existing green infrastructure network is shown on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Middleton St George Parish Council has prepared a draft neighbourhood development plan for the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Area. The plan proposes a number of planning policies which, once adopted, must be used in the determination of planning applications within the parish.

In accordance with the planning regulations, the Parish Council is required to publicise the draft plan and invite comments. The plan and supporting documents will be available for feedback for eight weeks commencing on 28 September 2020 and ending at 12 noon on 23 November 2020.

The draft plan can be viewed below:

Draft Plan – <http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-Plan...>

Draft Policies Map –

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-policies-map...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Draft-policies-map...>

The draft plan has been informed by the following background papers and supporting documents which are also available for comment:

Settlement Boundary –

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Settlement-boundary...>

Design Guide – Please note the file is large and has had to be split:

http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Design-Guide1_Part1...

http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Design-Guide1_Part2...

Local Green Space and Protected Open Space – Background Paper Please note the file is large and has had to be split

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../LGS-and-POS-Paper...>

Local Green Space and Protected Open Space –Map:

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../09/LGS-and-POS-Map.pdf>

Housing needs assessment:

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../Housing-needs...>

A leaflet has been distributed to all residents of the parish to summarise the plan:

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../2020/09/Leaflet.pdf>

Comments can be made in the following ways:

By completing the online questionnaire available at... MSG Online Response Form:

<https://docs.google.com/.../1FAIpQLSeaP.../viewform>

By completing the feedback form and either printing it and returning a hard copy to us or emailing it (if you want to do this rather than complete the online questionnaire)

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/.../09/Response-form.pdf>

(A version in Word format is also available from the Parish Council Website)

By email to: msgclerk@aol.com

By letter to: Middleton St George Parish Council, 5 Whitebridge Drive, Darlington Whitebridge Drive, Darlington, DL1 3TY; DL1 3TY

Any person or organisation may comment on the plan.

All comments must be received by the Parish Council no later than 12 noon on 23 November 2020. All comments will be publicly available and will be considered by the Parish Council in producing the final plan which will then be submitted to Darlington Borough Council for independent examination. Thank you.

12th November – Listing on Parish Council Website as Facebook “Online Event”

(21st November 2020 – posted on Parish Council Facebook Page):

Middleton St George Parish Council

Favourites · 21 November 2020 ·

LAST CHANCE TO RESPOND TO THIS CONSULTATION!

(Consultation ends on Monday 23rd November)

Go to the Neighbourhood Plan page on the Parish Council website, read the documents, and complete the survey/questionnaire.

<http://middleton-st-george.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan/>

Many thanks!

Appendix 10 Response form



Pre-Submission Draft Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan Response Form

You can use this response form to provide feedback on the Pre-Submission Draft Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan. If you have any questions, please contact the parish council by email msgclerk@aol.com or phoning 07722705008.

1. Do you agree with the key issues for the plan to address, identified in section 2 of the draft plan?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on the key issues, please add them below.

2. Do you agree with the vision and objectives for the plan, set out within section 3 of the draft plan?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on the vision and objectives, please add them below.

3. Policy MSG1 includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development and identifies a number of criteria against which all planning applications will be considered. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG1, please add them below.



**Middleton St George
Parish**

4. A design vision and a number of design aims for the parish were developed as part of the design code work. Do you agree with the design vision and aims?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on the design aims, please add them below.

5. Policy MSG2 requires new development to conserve local distinctiveness and identifies a number criteria against which new development will be considered. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG2, please add them below.

6. Policy MSG3 supports development which embeds sustainable design and construction and identifies a number of principles for consideration as part of the assessment of applications. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG3, please add them below.

7. Policy MSG4 proposes settlement boundaries for Middleton St George, Middleton One Row and Oak Tree – these are illustrated on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG4, please add them below.



8. Policy MSG5 seeks to protect and where practical improve and extend the green infrastructure network within the parish. The existing green infrastructure network is shown on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG5, please add them below.

9. Policy MSG6 proposes a green wedge between Middleton St George and Middleton One Row. This is illustrated on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG6, please add them below.

10. Policy MSG7 seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG7, please add them below.

11. Policy MSG8 identifies 18 sites to be protected as local green space. These are illustrated on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG8, please add them below.



12. Policy MSG9 includes 8 sites to be identified as protected open space. These are illustrated on the policies map. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG9, please add them below.

13. Policy MSG10 seeks to protect the significance of heritage assets that could be impacted from development. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG10, please add them below.

14. Policy MSG11 seeks to ensure that a range and choice of housing is available to meet identified local needs. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG11, please add them below.

15. Policy MSG12 requires all new housing development that contains ten or more units to contribute to the provision of affordable housing. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG12, please add them below.



16. Policy MSG13 supports proposals to enhance the provision of community services and facilities as well as resisting the loss of existing facilities. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG13, please add them below.

17. Policy MSG14 seeks to protect the three allotment sites within the parish. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG14, please add them below.

18. Policy MSG15 requires new development to provide or contribute to infrastructure requirements that are related to them. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG15, please add them below.

19. Policy MSG16 supports development proposals to create new and protect existing jobs. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG16, please add them below.



20. Policy MSG17 supports the development of new visitor attractions and leisure facilities, as well as supporting existing attractions and facilities. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG17, please add them below.

21. Policy MSG18 requires new development to: provide safe access, not significantly impact on traffic flows and make satisfactory parking provision. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG18, please add them below.

22. Policy MSG19 supports proposals to improve or extend the walking and cycling network within the parish. Do you support the draft policy?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If you have any comments on policy MSG19, please add them below.

23. Annex 1 to the plan identifies a number of community actions for the parish council to deliver. If you have any comments on the proposed community actions, please add them below.



24. If you have any other comments on the plan or its supporting documents, please add them below.

Contact details

Name:

Address:

Email:

Any personal data supplied will only be used in relation to the preparation of the neighbourhood plan and will be maintained in accordance with the data protection regulations and the parish council's privacy policy which is available at <https://middleton-st-george.org.uk/parish-council/documents/>

Completed response forms must be received by 23 November 2020.

Please send completed response forms to: Middleton St George Parish Council, 5 Whitebridge Drive, Darlington, DL1 3TY; or by email to: msgclerk@aol.com.

An online version of this form is available on the parish council website: middleton-st-george.org.uk/neighbourhood-plan/

Thank you for taking the time to give us your comments on the draft plan.

Appendix 11: Pre-Submission engagement – comments and response

Written responses to Pre-Submission Draft Plan

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Darlington Association on Disability	General	<p>I have look through the plan and I am concerned that there is no mention of Part M cottagey housing. Affordable housing is mentioned in many places in the plan but not housing for disabled people. Owing to a lot of local plans showing low percentages of category 2 and 3 housing for disabled people the government is now consulting on should they make all new housing a minimum of category 2.</p> <p>In fact there is very little in the plan to benefit disabled people apart from in play areas, even this is scant. For example play areas need to be more than just accessible to disabled children the need to be accessible for disabled adults accompanying none disabled children is just as important.</p> <p>There are other areas in the plan like where shared spaces is mentioned, it stipulates a minimum kerb height. This shows a great lack of understanding meeting the needs of all disabled people, especially when need clash. Instead of these little disability snippets it would be a lot better to have overarching commitments to follow standers set out in relevant guidance like 'Inclusive Mobility', and to work with local disability organisations to meet local disabled people's needs.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The scope of policies within neighbourhood plans are defined by the body preparing the plan. In identifying the scope of the plan, the parish council has considered current national and local requirements that are in place as well as the emerging Darlington local plan. The parish council does not believe that the inclusion of a specific policy within the plan on the provision of housing for those with disabilities would add anything that is not already required by national and local planning policies.</p> <p>However, the vision and objectives do state that accessible local facilities will be provided to its communities. Policy MSG2: Design, which will apply to all development proposals, requires new development to be accessible and well-connected, meeting the needs of its users. Requirement M1 within the design code (annex 2 to the plan), requires streets to be improved for wheelchair users and mobility scooters.</p> <p>Policy MSG5: Green Infrastructure, seeks to ensure that there is improved access to green infrastructure. In addition, community action 3 – play area improvements, makes reference to enhancing facilities for 'people' with disabilities, there is no suggestion that this is only for children.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Healthwatch Darlington	General	Thank you for sending the MSG Neighbourhood plan which I read with interest and I'm pleased to see there is much emphasis on community wellbeing in the plans.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Elizabeth Dickson - resident	General	<p>Read leaflet with interest. I seem to remember each household in the parish being charged a one-off fee of £9 some years ago for production of an earlier plan! This plan was to be subsumed into the DBC plan, which did not exist!! Hence the local plan fell by the wayside!! Why is this latest plan any different, other than so far there has been no precept on our Council Tax!</p> <p>Given the amount of building in the village and the number of planning applications approved, I think the boat may have sailed on this one!! However, if you can prevent further development of the village, all power to your elbow!!</p>	Noted, no amendments required. The previous draft neighbourhood plan was prepared by the former Middleton St George Parish Council that was in place prior to boundary changes in 2016. The work on the preparation of this neighbourhood plan is being funded by a government grant. The parish council fully acknowledges the level of development that has taken place in recent years. The plan proposes a positive policy approach to manage new development over the period to 2036.
The Coal Authority	General	Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above. Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.	Noted, no amendments required.
Sadberge Parish Council	General	I have reviewed the Middleton St George Parish Council's Neighbourhood Development Plan. The only comment I have is to compliment the Plan. It is well composed and covers all relevant issues. Well done to all involved in its production.	Support welcomed; no amendments required
National Grid	General	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>National Grid provides information in relation to its assets at the website below.</p>	Noted, no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/	
Historic England	General	Historic England is keen to ensure protection of the historic environment is appropriately taken into account in neighbourhood plans. Having reviewed the information provided in correspondence of 29 September 2020, I would like to congratulate the Parish Council on the draft neighbourhood plan and the great amount of work which has clearly gone into its preparation. In general, it is a very good plan.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Darlington Borough Council	General	I have undertaken a review of the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Pre-Submission Draft and the associated evidence base documents. It is noted that draft policies in the NP are thematic and generally reiterate national policy with a criteria based approach. A number of the principles within these policies are also set out within the existing development plan for Darlington and the emerging Local Plan. Repeating national and local policy does not give them any additional weight but there is no issue in doing this.	Noted, no amendments required.
David Darling - Resident	General	This has obviously taken a lot of time and investment by the local Parish Councillors and for this I thank them.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Miller Homes	General	Miller Homes have an interest in land located to the north of Station Road which has, in part, been assessed within Darlington Borough Council's HELAA (site ref. 090) as being suitable, available and developable within the 6-10 year period with an indicative yield of 109 dwellings. The land located further to the south is also considered by Miller Homes to have longer term potential.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		Overall, Miller Homes support the Neighbourhood Plan process and the Middleton St George Residents in preparing this plan. Miller Homes provide comments to the Neighbourhood Plan in the interest of working together with local residents of Middleton St George to help find the plan sound (?) and ensure that this Neighbourhood Plan is implemented in the future.	
Story Homes	General	<p>These representations are made in the context of Story Homes' land interests in Middleton St George, Land at Station Road, which extends to approximately 13.9 hectares. The Middleton St George Parish Council should be aware of Story Homes interests within the settlement given our involvement with the development at Paddocks View and also the live planning application relating to Land at Station Road (application reference: 16/00976/OUT).</p> <p>Story Homes have not previously been involved in the preparation of the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan, however, believe that it is important to be actively engaged in the plan making process wherever it is suitable and relevant to do so. It is noted that involvement at this stage is of significant importance given that the emerging Darlington Local Plan is expected to be submitted to the Secretary of State imminently and this Neighbourhood Plan will become part of the Development Framework with which future applications are assessed against. This Neighbourhood Plan should be made in accordance with said emerging Local Plan and should not be made prematurely.</p> <p>Story Homes is generally supportive of the proposals set out in the Pre-Submission draft Neighbourhood Plan, we do, however, have some concerns relating to the content of the</p>	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents. These representations seek to clearly outline said concerns and recommendations to align the Neighbourhood Plan with adopted National and local policy, in addition to the emerging Darlington Local Plan.	
Middleton Hall Retirement Village	General	The Neighbourhood plan is an extremely thorough and impressive series of documents.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
A Gunnell - resident	General	<p>It is unclear how this is a plan, in the sense that a plan sets out how something will be achieved. Normally it would contain actions, resources and timescales. This plan uses 'identifies' on six occasions, 'requires' on six more, 'highlights' once, 'proposes' on two occasions, 'seeks' once, 'supports' three times and 'protects' twice. Therefore, of the nineteen policies only 2 have 'action verbs' – the two protect policies, MSG 14 and 19.</p> <p>The consequence is that the document becomes a wish-list with no reference to what may be possible or what is required to achieve the objectives. This is important as planning in the village over the most recent 10 or so years has demonstrated that the opinion of residents counts for little, if anything, and development does not have to be conditional.</p> <p>A true vision would set out how the village would look, size, make-up, facilities that would exist, what would not be permitted and why a plan would provide "enhancement for future generations".</p>	Noted, no amendments required. Section 1 of the draft plan explains the background to neighbourhood planning and their role as part of the development plan. Planning policies are implemented through decisions on planning applications. The success, or otherwise of the policies contained within it, will be monitored by the parish council.
Friends of the Stockton and Darlington Railway	Paragraph 2.1	Amend Stockton to Darlington Railway to Stockton <u>and</u> Darlington Railway	Comments noted, amend as suggested.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Paul Foster - resident	Paragraph 2.5	First sentence: should 'high' be 'higher'? otherwise the sentence makes no sense ?? Also, Table 1 is confusing: the figures don't seem to relate to the description above. Have you put MSG'S figures in the wrong columns?	Comments noted, amend to ensure clarity.
David Darling - Resident	Paragraphs 2.4-2.7	<p>Sadly, the data obtained, and only from the 2011 Census, highlights a range of proposals which by the very nature of the data source, is out of date. I would have thought that the 2021 Census would be more up to date even taking into account the 2023 availability? Many of the figures provided then would reflect a better position if they had. Why was the decision taken for this report to be done now rather than wait for better data?</p> <p>Housing has increased substantially and linked with this of course is the village population. 2011 Census tells us that it was 4337 but given the changes seen since even 2018, the best guess estimate must be closer to 7000 with a substantial increase in houses.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The census information is a relevant consideration for the neighbourhood plan. It would not be appropriate to delay development of the plan until the 2021 census. Whilst the census may occur within 2021, data from it takes a long time to be released.</p> <p>The emerging neighbourhood plan fully acknowledges that the population of the plan area has grown significantly since the last census.</p>
David Darling - Resident	Paragraph 2.8	Mentions 3 public houses when in fact the Fighting Cocks (Platform 1) is no longer open.	Noted, no amendments required. Platform 1 is still open; its future is however threatened and has been nominated as an asset of community value and there is a village community group to ensure its future.
David Darling - Resident	Paragraph 2.15	<p>How do you know that currently there is a lack of affordable housing and what is the financial definition of such? Again, if taken from the 2011 Census, now very much out of date.</p> <p>Traffic levels/highway safety are already currently out of date and increasing this must mean a review of the vehicle speeds through the village. 20mph should be considered mandatory.</p>	Noted, no amendments required. The housing needs assessment provides up to date information on the need for affordable housing. Paragraph 2.15 provides a summary of the issues the local community highlighted were of concern.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Teesside International Airport	Paragraph 2.15	<p>Paragraph 2.15 of the Neighbourhood Plan sets out some important issues for the Neighbourhood Plan to look to address including amongst others, the impact of new housing on the character of the area, the need to protect important open spaces from development and importance of the natural and built environment. No reference is made in relation to the airport and whilst we note that the airport falls outside of the designated boundary, it does play a vital role within the parish and indeed on any future development. On this basis, the protection of the airport is required to be noted as a key issue.</p> <p>Required Change 1: Page 9, paragraph 2.15, insert the following additional bullet point;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to protect Teesside International Airport to ensure future aviation and economic growth. 	Noted, no amendments required. Paragraph 2.15 provides a summary of the issues the local community highlighted were of concern.
T Bingley - resident	Paragraph 2.15	Agree with key issues, however too much insensitive development has already been allowed.	Noted, no amendments required. Paragraph 2.15 provides a summary of the issues the local community highlighted were of concern.
H M Bullock - resident	Paragraph 2.15	Support the key issues	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks – resident	Paragraph 2.15	Support the key issues	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock – resident	Paragraph 2.15	Support the key issues	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baum – resident	Paragraph 2.15	Many of the aims which it is intended will be addressed within the plan period should have been addressed before significant development within the village had been allowed. This has certainly had a detrimental effect in the short term	Noted, no amendments required. MSGPC agree that these matters should have been addressed, however it is not possible to retrospectively require development that has been allowed/ constructed to address these matters.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		on village life and infrastructure issues in particular need to be addressed as a priority to prevent this damage becoming more permanent.	
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Paragraph 2.15	Support the key issues	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Paragraph 2.15	Support the key issues	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball - resident	Paragraph 2.15	<p>Support the key issues.</p> <p>1.Improving connectivity should be a key issue - the village is very poorly served by bus services with only a daytime infrequent service to Darlington and no service to the wider tees valley area, particularly Yarm area, Stockton, Middlesbrough.</p> <p>2. Traffic issues in the village centre are also an increasing problem that the plan could focus on - Middleton Lane has 2 bad junctions where it meets Neasham Road and also at Yarm road junction. The Lane has heavy vehicle Traffic and is also used by horseriders and cyclists.</p> <p>3.Improving facilities to provide a range of activities for children and young people is important - at present there is one small park with a limited range of equipment that is used by everyone from toddlers to teenagers.</p>	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. Connectivity is identified as one of the four objectives of the plan, with both planning policies and community actions identified to enhance it. This objective also covers traffic issues. The second objective, community well-being seeks to ensure that the local community have access to services, infrastructure and facilities that they need – there are also planning policies and community actions to support the delivery of this objective.
Paul Foster - resident	Paragraph 2.15	Support the key issues	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Ruth Sansom - resident	Vision and objectives	Well done and thank you for your work to create our Parish Plan. The vision and objectives are very desirable but I’m not sure they are realistic.	Support welcomed and comments noted, no amendments required. In response to the points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft policy MSG12 requires all new residential development of ten or more open market

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current building regulations should include affordable housing on the sites, but that is not the case. • I understood all new buildings should be 'green', but where is the evidence? • The lighting on these sites is intrusive and unnecessary. • The condition of the roads and pavements has been seriously damaged. • Yes to your ideals, but how much weight will they carry? 	<p>residential dwellings or sites of 0.5ha or more to contribute to the provision of affordable housing where there is an identified need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building regulations address the standard of energy efficiency in new buildings and neighbourhood plans can provide further guidance to seek to ensure that energy efficiency considerations have guided the design process. • Draft policy MSG2 seeks to ensure that new development will not prejudice residential amenity – this would include the impact of lighting. • Community actions 6 and 7 refer to seeking to improve the condition of roads and pavements. • Neighbourhood plans are part of the development plan. Therefore, planning applications must be determined in accordance with the policies within them, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
Historic England	Vision	<p>We welcome the inclusion of the historic environment within the vision of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, we would suggest rephrasing the third paragraph as currently the historic character and the environmental character are split. Instead we would recommend the use of historic and natural environment to differentiate between the two.</p> <p>Amend third paragraph to read: “The important historic and natural environmental character of the area will have been maintained and enhanced for future generations by ensuring new development is of an appropriate scale and design.”</p>	Comments noted, amend to ensure clarity.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
A Gunnell - resident	Vision	The vision speaks of “improvements to the local environment and the management of traffic”, yet not a single policy refers to management of traffic beyond where it is linked to new development.	Noted, no amendments required. The planning policies within the neighbourhood plan can only manage issues that relate to development proposals. Community action 1 does also relate to highway safety and traffic management.
H M Bullock - resident	Vision and objectives	Support the vision	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock – resident	Vision and objectives	Support the vision	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks – resident	Vision and objectives	Support the vision	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Miller Homes	Vision and objectives	Overall, we support the aims and visions of the Neighbourhood Plan, however, our key recommendation would be that the Neighbourhood Plan should not restrict development outside of the settlement boundary limits that would otherwise be supported by the Local Plan and National Policies from coming forward during the plan period.	Support welcomed and comments; no amendments required. The use of settlement boundaries is an established tool in guiding the location of new development. MSGPC consider that the proposed settlement boundaries will support the sustainable growth of the parish and protect the open countryside from unsuitable development in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.
T Bingley - resident	Vision and objectives	Generally agree, but ‘accessible local facilities’ can be taken to mean many things – i.e. places of work, industrial units etc. Need to define what these facilities are limited too otherwise it will ruin the nature of village life.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. Paragraph 5.9 of the draft plan explains that community facilities are identified in the national planning policy framework as: local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship. These facilities enhance the sustainability of local communities and residential environments.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Mike Baum - resident	Vision and objectives	Many of the objectives are laudable aims and it will be interesting to see the detail on the plans in each individual area. If these are to be successful, this will involve significantly greater ambition and support from DBC. If the recent repair to Archer Road in MOR is a measure of this support, we would have significant concerns about the achievement of these aims for MSG. Councillors should try and learn from their colleagues in Stockton when it comes to creating and maintaining infrastructure as historic issues such as the development of Ingleby Barwick before the right infrastructure was in place has been learnt from and it appears has been replaced by a more long term view.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Vision and objectives	Support the vision. I would like to see some shops being build such as a co-op this will generate jobs and help the town since its expanding.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. Policy MSG13 would support the development of new community services and facilities.
P Bullock - resident	Vision and objectives	Support the vision	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball - resident	Vision and objectives	Support the vision. The Parish council is to be congratulated for producing a comprehensive vision for the Village going forward.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Vision and objectives	Support the vision	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
A Gunnell - resident	Objectives	As stated above 17 of 19 objectives could be achieved without significant change to planning/development to date. Even worse, some objectives, e.g. MSG 16, could be implemented vigorously and have little or no positive impact.	Noted, no amendments required. The draft plan contains four objectives which flow from the vision. They then inform the structure of the plan and the scope of the planning policies. The purpose of policy MSG16 is to support planning proposals which would result in the creation or protection of jobs, as well as the sustainable development and economic growth of the area, but only

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
			where the proposals can be delivered without significant impact on the built and natural environment and residential amenity. The parish council does not agree that this policy approach will have little or no positive impact.
Historic England	Objective 1	Historic England supports the wording of this objective in the context of new development making a positive contribution to the historic environment of the area.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Environment Agency	Objective 1	We still consider there should be an objective solely in respect to environmental improvement. This will tie to improvements to quality of life for residents and the concept of improving connectivity should extend beyond traffic management but also toward protecting and enhancing wildlife connectivity. An objective could be to ensure that development does not further fragment habitat particularly along strategic river corridors such as the Tees or Lustrum Beck.	Noted, no amendments required. MSGPC consider that objective 1, which seeks to ensure that new development contributes positively to the natural environment of the area is appropriate.
Teesside International Airport	Objective 3	The Plan goes on to set out a number of objectives at paragraph 3.2 and objective 3 relates to supporting a sustainable economy. Reference should again be made to include the vital operations at the airport which should be protected and promoted. Required Change 2 - Page 10, paragraph 3.2, objective 3, insert the following requirement; d) Supporting and protecting the operations at the airport including growth opportunities.	Noted, no amendments required. The airport is a strategic matter, therefore is excluded from the plan. The emerging Darlington Local Plan includes policies that will protect and promote airport operations.
Historic England	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	Historic England supports criteria d. of this policy which will help ensure new development protects or enhances the historic environment.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Gladman	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	<p>Gladman support the presumption in favour of sustainable development as outlined in this policy. Gladman would like to remind the Qualifying Body that it is not in the remit of the neighbourhood plan to determine planning applications as this is the sole responsibility of the local planning.</p> <p>Policy MSG1 sets out 8 criterion which development must demonstrate to ensure sustainable development. Gladman further reiterate the above point regarding the determination of applications and suggest that the policy wording is amended to state:</p> <p><u>"In seeking to ensure that development is sustainable, the Parish Council would support development which achieves the following principles:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Make efficient and effective use of land, by encouraging the re-use of previously developed land and buildings where possible; b. Minimise the impact and mitigate the likely effects of climate change; c. Minimise any impact on amenity for new and existing residents, business and other land uses in the vicinity of the proposed development; d. Protect or enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings; e. Support the health and well-being of the local community; f. Ensure the quality of biodiversity, as well as the natural and water environment is maintained and enhanced; g. Address contamination or land instability issues; and h. Ensure that all infrastructure necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms is either in place or can be provided prior to the development being brought into use." (Gladman suggested changes) 	<p>Support welcomed and comments noted, no amendments required. It is not suggested that the parish council will determine planning applications. The policies are worded in such a way as to allow them, as part of the development plan to be used by the local planning authority to assess planning applications against.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Teesside International Airport	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	Having regard to the specific policies contained within draft Neighbourhood Plan, policy MSG1 relates to sustainable development and seeks to ensure development is sustainable by demonstrating a number of matters such as minimising the impact of climate change, making efficient use of land, minimise any impact on amenity of surrounding land uses. It is vital that reference is made to the protection of the airport to ensure future sustainability. Required Change 3 Page 11, policy MSG1, insert the following requirement; i) Protect the airport operations and future growth opportunities.	Noted, no amendments required. The airport is a strategic matter, therefore is excluded from the plan. The emerging Darlington Local Plan includes policies that will protect and promote airport operations.
T Bingley - resident	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	Agree with requirement for sustainable development, but the council has already allowed massive unsustainable development. Don't understand why another 700+ houses are planned/ being allowed from permitting housebuilders to line their pockets. There shouldn't be a need for affordable housing in recent developments had included it – instead 3/4/5 bed 'executive' homes of identikit nature have been built everywhere. There is not a need for new housing schemes. The recent developments surely have exceeded many times over the housing needs. There is a need for more open/ green/ accessible space.	Support welcomed and comments; no amendments required. The policies within the neighbourhood plan can not retrospectively apply to developments that have been given planning permission. However, once adopted, as they are part of the development plan, new development will have to accord with them, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. MSGPC are seeking to address those issues identified with the policies contained within the emerging plan.
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	Support the policy. It is absolutely critical to maintain the fabric of the natural, built and historic environments in addition to developing better infrastructure. All of these factors were what attracted us to live in MSG and the removal of the green wedge between the two areas would in our view destroy both the village feel and the distinctly different characters of the two areas.	Support welcomed and comments; no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball - resident	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	'f.' You cannot 'ensure the quality of biodiversity' by allowing ANY development. This is a contradiction in terms. Any chance of biodiversity is wiped out by the actions of developers, who might just view a piece of scrubland as being unimportant, whereas it contains a multitude of interdependent ground feeding birds, small mammals, insects and soil bacteria etc, all of which are destroyed or dispersed.	Noted, no amendments required. Development is defined under the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act as 'the carrying out of building, engineering, mining or other operation in, on, over or under land, or the making of any material change in the use of any building or other land'. In accordance with national planning policy, the policy supports development, which is not just the construction of new housing, where it protects and enhances

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
			biodiversity. The policy reflects national policy and guidance.
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG1: Sustainable development	How can it be necessary in 2021 to identify a preference for developing brownfield in advance of greenfield?	Noted, no amendments required. National planning policy is clear that new development should support the re-use of brownfield land as much as possible.
David Darling - resident	Design vision	The design vision should not place too much emphasis on “for people not cars” as both are important to the residents of the village.	Noted, no amendments required. MSGPC consider the design vision is balanced.
H M Bullock – resident	Design vision	Support the vision.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock – resident	Design vision	Support the vision.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks – resident	Design vision	Support the vision.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Design vision	<p>Agree development should be in keeping with local distinctiveness – but this hasn’t been the case for recent development.</p> <p>If two of the main aims of this vision, namely to ensure any development is locally distinctive and appropriate, are achieved then we are confident that this would be a success for the village. It would be good to know what the Parish Council consider appropriate but, this would need to in line with the current feel and fabric of the villages.</p>	Support welcomed; no amendments required. MSGPC agree that it is essential that new development reflects the local character of the parish.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Design vision	Support the vision.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
P Bullock – resident	Design vision	Support the vision.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Design vision	Support the vision.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster – resident	Design vision	Support the vision.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Historic England	Design aims	Historic England supports the wording of the design objectives.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Albert Hill Properties	Policy MSG2: Design	<p>The above policy sets out 12 design criteria against which proposals for development will be assessed. It states that development should accord with the requirements of the Middleton St George Design Code at Annex 2 of the draft Plan. In order to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan reflects the latest available evidence, we suggest the following wording is added to the policy text ‘or any future revisions’.</p> <p>Whilst the importance of high-quality design is recognised, planning policies and the documents supporting them should not be overly prescriptive and contain sufficient flexibility in order for schemes to respond to sites specifics and the character of the local area. There will not be a ‘one size fits all’ solution in relation to design and sites should be considered on a site-by-site basis with consideration given to various design principles.</p> <p>Secondly, we do not consider that sufficient detail is provided in the policy or supporting text so as to allow the policy to be applied consistently by decision makers. For instance, the policy requires that an application demonstrates a commitment to sustainable design that minimises energy use.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. As the design code forms an important element of the neighbourhood plan, should it be revised in the future then this would form part of a review of part of the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>The response seems to contradict itself in that it states that planning policies should not be overly prescriptive then states that insufficient detail has been provided. MSGPC believe that the policy, when read alongside the design code provides sufficient detail to allow it to be used effectively in the development management process.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>There is no specific guidance on how an application can apply this element of the policy and demonstrate such a commitment.</p> <p>It is essential that detail is provided so as to ensure that those submitting applications are fully aware of what is required by the policy.</p>	
Historic England	Policy MSG2: Design	<p>We support the intention of criteria c. with regards the conservation of heritage assets and their setting. However, to strengthen the policy so that where possible opportunities that are available to enhance the historic environment are taken, we consider that criteria c. should be amended.</p> <p>Amend criteria point c. to read “Conserves <u>and where possible</u> enhances the significance of heritage assets and their setting;</p>	Support welcomed, and comments noted, amend as suggested.
Gladman	Policy MSG2: Design	<p>This policy sets out a range of design principles which development proposals should seek to meet. While the government has shown support for development to incorporate good design principles, Gladman would note that the Framework also states:</p> <p>“To provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, plans or supplementary planning documents should use visual tools such as design guides and codes. These provide a framework for creating distinctive places, with a consistent and high-quality standard of design. However, their level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances in each place and should allow a suitable degree of variety where this would be justified.”</p> <p>Whilst Gladman recognise the importance of high-quality design, in accordance with the requirements of the</p>	Noted, no amendments required. MSGPC believe that the design code, which was prepared by a recognised national consultancy through the government’s technical support programme, meets the requirements of the NPPF. It is also considered that policy MSG2 provides an appropriate level of detail to ensure that new development conserves local distinctiveness.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>Framework (above), design policies should not aim to be overly prescriptive.</p> <p>Policies require some flexibility in order for schemes to respond to site specifics and the character of the local area. In essence, there will not be a 'one size fits all' solution in relation to design and sites should be considered on a site by site basis with consideration given to various design principles.</p>	
David Darling - resident	Policy MSG2: Design	(I & J) Both could have an affect with increased development and for the safety of those places occupied, should have better lighting. Many of an older generation welcome lighting especially if they see it as maintaining their security.	Noted, no amendments required. It is considered appropriate to consider the impact of new development on amenity and also that lighting could impact on amenity and wildlife. It is not suggesting that no lighting is included as part of development proposals, only that it does not have a significant effect.
Miller Homes	Policy MSG2: Design	<p>Miller Homes generally support the design principles set out within policy MSG2, however, policy MSG2 further states that new development should accord with the requirements of the Middleton St George Design Code (set out in annex 2).</p> <p>Whilst Miller Homes support the inclusion of policies which seek to achieve the highest standard of design for new development proposals, we consider the use of an inflexible Design Code to be unnecessarily restrictive on new development proposals and may prevent some sites from coming forward. We consider that the Design Code set out within annex 2 should be used a guide rather than something which should be explicitly met and wording should be included within policy MSG2 to this effect.</p>	Support welcomed, and comments noted; no amendments required. MSGPC believe that the design code, which was prepared by a recognised national consultancy through the government's technical support programme, meets the requirements of the NPPF and is not inflexible.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		We would suggest the following wording should be included 'The Design Code set out within annex 2 should be used as a guide for new development proposals and should be incorporated into new schemes where it is possible and feasible to do so' to ensure that such codes do not prevent new development sites from coming forward.	
Story Homes	Policy MSG2: Design	<p>The introduction to the policy suggests that future development should priorities high-quality design which respects and enhances local character and identity. Story Homes shares these values and seeks to incorporate visual distinctiveness and local character where possible and where appropriate.</p> <p>Story Homes raises concerns over the inclusion of a Design Code within the Neighbourhood Plan (as an appended document). Darlington Borough Council currently have an adopted Design SPD, Design of New Development Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2011. This adopted document sufficiently covers all matters pertaining to design in a detailed manner including an analysis of local characteristics present in Middleton St George. It should also be noted that Darlington Borough Council are in the process of preparing a new Design of New Developments SPD, with a timescale for adoption of Summer 2021, which would supersede the current SPD. The principles within the Neighbourhood Plan Design Code align with the adopted SPD. However, due to the anticipated timescales of publication of the revised SPD (Spring 2021) and the adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan (assumed to be Summer 2021) there will be a discord between the emerging guidance and that demonstrated within the NP Design Code. There is a risk that</p>	Support welcomed, and comments noted; no amendments required. MSGPC believe that the design code, which was prepared by a recognised national consultancy through the government's technical support programme, meets the requirements of the NPPF. Whilst the MSG Design Guide makes reference to the adopted Darlington design SPD it does not merely repeat it. The design code element of the guide provides helpful detail to enable new development proposals to respond to local character.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>the Neighbourhood Plan Design Code could be considered out-of-date should it only have regard to the 2011 Design of New Developments SPD.</p> <p>The content of the Neighbourhood Plan Design Code repeats the content of the adopted Design SPD and also the content included within the Neighbourhood Plan itself. This repetition of content between the Neighbourhood Plan Design Code and the adopted Design SPD includes policy on (but not limited to) density and massing, boundary treatments, views and vistas and landscape character and treatment. It is therefore unclear why an additional Design Code is thought necessary to accompany the Neighbourhood Plan. The inclusion of a Design Code within the Neighbourhood Plan provides an unnecessary layer of policy which prospective applications will need to consider.</p> <p>Aside from the repetition, Story Homes is also concerned at the lack of substantial evidence published or referenced to inform the guidance within the Neighbourhood Plan Design Code. For example, guidance surrounding densities indicates that “A density of around 18-40 dwellings per hectare (DpH)11” should be applied to the Middleton St George locality. However, there are no references to evidence which has been used as the basis for this suggestion. Whilst it is acknowledged that increased density can form a crucial part of sustainable development, it should also be clearly evidenced as stated in paragraph 123 of the NPPF (2019). Should the Design Code be retained, with repetition removed, detailed references to evidence bases will need to be made in order to be considered robust. Basic Conditions Test: Story Homes considers that the Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet the basic conditions test because: d) the making of the</p>	

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development:</p> <p>The Design Code appended to the Neighbourhood Plan does not provide any substantial additional guidance which is not already included within both the Neighbourhood Plan and the adopted Design SPD (July 2011). The Design Guide, in its current form, does not meet basic conditions test, it will not enable a more sustainable form of development which responds to local character to come forward, than would have been brought forward under adopted policy.</p> <p>Recommendation: It is considered preferable for the Design Code to be omitted from the Neighbourhood Plan, however, if the Parish Council think it necessary to retain there should be a deletion of repetitive policies across both the Neighbourhood Plan and the Design Code. There should also be more detailed consideration given to the matters dealt with in the already adopted Design SPD to ensure repetition is avoided. Any detailed design policies included within the Neighbourhood Plan Design Code should be suitable evidenced so as to not compromise the effectiveness of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG2: Design	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock – resident	Policy MSG2: Design	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks – resident	Policy MSG2: Design	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG2: Design	Support the policy. This will require courage from both DBC and the Parish Council to deter outside developers 'steamrolling' the planning process as has been achieved thus far with the proposed development just off Middleton Lane in the heart of the green wedge.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG2: Design	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG2: Design	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball - resident	Policy MSG2: Design	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG2: Design	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG2: Design	What is the “character of the area”. Is it the original or modern character? If not clearly stated how can it be conserved and how would we know?	Noted, no amendments required. As explained within paragraph 4.4 of the draft plan, the design guide explains the evolution of the settlement pattern of the parish, describes movement and streets, landscape and heritage, neighbourhood structure as well as its built form and character. It will be a key tool to be used to inform decisions on planning applications.
Albert Hill Properties	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy	Policy MSG3 requires development proposals to embed a commitment to sustainable design and construction in order to be afforded support. Neighbourhood Plans should not apply any additional technical standards relating to the construction of new homes and indeed optional technical standards should only be implemented through a Local Plan based on a clear and up-to-date assessment of need.	Comments noted, amend to clarify that the policy is not looking to apply additional technical standards, it is providing guidance on how new development can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions, in accordance with paragraph 150 of the NPPF.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>Neighbourhood Plans should not be used to apply any new standards relating to energy efficiency.</p> <p>It is noted that policy MSG3 seeks to apply additional technical standard's above and beyond those set out in Policy DC1 of the pre-submission version of Darlington's emerging Local Plan and accordingly it is considered that policy MSG3 requires some revision.</p>	
Gladman	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy	<p>While Gladman recognise the importance for planning for renewable energy measures and sustainable design, the response to MSG2 is reiterated. MSG3 is more restrictive than national policy and should provide further flexibility to allow for site specifics and local character.</p> <p>The Qualifying Body should review this policy in detail to make sure its requirements are not already covered by other legislation such as Building Regulations and/or policies already in the Local Plan.</p> <p>In many instances there are no 'baseline' figures to measure against in this policy and as such, and noted above, much of this is already covered in Building Regulations requirements, principally in Part G and Part L.</p>	Comments noted, amend to ensure clarity that the policy is identifying criteria to seek to ensure that new development can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
David Darling - resident	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy	I see this as being an extremely difficult project to manage.	Noted, no amendments required. This is not a specific project, the requirements of the policy would be considered as part of the assessment of planning applications.
T Bingley - resident	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy	Agree that design should be sustainable and carbon neutral. This needs to be applied to all current developments, but will	Support welcomed, and comments noted; no amendments required. It is not possible to apply planning policies retrospectively to developments that have been

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	efficiency and renewable energy	be difficult to get house builders to do, as government has pushed it back to 2025 nationally.	approved. National planning policy requires new development to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and there are national technical standards for the sustainability of buildings.
Story Homes	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy	<p>Story Homes supports the Parish Council in the focus upon sustainable development and renewable technologies. This is becoming a more prevalent policy focus across the UK as more and more Climate Emergencies are made by Local Authorities and, more generally, the importance of sustainability is becoming more widespread and acknowledged. This is recognised by Story Homes as being a key theme throughout the Neighbourhood Plan, one which is mirrored in our planning, development and engagement.</p> <p>Story Homes ensure that all development is not only compliant with Building Regulation standards on energy efficiency but seeks to exceed this where possible. We seek to enhance and protect the environment through the efficient use of materials, energy and water. In addition, we also ensure a reduction in waste and can demonstrate high percentages of construction material being diverted from landfill.</p> <p>Whilst Story Homes support draft Policy MSG3, there should be consistency between this draft policy and current Building Regulations. Although the Neighbourhood Plan can encourage development to exceed adopted standards, it will be for Building Regulations to set a level of compliance, not the Neighbourhood Plan. Should the Neighbourhood Plan wish to retain this policy there should be a degree of consideration given to viability implications, this will need to</p>	Support is welcomed and comments noted, amend to ensure clarity that the policy is identifying criteria to seek to ensure that new development can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It is not trying to create new technical standards.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		be evidenced, in order to understand any implications on delivery the policy may have.	
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	efficiency and renewable energy		
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball - resident	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG3: Embedding energy efficiency and renewable energy	I strongly agree with this. Any further development MUST be of 'passivhaus' standard to mitigate and make a real contribution to averting the climate catastrophe we are facing. To expand on the points made in MSG3, the technology should include ground heat pumps, solar panels and possibly a wind turbine, among other solutions. The reduction in cost of living to the occupants will be immense, and all of these are far less expensive to fit to newbuild rather than retrofit. If it could be done at Middleton Hall, then there is no reason why it can't be the village standard. It would certainly discourage the greediest of developers from applying.	Support welcomed comments noted; amend supporting text to refer to issues identified in response, many of which can be installed under permitted development rights. It is not possible to require all properties to be constructed to passivhaus standards
Albert Hill Properties	Policy MSG4: General	As detailed in policy MSG4, development will be focused within the define settlement boundaries of Middleton St	Noted, no amendments required. The use of settlement boundaries is an established tool in guiding the location of

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	location of new development	<p>George, Middleton One Row and Oak Tree. Development outside the settlement boundary will be limited to that which accords with 6 criteria set out in the policy.</p> <p>We do not support the use of settlement boundaries if they are used to preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Framework is clear in stating that sustainable development should proceed without delay. Use of such settlement boundaries to arbitrarily limit suitable development on the edge of settlements does not accord with the positive approach required by the Framework and is contrary to Basic Condition (a) and (d).</p> <p>As currently drafted, policy MSG4 is considered to apply an overly restrictive approach and provides very limited flexibility that would allow the Neighbourhood Plan to respond positively to changing circumstances.</p>	<p>new development. MSGPC consider that the proposed settlement boundaries will support the sustainable growth of the parish and protect the open countryside from unsuitable development in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.</p>
Gladman	Policy MSG4: General location of new development	<p>Policy MSG4 supports the focus of new development within the settlement boundaries of Middleton St George, Middleton One Row and Oak Tree. Several scenarios are listed whereby new development outside the defined settlement boundaries; however, this fails to account for new major residential developments.</p> <p>Gladman object to the wording of this policy and use of settlement boundaries as an appropriate planning tool where they would preclude otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. Indeed, the use of development limits which arbitrarily restrict suitable development on the edge of settlements does not accord with the positive approach to growth required by the Framework which is clear that development which is considered sustainable should go</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The use of settlement boundaries is an established tool in guiding the location of new development. The policy approach quoted within the Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan is noted but not considered appropriate for the MSG plan. There are many examples of both local and neighbourhood plans that define settlement boundaries. MSGPC consider that the proposed settlement boundaries will support the sustainable growth of the parish and protect the open countryside from unsuitable development in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF. The use of 'or' within the policy means that it does not require all of the criteria a-f to be met in order to be supported.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>ahead without delay in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development. As a result, this approach is also contrary to basic condition (a).</p> <p>Gladman contend that this policy should be worded more flexibly in accordance with Paragraphs 11 and 16(b) of the NPPF (2019) and the requirement for policies to be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change and prepared positively.</p> <p>It is suggested that Policy MSG4 should support development proposals adjacent to the settlement boundaries provided that any adverse impacts do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of development alongside according with other policies of the MSGNP and other development plan policies.</p> <p>Indeed, a flexible policy approach for developments adjacent to a settlement boundary was taken in the examination of the Godmanchester Neighbourhood Plan. Paragraph 4.12 of the Examiner's Report (August 2017) states3:</p> <p>"...Policy GMC1 should be modified to state that "Development ...shall be focused within or adjoining the settlement boundary as identified in the plan." It should be made clear that any new development should be either infill or of a minor or moderate scale, so that the local distinctiveness of the settlement is not compromised. PM2 should be made to achieve this flexibility and ensure regard is had to the NPPF and the promotion of sustainable development. PM2 is also needed to ensure that the GNP will be in general conformity with the aims for new housing development in the Core Strategy and align with similar aims in the emerging Local Plan."</p>	

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>Gladman would suggest this policy is going to prevent sustainable development from coming forward and not allow appropriate flexibility to ensure an appropriate level of housing is delivered for the neighbourhood plan area in supporting the (emerging) Darlington Borough Local Plan.</p> <p>The current wording reads that new development must meet all criterion a-f or criterion g. The Qualifying Body must consider carefully whether this is the intention of the policy, and as above it is likely to prevent nearly all forms of development coming forward and should be amended significantly or deleted.</p>	
Darlington Borough Council	MSG4: General location of new development	It is acknowledged that the neighbourhood plan is being prepared to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the existing Local Plan (Darlington Core Strategy 2011 and saved policies of the Local Plan 1997). The NP has also been informed by the emerging Local Plan policies and evidence base. It is noted in the Settlement Boundary Background Paper that the group does not consider site ref 99 Maxgate Farm, MSG, a suitable location for housing development. The Council has a different view and the site is to be put forward for allocation within the submission version of the Local Plan. The neighbourhood planning group should be mindful that if the Local Plan is adopted following the independent examination, this will potentially make elements of the NP out of date quite quickly.	Noted, no amendments required.
Miller Homes	Policy MSG4: General location of	Policy MSG4 sets out the focus of development across the plan area and seeks to see new development located in the area as defined on the policies map.	Noted, no amendments required. The use of settlement boundaries is an established tool in guiding the location of new development. MSGPC consider that the proposed settlement boundaries will support the sustainable

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	new development	<p>Policy MSG4 further states that new development outside the defined settlement boundaries will be supported where it relates to business, provides local services/community facilities, a visitor attraction, is a single house or conversion. Policy MSG4, therefore, restricts development outside of settlement boundaries to relatively small scale.</p> <p>As stated previously, we consider it prudent to reiterate that the role of the Neighbourhood Plan is not to restrict or prevent sites from coming forward which would be otherwise acceptable in terms of the Local Plan and national planning policy.</p> <p>To be considered sound, we would suggest that the following wording should be included within Policy MSG4 to allow sites which would otherwise be acceptable in terms of the Local Plan and national planning policy to come forward: 'Development outside the defined settlement limits should be only be considered acceptable where it accords with the Statutory Development Plan or with other relevant National or Local planning policy documents'.</p>	growth of the parish and protect the open countryside from unsuitable development in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.
Teesside International Airport	Policy MSG4: General location of new development	It is noted that the focus of development across the plan area will be within the Middleton St George, Middleton One Row and Oak Tree Settlement Boundaries under policy MSG4 as per the plan shown overleaf. Policy MSG4 also sets out instances where development outside of the defined settlement boundaries will be supported including amongst others, growth of existing businesses, visitor attractions, agricultural enterprises, community facilities etc. Whilst the airport does not object to the policy, reference should be made to emphasise the need to understand the risk of proposals near the airport to avoid issues in the future in	Noted, no amendments required. The airport is a strategic matter, therefore is excluded from the plan. The emerging Darlington Local Plan includes policies that will protect and promote airport operations.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>terms of conflict. To resolve this, reference should be made to the need for proposals to outline any potential impacts and be accompanied by supporting justification in relation to mitigation measures. This would be in line with paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states; 'Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and community facilities...existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development (including changes of use) in its vicinity, the applicant (or 'agent of change') should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed'.</p> <p>A key issue for surrounding land uses will be the issue of noise/air quality and appropriate mitigation needs to be considered.</p> <p>Required change 4 - Page 15, Policy MSG4, insert the following requirement; h) Does not have an adverse impact on the operations at the airport or jeopardise future growth opportunities. Where relevant, proposals will be required to outline any potential impacts on the airport and be accompanied by supporting justification in relation to any mitigation measures required to make the development appropriate.</p>	
Story Homes	Policy MSG4: General location of	Story Homes note that the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan does not propose to identify any new locations for residential development and is reliant upon the	Noted, no amendments required. The Darlington Local Plan is not yet at an advanced stage of preparation and there remain significant unresolved objection to matters

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	new development	<p>allocations and designations made through the emerging Darlington Local Plan. It will be through the emerging Darlington Local Plan that strategic policies are determined, including the spatial disaggregation of development across the Borough and the realignment of Green belt boundaries where necessary.</p> <p>It is of concern, that the Neighbourhood Plan does not align with the emerging Darlington Local Plan, which is currently at Submission draft, to be submitted to the Secretary of State imminently. The Neighbourhood Plan does not include, or refer to, the proposed allocations made in the emerging Local Plan nor are these draft allocations depicted on the Policy Maps appended to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As an example, it is clear that the Development Limits shown on both the Neighbourhood Plan Policy Map and the emerging Local Plan Policy map do not align. It should be noted that the Neighbourhood Plan uses the term Settlement Boundary as opposed to Development Limit. Within the Neighbourhood Plan the Development Limit follows the pattern of built development around the settlement, with an inclusion of permitted development. Whereas the emerging Local Plan includes the emerging allocations within the Development Limit.</p> <p>It should also be noted that through the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan Settlement Background Paper the site within our control, land at Station Road (ref: site 99) is stated as being constrained by flood risk, access, infrastructure and heritage (paragraph 4.10). Story Homes does not agree with this assessment, nor does it align with the assessment undertaken by Darlington Borough Council on the suitability</p>	<p>concerning the level and location of new housing development. The emerging local plan is referred to within the evidence base supporting the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate for the neighbourhood plan to use different terms to refer to settlement boundaries and for it to identify different boundaries based on more detailed local analysis.</p> <p>The settlement boundary background paper includes site assessments which have been informed by local knowledge.</p> <p>MSGPC consider that the proposed settlement boundaries will support the sustainable growth of the parish, as identified within the MSG Housing Needs Assessment, as well as protecting the open countryside from unsuitable development in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>of said site. Land at Station Road is being brought forward as a draft allocation through the emerging Darlington Local Plan and is considered to be suitable for residential development, sustainable and deliverable. Story Homes considers the evidence base to be presented by the Neighbourhood Plan group to be flawed and inconsistent with that produced by Darlington Borough Council.</p> <p>There is a clear discord here between the two framework plans. Either the Neighbourhood Plan is based upon a previous version of the emerging Local Plan, or the Neighbourhood Plan do not wish to acknowledge the emerging allocations made within the settlement. Both of these indicate that the Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet basic condition (e) and guidance contained within the Planning Practice guidance (PPG) at paragraph 74 (Reference ID: 41-074-20140306). This is set out clearly below.</p> <p>Basic Conditions Test: Story Homes considers that the Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet the basic conditions test because: e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area): The Policies map could undermine the effectiveness of housing allocations as made in the emerging Darlington Local Plan, this may then have a negative effect on housing delivery within the settlement and Borough.</p> <p>Recommendation: In order to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan can continue to referendum, and aligns with the basic conditions, it should be updated to reflect the policies made in the Submission draft Darlington Local Plan. This includes</p>	

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		the methodology and analysis of allocations made in the settlement, Land at Station Road is considered suitable, sustainable and deliverable as proven through its draft allocation within the emerging Darlington Local Plan. In addition to this, Story Homes also implored the Neighbourhood Plan Group to ensure that guidance and evidence base documents reference the most up-to-date version of the emerging Local Plan, including housing requirement figures. It has been noted that a much lower housing requirement figure has been cited throughout the Neighbourhood Plan and also evidence base documents, this is incorrect and needs to be amended in line with the emerging Local Plan. It is critical that the Neighbourhood Plan aligns with the most up-to-date version of the emerging Local Plan in order to be considered robust and effective. This includes making amendment to the Policies Map in order to show the Development Limits in the correct location which considers the emerging housing allocations and committed development parcels.	
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG4: General location of new development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG4: General location of new development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG4: General location of new development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG4: General location of new development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG4: General location of new development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG4: General location of new development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG4: General location of new development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG4: General location of	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	new development		
Middleton Hall Retirement Village	Policy MSG4: General location of new development	My main concern is that the Medical Centre is not shown within the settlement boundaries and only referred to with reference to access (the access issue has now been improved by the increase in the frequency and stops of the bus service, thanks to the efforts of Councillor Jones and the Tees Valley Mayor). It will clearly be important to retain a Primary Care facility in Middleton St George for the future so I would suggest it should be given greater profile. I would also propose that Middleton Hall Retirement Village as part of the community should be shown within the settlement boundary. It is likely that Middleton Hall will increase services to the community in the future, so we would suggest that the retirement village and land adjacent to the Medical Centre should be shown as part of the settlement area of Oak Tree. There will be opportunities to increase community facilities around the Medical Centre in the future as housing grows on this side of Middleton St George.	Comments noted, amend to ensure the medical centre is referred to in a positive way, as it is an important local resource. However, criteria 'd' of policy MSG4 does allow for development outside settlement boundaries which would provide local services or community facilities and criterion 'b' would allow for development which supports the sustainable growth of existing businesses and enterprises. So new development as described would be supported under the policy.
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG4: General location of new development	How does the identification of boundaries influence development when the landowners and developers appear to have the major influence on any process?	Noted, no amendments required. As explained within paragraph 4.9 of the draft plan, the purpose of settlement boundaries are to manage the location of new development and protect the countryside from unsuitable development. Landowners and developers are stakeholders in the plan making process; however their views do not have any greater influence. The plan making process should be informed by evidence.
Friends of the Stockton and	Paragraphs 4.12 to 4.14	Transport corridors, particularly railway routes both active and abandoned, also contribute to green infrastructure networks. Darlington Borough Council's Green Infrastructure	Comments noted, amend to include reference to railway routes, both active and abandoned, contributing to green infrastructure networks. The route of the former Stockton

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Darlington Railway		Strategy identifies the S&DR as a strategic corridor and the Neighbourhood Plan should recognise this. This is clearly shown on the Policies Map as a continuous green corridor across the northern part of the parish.	and Darlington Railway is show on the policies map as part of the green infrastructure network.
Albert Hill Properties	Policy MSG5: Green infrastructure	Policy MSG5 states that ‘when determining planning applications, consideration will be given to’ 6 criteria relating to green infrastructure. We support the intention to seek to protect and improve green infrastructure within the Plan area. However, we would like to remind the Parish Council that it is not within their powers to ‘determine’ planning applications and accordingly consider that it is appropriate to replace the word ‘determining’ with ‘supporting’.	Noted no amendments required. There is no suggestion within the draft plan that the parish council will determine planning applications. The neighbourhood plan will be part of the development plan, it is therefore considered the wording is appropriate for a development plan policy against which applications will be determined.
Gladman	Policy MSG5: Green infrastructure	Gladman support the delivery and retention of Green Infrastructure. New developments are well placed to provide new and improved areas of Green Infrastructure. This should be recognised in the policy and supported through the other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. Gladman further remind the Qualifying Body that it is not the responsibility of the Neighbourhood Plan to determine planning applications and recommend that the Policy Wording is amended to state: “Development proposals which provide the following measures will be supported...”	Support welcomed and comments noted, no amendments required. The wording of the policy is clear that new development can improve and extend green infrastructure. It is not suggested that the parish council will determine planning applications. The policies are worded in such a way as to allow them, as part of the development plan to be used by the local planning authority to assess planning applications against.
T Bingley - resident	Policy MSG5: Green infrastructure	Agree that green infrastructure should be protected and extended. There currently is insufficient in this area.	Support welcomed and comments noted, no amendments required.
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG5: Green infrastructure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG5: Green infrastructure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG5: Green infrastructure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG5: Green infrastructure	Support the policy. The existing green infrastructure is currently wholly inadequate so, again when improvements to infrastructure are being considered, this will need to be high on the agenda.	Support welcomed and comments noted, no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG5: Green infrastructure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG5: Green infrastructure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG5: Green infrastructure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG5: Green infrastructure	Do not support the policy. 'New development'....'improve and extend green infrastructure'. This is not possible! 'green infrastructure' cannot be improved or extended by building on it and laying some turfs. The only conceivable scenario for this policy is if a new smaller development replaces an existing one, or a concreted area, and gives back some of it to nature. Besides, I thought, reading this document, that the whole idea was to stop 'green infrastructure' being built on at all!	Comments noted, no amendments required. Development is defined under the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act as 'the carrying out of building, engineering, mining or other operation in, on, over or under land, or the making of any material change in the use of any building or other land'. Through new development it is possible to improve and extend green infrastructure. It is also possible for the plan to protect existing areas of green infrastructure that are identified on the policies map.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
David Darling - resident	Policy MSG6: Green Wedge	Absolutely agree but changes to future local and national governments will naturally make these items difficult to protect especially on new housing demands. Particularly with new ruling introduced on how Government sees planning applications.	Support welcomed and comments noted, no amendments required. Neighbourhood plans are part of the development plan. Once the plan is made, its policies are used to determine planning applications, therefore the green wedge would be protected in accordance with the policy approach.
Alan and Eileen Wilcox - residents	Policy MSG6: Green Wedge	My comments are the green wedges and green areas are important to maintaining MSG's separation from One Row to keep our village structure. Roman gate has caused very difficult problems for certain areas and the increase in traffic is overwhelming.	Support welcomed; no amendments required
Albert Hill Properties	Policy MSG6: Green Wedge	<p>Policy MSG6 seeks to define an extensive area of the Plan boundary as 'Green Wedge'. Development within the defined Green Wedge will only be supported in very limited circumstances. Four purposes of the Green Wedge are set out in the policy and include preventing the coalescence of Middleton St George and Middleton One Row.</p> <p>There are no policies within the National Planning Policy Framework which advocate the designation of Green Wedges. In addition, there is no mention of Green Wedges in the Planning Practice Guidance which accompanies the NPPF. Section 13 of the NPPF is concerned with Green Belt, which amongst other things, seeks to prevent neighbouring towns from merging, however the land within the Parish of Middleton St George does not lie within the Green Belt.</p> <p>At a Borough wide level, Darlington has no individual policy for Green Wedges but does identify a Green Wedge within Policy CS17 – Delivering a Multifunctional Green Infrastructure Network, of the adopted Core Strategy (2011).</p>	<p>Comments noted, amend supporting text to include reference to the findings of the design code work. The NPPF (paragraph 170) states that planning policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. It can do this in a number of ways, including protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, as well as recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. In addition, paragraph 185 of the NPPF requires plans to set out a positive strategy for the conservation of the historic environment, with paragraph 184 explaining that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.</p> <p>As explained within the draft plan, the green wedge designation is not only related to coalescence. It is proposed as the area is identified as an important green space, a valued part of the landscape that sits within the wider countryside and contributes to the setting and significance of the conservation area. It is also a valuable</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>No Green Wedge is proposed in the Middleton St George Parish. The emerging Local Plan also identifies 3 Green Wedges at Policy ENV3 but defines the area between Middleton St George and Middleton One Row as a rural gap rather than a Green Wedge. This rural gap is not defined on the maps that sit alongside the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>As drafted in Policy ENV3, development in the 3 identified Green Wedges would be permitted subject to meeting 4 criteria or in the instance where the proposed development is considered to be limited infilling. The criteria identified in the emerging Local Plan afford significantly more flexibility than the criteria proposed in policy MSG6.</p> <p>We have been unable to identify any evidence to support the inclusion of the proposed Green Wedge or indeed to provide justification for the area included in the proposed designation. Providing sufficient evidence is a fundamental requirement of the Neighbourhood Plan process. In respect of this the PPG11 states;</p> <p>“Proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. The evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies in the draft neighbourhood Plan.”</p> <p>Any evidence considering the defining of a Green Wedge will need to consider the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An analysis of the size and distance of the existing 'gap' between settlements; • An analysis of landscape, topographic or infrastructure features which add to or reduce separation, or the perception of separation, between settlements; 	<p>wildlife corridor. The importance of the area is also acknowledged within the design guide as an important part of the uniqueness of the area. The design codes state that the green gap should be retained. It is therefore considered that the proposed green wedge allocation is appropriate. There is no suggestion that this is a strategic green space, as strategic matters are addressed in the local plan.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A consideration of key views, including intervisibility between existing and proposed settlement edges; • An analysis of the setting and character of the existing settlement edges; • An analysis of the contribution which each area makes to the approaches and transition between settlements; • Justification of the judgements in respect of landscape and visual value of the land within each area, and an explanation of what has informed these judgements; and • Information to support the conclusions drawn in respect of the wildlife value of each area. <p>Notwithstanding the above, the identification of land as a local Green Wedge would create an unnecessary policy constraint to future development, effectively preventing growth on the edge of Middleton St George and Middleton One Row. The Green Wedge policy is a strategic planning tool and has been considered at a Borough wide level. The addition of new Green Wedges at a local level, effectively seeks to provide the same level of constraint and a disproportionate level of protection which is akin to Green Belt.</p> <p>In respect of the identified purposes of the Green Wedge relating to coalescence, given that the entrance to Middleton One Row is directly adjacent to the edge of Middleton St George, it is unclear how the Green Wedge will fill the purpose to restrict physical separation between the two settlements.</p> <p>We consider that an area's pleasant sense of openness and rural feel cannot simply amount to a landscape which should</p>	

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>be protected and providing a rural gateway does not amount to contributing to a unique sense of identity.</p> <p>Further the boundary of the proposed Green Wedge doesn't appear to represent that which would normally be designated, with areas being shown within the designation that simply make little sense. Including land in this manner signals an attempt to simply restrict future development without any justification.</p> <p>In not defining such a gap in the emerging Local Plan, it is clear that Darlington Borough Council do not consider that the 'gap' between Middleton St George and Middleton One Row warrants designation as a Green Wedge and accordingly we strongly object to such a strategic policy being included in a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
Historic England	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	Historic England supports the designation of green wedge along Middleton Lane in the area between Middleton St George and Middleton One Row. By designating this as green wedge this will help maintain the special character and appearance of the conservation area which as the Conservation Area Appraisal explains "the landscape setting of the Conservation Area has a major impact on the character of the area."	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Gladman	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	Gladman object to the identification of Green Wedges and submit that new development can often be located on the edge of settlements 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 purposes of this policy, particularly as it would prevent the	Comments noted, amend supporting text to include reference to the findings of the design code work. As explained within the draft plan, the green wedge designation is not only related to coalescence. It is proposed as the area is identified as an important green space, a valued part of the landscape that sits within the wider countryside and contributes to the setting and


Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>development of otherwise sustainable and deliverable housing to assist in meeting the Borough's housing needs.</p> <p>Indeed, the emerging Darlington Borough Local Plan, currently at the Regulation 19 stage, does not propose a strategic settlement gap for Middleton St George. As highlighted in the PPG, a draft Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in force if it is to meet the basic conditions. It is also clear the above Policy is drafted to avoid coalescence between Middleton St George and Middleton One Row, Gladman consider that this is a strategic issue that should only be considered through the Local Plan process.</p> <p>Furthermore, if the Neighbourhood Plan is to proceed with Policy MSG6 then it must be supported by robust evidence, as set out in the PPG, allowing for flexibility to assess any harm to the visual and functional separation of settlements against the benefits of a development proposal:</p> <p>"A wide range of settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas, so blanket policies restricting housing development in some types of settlement will need to be supported by robust evidence of their appropriateness."</p> <p>The Council have referred to the 2010 Middleton One Row Conservation Area Character Appraisal, before listing two planning applications as evidence to justify Policy MSG6. Firstly, Gladman contend that the Conservation Area Character Appraisal is dated and does not provide robust or up-to-date evidence in which to form the basis of a policy. Furthermore, the justification listed within this document propose the area provides 'key views', yet Gladman propose</p>	<p>significance of the conservation area. It is also a valuable wildlife corridor. The importance of the area is also acknowledged within the design guide as an important part of the uniqueness of the area. The design codes state that the green gap should be retained. It is therefore considered that the proposed green wedge allocation is appropriate. There is no suggestion that this is a strategic green space, as strategic matters are addressed in the local plan.</p> <p>The green wedge is not a blanket policy to restrict housing development. The plan supports the delivery of sustainable development to meet future needs.</p> <p>The NPPF (paragraph 170) states that planning policies should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. It can do this in a number of ways, including protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, as well as recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. In addition, paragraph 185 of the NPPF requires plans to set out a positive strategy for the conservation of the historic environment, with paragraph 184 explaining that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>that this is a subjective issue and is little beyond a 'nice view of the countryside'.</p> <p>Secondly, Gladman refer to the two planning applications; 18/01108/FUL and 18/00275/OUT, detailed by the Parish Council as justification for the Policy. While the Inspector for the Appeal relating to Land east of Middleton Lane, Middleton Lane highlighted the local character and appearance of the local areas as attracting weight within the decision, these were not determinative issues when regarding plan making.</p> <p>While the Council have presented analysis behind Policy MSG6, Gladman contend that the Parish Council have not provided robust evidence supporting the approach taken. Indeed, the policy applies a blanket approach to restricting housing development where a development proposal may be designed in a manner that is able to mitigate against harm to the character and local appearance.</p>	
Darlington Borough Council	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	You may wish to prepare some evidence or discussion paper on why you have chosen to propose for allocation the areas of green wedge and green infrastructure. Apologies if this is already set out within the evidence base.	Comments noted, amend supporting text to refer to also refer to design code work which highlights the importance of the green gap/ wedge.
T Bingley - resident	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	A green wedge between MSG and MOR is essential.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock – resident	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Jon Meeks – resident	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	Support the policy. As mentioned earlier, the removal of the green wedge between the two areas would in our view destroy both the village feel and the distinctly different characters of the two areas. Everyone realises that development is inevitable mainly due to lower property occupancy rates across society but, this must be done in a way that doesn't damage the fabric of the existing natural or built environments.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	The green wedge is fully supported. The boundary to the west should be extended to include a wider wedge from Middleton Lane right across to Roman Road.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. It is not possible to extend the green wedge as suggested as a result of existing planning permissions.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG6: Green wedge	Identification of a “green gap” will not protect it. It must be retained. This is another example of the (supposed) action being a position.	Noted, no amendments. Policy MSG6 would resist development proposals which would not: protect and enhance the significance of the conservation area; prevent the coalescence of Middleton St George and Middleton One Row; protect the important landscape character and visual amenity; or protect the valuable wildlife corridor and habitat. The parish council therefore

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
			disagree with the suggestion the identification of a green wedge will not protect the area.
Natural England	Policy MSG7: Biodiversity	We welcome the specific reference to biodiversity net gains being realised from development, but given that biodiversity net gain will become mandatory when the Environment Bill completes its passage through parliament, we advise that this policy is made stronger to reflect this position. We would suggest rewording the policy to state that developers will be required to show how 'a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain will be achieved'.	Support welcomed, and comments noted, amend as suggested.
T Bingley - resident	Policy MSG7: Biodiversity	Agree, but biodiversity needs to be increase.	Support welcomed; no amendments required. The policy supports enhancement to biodiversity.
Environment Agency	Policy MSG7: Biodiversity	We are pleased to see the inclusion of "biodiversity net gains, where possible" in proposed policy MSG7.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG7: Biodiversity	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock – resident	Policy MSG7: Biodiversity	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG7: Biodiversity	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG7: Biodiversity	Support the policy. The current biodiversity is the 'jewel in the crown' of the area and must be maintained and further improved almost at all cost. It is vital for the health and wellbeing of both residents and the environment.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG7: Biodiversity	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG7: Biodiversity	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG7: Biodiversity	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG7: Biodiversity	This should be thrown out. I commented on the DBC plan that you can't protect or enhance biodiversity by building on it. Zero tolerance is required!	Noted, no amendments. Development is defined under the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act as 'the carrying out of building, engineering, mining or other operation in, on, over or under land, or the making of any material change in the use of any building or other land'. In accordance with national planning policy, the policy supports development, which is not just the construction of new housing, where it protects and enhances biodiversity. The policy reflects national policy and guidance.
Story Homes	Policy MSG8: Local Green Space (LGS01)	<p>Story Homes support Policy MSG8 and recognize that our land at Station Road, subject to an outline application (reference: 16/00976/OUT) bounds Local Green Space 01 Water Park, Station Road. It should be noted that through our layout and technical arrangements as presented in our outline application, this Local Green Space is respected.</p> <p>Our proposed layout for the site at Station Road seeks to enhance accessibility to Local Green Spaces within the settlement, as recognised within the policy, by providing pedestrian links from the scheme through to the Water Park. In addition, our boundary treatments will respect the interface between the activities undertaken at the waterpark and the neighbouring residential use. The orientation of plots along this boundary will seek to face the water park in order</p>	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		to create a degree of natural surveillance but also ensure that the amenities of prospective residents is respected.	
Middleton Hall Retirement Village	Policy MSG8: Local Green Space (LGS03)	On a small point but important point, I was pleased to see that the Stockton and Darlington railway track bed has been identified as a green space.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Ian and Adrienne Stark - residents	Policy MSG8: Local Green Space (LGS06)	<p>We understand the need to protect green spaces and we have no objection to the slope in front of our house which is visible from the Teesdale Way being protected in this way. The tiny map supplied seems to have the proposed area abutting our property whereas all other properties on the map have been given space in front of their buildings. We would propose that in our case the boundary should cover the slope and not the plateau that our house, lawns, vegetable garden, outbuilding and patio is on. I have indicated this with a red line on the picture below, the slope to the river is to the south of this line. We are of course happy for inspectors to visit our property to look at the gradients etc. We trust that the PC will take this point into consideration and slightly revise the map accordingly.</p> 	Comments noted, amend as suggested.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Albert Hill Properties	Policy MSG8: Local Green Space (LGS06, LGS09 and LGS11)	<p>Policy MSG8 identifies a total of 18 tracts of land that are to be designated as Local Green Space.</p> <p>The designation of land as Local Green Space (LGS) is a significant policy designation and effectively means that once designated, land is afforded the same level of protection that is comparable to that for Green Belt land. As such, the Parish Council should ensure that the proposed designations are capable of meeting the requirements of national policy if they consider it necessary to seek LGS designation.</p> <p>Taking this into consideration, it is necessary for Plan makers to clearly demonstrate that the requirements for LGS designation are met. As set out in paragraph 100 of the NPPF, the designation of LGS should only be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; • Demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and • Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. <p>Upon reviewing the identified LGS and the Background Paper supporting the policy, we are concerned that not all of the identified land meets the above criteria.</p> <p>In particular we consider that LGS11, LGS06 and LGS009 represent extensive tracts of land and as such do not consider that they meet the requirements set out in national policy.</p> <p>Further, it is noted that the emerging Darlington Local Plan also seeks to identify Local Green Space. The map accompanying the pre-submission version of the Local Plan</p>	<p>Noted no amendments required. Whilst paragraph 100 of the NPPF states that LGS designation should not be applied to extensive tracts of land, it does not give any further guidance as to what this means, apart from that it should be 'local in character'. NPPG explains, that blanket designated of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate.</p> <p>The evidence supporting the proposed designation of sites LGS06, LGS09 and LGS11 set out within the background paper, clearly explains the reasons MSGPC believe these sites meet national requirements. They are not extensive tracts of land. They are all local in character and would not result in the blanket designation of open countryside.</p> <p>The lack of inclusion of sites by Darlington Borough Council within the emerging local plan is not a reason not to include them within the neighbourhood plan. LGS should be demonstrably special to the local community. It is submitted that MSGPC has an intimate understanding of what is special to the community. In addition, there are numerous examples where neighbourhood plans include LGS sites that are not included within local plans, such as the made Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Neighbourhood Plan, also in Darlington Borough area.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>shows that only 4 tracts of land have been considered appropriate for designation as Local Green Space within the Parish compared with 18 in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The use of such a designation should not be used as a mechanism to prevent sustainable development from coming forward and accordingly, we suggest that the Council reviews their evidence so as to ensure consistency in the approach taken in the designation of Local Green Space.</p>	
Gladman	Policy MSG8: Local Green Space (LGS11)	<p>The above policy seeks to designate 18 areas of land as Local Green Spaces (LGS) and therefore protecting them from development due to their local significance or community value.</p> <p>In order to designate land as LGS the Parish Council must be able to demonstrate robust evidence to meet national policy requirements as set out in the Framework. The Framework makes clear at §99 that the role of local communities seeking to designate land as LGS should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development.</p> <p>“The designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Designating land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.”</p>	<p>Noted no amendments required. MSGPC believe that the local green space and protected open space background paper provides proportionate evidence to justify the allocation of site LGS11. This includes that the site is: important to the setting of the settlement; has historic significance as a result of the inclusion of part of the Cade’s Roman Road; is well used by the local community; and is tranquil.</p> <p>It is considered that the comments made regarding the assessment within the settlement boundary background paper are not relevant to the assessment of the suitability of the site as LGS. Both NPPF and NPPG are clear that the allocation of sites as LGS should not be used to undermine the aim of plan making and will rarely be appropriate where a site has planning permission for development. The background paper clearly identifies that the site does not have planning permission and the site is not allocated for development. It is not the role of LGS designation process to assess whether the site is suitable for development.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>Further guidance is provided at Paragraph 100 of the Framework which sets out three tests that must be met for the designation LGS, stating:</p> <p>“The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.” <p>Gladman contend that the Local Green Space and Protected Open Space – Background Paper does not provide proportionate or robust evidence as required by the PPG to designate such land. Failure to demonstrate how each designation meets the tests set out in §100 is contrary to the requirements of national policy and guidance and is therefore inconsistent with basic condition (a).</p> <p>The Parish Council is aware that Gladman Developments Ltd. has interests in the site proposed (in this Regulation 14 plan) as of ‘LGS11 The Fields Behind The Greenway and north of the railway line’.</p> <p>The Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan: Settlement Boundary Background Paper states:</p> <p>“Previous parish council responses to the pending application for the development of site 375 illustrate that there are significant access and highway infrastructure capacity issues. The proposed access to the site is not within the same ownership and would only be able to be provided at this point if number 20A The Greenway was purchased and demolished.</p> 	<p>MSGPC consider that site LGS11 is not an extensive tract of land, it is local in character and would not result in the blanket designation of open countryside.</p> <p>The suggestion that the wording of policy MSG8 is seeking to introduce Green Belt ‘through the back door’ is disputed. The wording reflects policies contained within numerous approved neighbourhood plans, including Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent, which is within the Darlington Borough Council area.</p> <p>The lack of inclusion of sites by Darlington Borough Council within the emerging local plan is not a reason not to include them within the neighbourhood plan. LGS should be demonstrably special to the local community. It is submitted that MSGPC has an intimate understanding of what is special to the community. In addition, there are numerous examples where neighbourhood plans include LGS sites that are not included within local plans, such as the made Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>It is also considered that the proposed access route does not and could not meet the council's highway standards in terms of width of road to be provided and the provision of the required footpaths. Traffic survey data illustrates that the development of the site could cause result in significant highway safety issues."</p> <p>Gladman's planning application to Darlington Borough Council, registered under reference 19/00231/OUT, does not have any highways objections relating to highways infrastructure or capacity. It is not for the Parish Council (or Qualifying Body) to predetermine the outcome of a planning application and a development management process.</p> <p>Evidence supporting the designation of 'LGS11 The Fields Behind The Greenway and north of the railway line' in the Background Paper provides limited justification for designating the site as LGS. Part 1 of the Background Paper states that the site is of particular local significance as it is 'well used by the local community' and has 'a number of public rights of way cross the site linking to the wider countryside'.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the site has public rights of way (PRoW) crossing it. However, in the illustrative Development Framework Plan submitted in support of application 19/00231/OUT (see Appendix 1) demonstrates that all PRoWs can be accommodated on-site without interruption or diversion. No further supporting evidence or documents demonstrating how the land is used by the community has been provided.</p>	

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>Simply because a site has PRoW(s) crossing it or within its 'boundaries', does not mean it meets the requirements for a LGS and nor that development should be refused for this reason. Indeed, on the site immediately north of (proposed) LGS11, there is an outline planning permission for 198 dwellings (15/00976/OUT) and this site has the same (continuation) footpaths crossing it as on LGS11.</p> <p>Additionally, the NPPF makes it clear that LGS designations should not be an extensive tract of land, with the PPG providing further clarification by stating, "There are no hard and fast rules about how big a Local Green Space can be because places are different and a degree of judgment will inevitably be needed. However, paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently, blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate..."</p> <p>In this regard, Gladman assert that the proposed designation of LGS11 contradicts national policy guidance by attempting allocate an extensive tract of land (amounting to approximately 15 acres), alongside applying a blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and an approved residential application (15/00976/OUT).</p> <p>This is compounded by the fact that the site (Reference: 375 'Land south of High Stell') was considered suitable, available and achievable for residential development in the Darlington Borough Council Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA 2017) published in 2018.</p>	

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>Additionally, in the Regulation 18 Darlington Local Plan (June 2018) the site was proposed for residential development with an indicative yield of 100 dwellings.</p> <p>While, the site allocation is no longer included within the Regulation 19 version of the Plan, there is no further evidence which changes the assessment of the site and therefore can still be considered suitable for residential development. Indeed, the emerging Local Plan process has not considered, nor assessed the site for LGS purposes further demonstrating inconsistencies with Basic Condition (e).</p> <p>Furthermore, the Darlington Borough Council's Planning Policy Consultation Response stated that, "It is considered that residential development on this site would not have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside."</p> <p>Therefore, Gladman assert that no robust or proportionate evidence has been provided alongside the draft Neighbourhood Plan which justifies the designation of LGS11 or any of the proposed LGS designations. Middleton St. George Neighbourhood Plan is consequently inconsistent with basic condition (a).</p> <p>Policy MSG8 further states, "Inappropriate development on land designated as local green space will only be permitted where very special circumstances can be demonstrated in accordance with national Green Belt policy."</p> <p>It is not appropriate for Neighbourhood Plan to develop policies akin to Green Belt. There is no Green Belt within the</p>	

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>Borough of Darlington and an attempt to introduce it through the back door in this Neighbourhood Plan in a Local Green Space policy would not be appropriate and is likely to fail to meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>Additionally, Darlington Borough Council have produced detailed site assessments and analysis within the emerging Local Plan process which demonstrates that land South of High Stell (proposed to be designated as LGS11) is suitable, available and deliverable for residential development without significantly impacting the character and appearance of the countryside. Gladman highlight that as currently drafted Policy MSG8 is inconsistent with basic condition (e).</p> <p>Gladman contend that LGS11 is an extensive tract of land which main objective is to sterilise a sustainable location adjacent the settlement edge and an approved residential planning application from development. It is recommended that this element of the policy is deleted.</p>	
Middle Oak Management Ltd	Policy MSG8: Local Green Space - proposed allocation LGS17 – Virginia Estate	<p>Middle Oak Management Ltd is a small “Not for Profit” company exclusively funded by an Estate Maintenance Fee paid by property owners on the Virginia Estate in addition to the full council tax including the Parish precept.</p> <p>During discussions with Catherine Gilsenan we were under the impression that she had offered to arrange a meeting with your Consultant and/ or herself. It was very disappointing that her offer was withdrawn in her email of 7th September 2020.</p> <p>As you will be aware when MOM Ltd Directors attended a Parish Meeting in relation to a planning issue on that meeting’s agenda the Councillors present informed them that</p>	<p>Comments noted, amend the plan to protect specific land as protected open space, rather than local green space and add a community action regarding joint working with MOM Ltd on community wildlife projects.</p> <p>The initial contact from the parish council was to provide advance notification to MOM Ltd that there was to be a consultation on a draft neighbourhood plan, which was proposed to allocate land as local green space.</p> <p>The proposed allocation was informed by a site assessment process that is outlined within the local green space and protected open space background paper. The</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>they did not know where the Virginia Estate was located, had never visited it and had no awareness of the issues in relation to the planning application to be discussed.</p> <p>Would it be reasonable to conclude from the inaccuracies on the Council's Local Green Space proposal that this lack of awareness continues? Could it be that the diagram indicating proposed Local Green Spaces in relation to the Virginia Estate was drawn up based on something like google maps or aerial photographs?</p> <p>The inaccuracies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide roads, no they are not, the roads are below residential width, are over 60 years old and require widening and improved drainage or replacing which is going to be very expensive. • The estate was not built when members of the Canadian Airforce were stationed at Middleton St George Airfield and has no links to the Second World War. <p>Please Note: I have dyslexia and would ask you to be mindful of this. If this causes my correspondence to be unclear please do not hesitate to contact me to clarify.</p> <p>Significant proportion of the verges are taken up by accessways and parking areas and this is likely to increase.</p> <p>There has never been a football pitch on Virginia Estate, since 1993 when MOM Ltd became responsible for the area, just a set of posts for residents' children & young people to have a kick about.</p>	<p>parish council do believe that Virginia Estate has a special character and historical associations, for the reasons outlined within the background paper.</p> <p>References to wide roads were taken from the information on the Virginia Estate website. The references to the Canadian Airforce and the second world war were included to provide background to the history of airport, rather than suggesting there were any specific links between the estate. Again, this information was taken from the Virginia Estate website. With regard to the reference to a football pitch – I agree that this should have included an explanation that this was not a full size football pitch and that it is only used for informal recreation.</p> <p>Following discussions with MOM Ltd, the parish council agree that the land proposed should not be identified as local green space and a protected open space designation for the small football pitch should be included as an alternative.</p> <p>It should be noted that comments regarding the implied actions of the parish council as disputed.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>In addition, the Green Spaces are MOM Ltd.'s only asset, the other property be own being liabilities. As there's no compensation in Local Green Space designation your proposal removes the option of either use them as security for loans or selling parts for development increasing annual revenue.</p> <p>We have still not received an explanation as to why the Parish Council heavily lobbied MOM Ltd to agree to designate our green spaces as development land and having been turned down are now proposing to submit them for Local Green Space designation. Please provide a written explanation as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>After consulting the Company's Solicitor, we are formally notifying you that if you persist in trying to register the Virginia Estate green area as Local Green Space in your neighbourhood plan, we will be objecting and if necessary, taking it to appeal.</p>	
Middle Oak Management Ltd (further response)	Policy MSG8: Local Green Space - proposed allocation LGS17 – Virginia Estate	<p>Following telephone conversations with Parish Council Chair & Consultant in relation to the issues raised in our letter of 28th September 2020 below is our submission for your consideration before the proposed plan is submitted to Darlington Borough Council for the next stage of the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p> <p>Roads – Are not wide being considerably narrower than minimum residential width. In addition, they are over 60 years old and will need replacing in the next few years. This will inevitably require either reduction or removal of the verges.</p> <p>Verges – Significant amounts of these are taken up by accessways and parking bays. As Parking issues are increasing, especially as new younger property owners move onto the</p>	Comments noted, amend the plan to protect specific land as protected open space, rather than local green space and add a community action regarding joint working with MOM Ltd on community wildlife projects.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>estate it is expected that requests for more accessway constructions or widening thereof will be received.</p> <p>2nd World War – The estate has no link to this or the Canadian Airforce personal based at Goosepool during it as it was built in the early 1950's. With the addition of garages and extensions the estate has no architectural significance.</p> <p>Football Pitch – There has never been one on the current Virginia Estate. During MOD ownership the pitch was on the green space to the west of The Spinney which is not included in your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Open Spaces – There is very limited recreational use of these areas primarily dog walking. Even during school holidays local children & young people make very little use of them. The Public Footpath from the railway crossing to Yarm Road is the most used by groups of ramblers.</p> <p>Bio-Diversity – The open spaces make no significant contribution and are mowed regularly during summer to keep them tidy. However, the estate has a significant bird population including house & hedge sparrows, hedgehogs, field mice and toads. In addition, there are a number of mature trees including oaks, hedges and a wooded area with a beck. Over the past 3 years we have been implementing improvements to manage the 3 tree diseases on the estate, introducing nesting boxes in conjunction with the Wilding the Tees Project, exploring possibility of being a orphaned hedgehog release site and increasing the hedging species diversity to increase food sources. The planned next stage is to revise the mowing programme to develop wild borders.</p>	

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>Maintenance – Increasingly expensive especially roads, footpaths and surface water system in addition to the grounds maintenance. At present this is funded exclusively by an estate fee charge on each property. With the road deterioration requiring major repairs or replacement and the government proposed legislation to require roads maintained by an estate fee charge to be brought up to adoptable standard plus costs of maintaining the surface water drainage system will vastly increase MOM Ltd.’s expenditure. The Open spaces are the only asset that Directors could use as either collateral for loans or develop as an alternative to significantly increase the estate fee charges.</p> <p>Residents – A special Update was issued in September informing residents of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Virginia Estate Local Green Space proposal. All the responses received to date have been against your proposal wishing to see decisions relating to the Virginia Estate verges and Open Spaces remain a Middle Oak Management responsibility.</p>	
Darlington Borough Council	Policy MSG8: Local Green Space	A significant number of Local Green Space designations are proposed in the NP. The Council has proposed 4 of these sites for allocation in the emerging Local Plan (sites LGS01, LGS10, LGS16, LGS18). I do have concerns that a number of the additional allocations proposed do not meet the criteria of the designation in NPPF, in terms of being special to the local community and holding a particular local significance. Some of the sites also have protection from other designations. Consideration should be given to whether there would be any additional local benefit from a Local Green Space designation. I would also advise contacting the landowners of the sites proposed for designation to seek their views, in line with the	<p>Noted no amendments required. MSGPC believe that the local green space and protected open space background paper provides proportionate evidence to justify the allocation of the proposed areas of LGS. As is explained within the background paper, landowners were notified, where their details were available.</p> <p>MSGPC are aware of the sites being proposed by the Borough Council and the evidence base. The lack of inclusion of sites within the emerging local plan is not a reason not to include them within the neighbourhood plan. LGS should be demonstrably special to the local community. It is submitted that MSGPC has an intimate</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		NPPG. A number of the sites were submitted for consideration for inclusion in the emerging Local Plan and their consideration is detailed in an assessment available here https://microsites.darlington.gov.uk/local-plan/plan-development/local-green-space-designation/	understanding of what is special to the community. In addition, there are numerous examples where neighbourhood plans include LGS sites that are not included within local plans, such as the made Low Coniscliffe and Merrybent Neighbourhood Plan.
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG8: Local green space	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG8: Local green space	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG8: Local green space	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG8: Local green space	We absolutely support both the protection of existing green open spaces and the creation of new ones where appropriate.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG8: Local green space	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG8: Local green space	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG8: Local green space	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG8: Local green space	Support the policy. What would you consider to be 'Special circumstances'? The 'Green Belt' policy has been violated for decades without redress. It seems to be meaningless, especially in MSG and Darlington as a whole.	Support is welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. National planning policy does not define very special circumstances, however it explains that such circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the allocation and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. It should be noted that there is no Green Belt designation within the parish or the Darlington Borough Council area. The areas which have been permitted for development are greenfield, rather than Green Belt, which mean different things in planning policy.
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG8: Local green space	If the 18 proposed sites are in line with national policy why are they only 'proposed'?	Noted, no amendments required. The policies within the draft plan are proposed for inclusion as part of the development plan. They cannot be put in place until they have successfully passed examination and referendum.
T&L Meiklejohn - residents	Policy MSG9: Protected open space – proposed allocation POS1	Thank you for your letter dated 21.09.20 making us aware of the Parish Council's intention to have our green designated as a Protected Open Space. Provided that such a designation ensures that our green remains our green and will indeed remain protected, as residents of The Greenway we have no objection to the Council's proposal.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
N Bassett & S A Vadgama - residents	Policy MSG9: Protected open space – proposed allocation POS1	I am pleased to confirm that we are also in agreement with this proposal on the terms mentioned.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
David Beale - resident	Policy MSG9: Protected open space –	Thank you for your letter dated 21st September 2020. My wife and I have been residents of Ropner Gardens since we bought our property in 2002. I would comment as follows:	Comments noted, amend to reflect correct boundaries contained within background paper.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	proposed allocation POS5	<p>1. The Green at Ropner Gardens is owned by Ropner Gardens Management Company Limited (RGMCL) the total shareholding of which is held in equal shares by the property owners.</p> <p>2. The map attached to your letter (and the pre-submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan) seems to show that the Green at Ropner Gardens is split between POS05 and LGS08? However, the LGS and POS Background Paper (p20) states that the Green should not be designated as LGS but that it “would be more appropriate to identify the site as protected open space”. Appendix 4 (p71) and Appendix 5 (p73) show the Green as POS5. The Background Paper also shows that LGS08 relates to the War Memorial and Garden of Remembrance.</p> <p>3. On the basis that it is proposed that the Green at Ropner Gardens is to be designated as a Protected Open Space it would be helpful to understand what is meant by the phrase “...should be safeguarded and only lost where a number of detailed criteria are met”. I assume that it is proposed that a Protected Open Space would be safeguarded against housing development but what are “the detailed criteria”?</p> <p>4. My wife and I would not wish more houses to be built on the Green but would the designation as a POS remove such a decision from us and the other shareholders of RGMCL?</p> <p>5. Are you able to confirm that the designation as a POS would not impact upon the decisions of RGMCL shareholders as to the use of our privately owned space? The shareholders are responsible for the upkeep of the Green and we certainly would not wish our private land to be used for recreation purposes.</p>	<p>The detailed criteria for the retention of protected open space are set out within policy MSG9, this would require that the open space was surplus to requirements, the open space would be replaced by at least equivalent or better provision. The proposed allocation would not impact on any legal powers of RGMCL or the use of the privately owned open space. The purpose of the designation is to seek to provide further protection against inappropriate development.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Head teacher of St. George's Academy	Policy MSG9: Protected open space – proposed allocation POS8	<p>Thank you for sharing the information on the consultation regarding land in the village.</p> <p>The Director's understanding is that the school building and footprint is owned by the DDBF (and that we occupy this under a Church Supplemental Agreement which is a licence on the nationally agreed model) and the playing fields are on a long lease with the LA.</p> <p>As far as we understand a long lease does mean the MAT has leasehold registered title over the land and we believe we are being consulted as a site owner (through leasehold title) and occupier on the proposal to designate the land as a protected open space through the local plan. The Council are the freehold owner of the playing fields and we would suspect that you would be formally consulting them on this too.</p>	Noted, no amendments required. Darlington Borough Council has been consulted on the pre-submission draft plan.
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG9: Protected open space	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG9: Protected open space	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG9: Protected open space	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG9: Protected open space	As above, we absolutely support both the protection of existing open spaces and the creation of new ones where appropriate.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG9: Protected open space	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG9: Protected open space	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG9: Protected open space	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG9: Protected open space	Support the policy but POS7 is too late.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG9: Protected open space	How can a space be “protected” if it can be developed? It is unclear what is different in Policies 8, 9 and 10, or why they are not guaranteed, plan or no plan?	Noted, no amendments required. Policy MSG9 seeks to protect the identified sites unless the criteria identified within the policy can be met. This accords with the requirements of national planning policy and guidance. Policy MSG10 seeks to protect the significance of heritage assets, again in accordance with the approach set out in national planning policy and guidance.
Historic England	Paragraph 4.27	Designated assets within the plan area also include two Scheduled Monuments, we would therefore suggest including this alongside conservation areas and listed buildings.	Comments noted, amend as suggested.
Historic England	Paragraph 4.27	Whilst we agree that non-designated heritage assets may generally be of lesser significance than designated heritage assets, this may not always be the case, therefore we would generally recommend that the terminology as used within Planning Practice Guidance would be better here, Paragraph ID: 18a-039-20190723 describes non-designated assets as	Comments noted, amend as suggested.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>“having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets.”</p> <p>Amend final sentence of paragraph to read “A non-designated asset is a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions but which do not meet the criteria for designated heritage assets.”</p>	
T Bingley - resident	Paragraph 4.31	I don't understand why Low Middleton is included, or are housebuilders putting in planning applications there? Low Middleton is a hamlet and should be kept that way.	Noted, no amendments required. Reference to Low Middleton within the plan is to highlight that it is a grade II* listed building. No development is currently proposed.
Friends of the Stockton and Darlington Railway	Paragraph 4.32	The participation of the Parish Council in the S&DR Heritage Action Zone programme should not be confused with the creation of the Middleton St George S&DR Heritage Steering Group, established by the Parish Council with the assistance of the Friends of the S&DR. This group is assembling a package of enhancement projects around the former station which will collectively create the Fighting Cocks Rail Heritage Hub.	Comments noted, amend to ensure clarity.
David Darling - resident	Paragraph 4.32	An excellent job that has been done here, however, given those dog owners that do not respect walkers sharing these routes with dog waste littered everywhere, more waste bins need to be installed along them. There also needs to be provision to police these routes given the increased off road motorbike activity.	Support welcomed and comments noted, amend community actions to include one on antisocial behaviour. Planning policies cannot control dog waste or off-road motorbike activity. Community action 4 deals with dog fouling.
Friends of the Stockton and	Paragraph 4.33	The heritage assets of the S&DR are described in the Historic Environment Audit 2016, prepared for the three local authorities along the line. Appendix 5 to the Audit describes	Comments noted, amend to ensure clarity

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Darlington Railway		the route within the Parish and makes recommendations for the protection and management of its assets. The content of the Audit will inform the specific policy in the emerging Darlington Local Plan for the protection, enhancement and promotion of the S&DR, and this should be seen in conjunction with the general nature of policy MSG10. More detailed information on the assets is contained in the Friends Walks Booklet No 6 - Darlington to Goosepool.	
Paul Foster - resident	Paragraph 5.3	'should not promote less development than is required by the local plan'. The DBC Local Plan is nonsense concerning development in our area, as was admirably 'rubbished' by Cllr Catherine Gilsean.	Noted, no amendments required. The statement within the plan reflects national planning policy.
Historic England	Policy MSG10: Heritage assets	Historic England supports the wording of Policy MSG10 which reflects the wording of national policy.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Gladman	Policy MSG10: Heritage assets	Once more Gladman highlight that it is the sole responsibility of the Local Planning Authority to determine planning applications. Therefore, it is advised that the policy is deleted or that policy wording is amended to reflect the concerns raised here and throughout this representation.	Noted, no amendments required. There is no suggestion within the draft plan that the parish council will determine planning applications. The neighbourhood plan will be part of the development plan, it is therefore considered the wording is appropriate for a development plan policy against which applications will be determined.
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG10: Heritage assets	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG10: Heritage assets	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG10: Heritage assets	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG10: Heritage assets	Support the policy. It is essential that any development does not in any way damage any of the heritage assets, which as well as adding to the distinct character of the area give opportunities for further development of tourism, leisure and employment/economic growth potential.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG10: Heritage assets	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG10: Heritage assets	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG10: Heritage assets	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG10: Heritage assets	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Albert Hill Properties	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	<p>The above policy states that proposals for new housing should include starter homes, homes for sale and homes for social and private rent.</p> <p>It is vital that any policies that seek to shape the housing mix on individual sites are fully justified within the Plan's proportionate evidence base. The policy approach should provide a clear requirement on how issues relating to housing mix will be considered through the decision making process</p>	Comments noted, amend to ensure clarity that there would be a requirement to provide a mix of housing to meet identified needs.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>on individual planning applications and contain flexibility in order to ensure that site specific circumstances can be considered on a case-by-case basis (including in the consideration of issues such as site size, location, scale and viability).</p> <p>Further, it is noted that emerging Local Plan policy H4 is not as prescriptive as policy MSG11 and contains the flexibility that is necessary so as to ensure that a specific housing mix requirement does not render otherwise sustainable development undeliverable. Accordingly. We suggest that reference to specific mechanism by which future houses will be available is deleted and that this element considered on case-by-case basis.</p>	
Gladman	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	<p>Gladman are supportive of the flexibility contained within Policy MSG11 to ensure that the policy can remain up-to-date throughout the plan period.</p> <p>Policy MSG11 has regard to the Middleton St George Housing Needs Assessment (2020) and the Darlington Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2017) and any subsequent updates. However, Gladman recommend that reference is also given to the adopted development plan.</p>	Support is welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. It is not necessary for a neighbourhood plan policy to refer specifically to the adopted development plan. Once made by the local planning authority, the policies within a neighbourhood plan also become part of the development plan.
Darlington Borough Council	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	<p>I do have concerns with policy MSG11 Housing Mix in terms of the requirement that all housing sites should include starter homes, homes for sale and homes for social and private rent. Influencing appropriate housing mix is often a key aim of neighbourhood planning, however requiring all of these tenures on one site is unlikely to be achievable, unless it was a large scale strategic development. The policy doesn't set out what proportions would be required of each tenure</p>	Comments noted, amend to ensure clarity that there would be a requirement to provide a mix of housing to meet identified needs. Not all sites would be required to provide starter homes, homes for sale and private rent. Also amend to refer to the 2015 SHMA.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>and the wording of the policy would also capture small sites below 10 dwellings and therefore would not accord with the NPPF. The group should be mindful of the NPPF requirement that 10% affordable home ownership products are required on major developments. The principle of the policy is supported, however this specific requirement is too broad and unclear. It is important that policies are clearly written and unambiguous, in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>With regards to policy MSG11 it should also be noted that the 2017 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is an objective assessment of housing need which proposes a housing requirement figure for Darlington. It does not provide evidence on the type, tenure and mix of housing required for specific groups in the borough, which is contained within the 2015 SHMA. This evidence is however currently being updated by the Council and should be published late December or early in the new year. The policy should refer to the 2015 SHMA or the update when published.</p>	
Miller Homes	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	<p>Miller Homes support policy MSG11 to ensure that a range and choice of housing is available to meet identified need.</p> <p>We have also reviewed the Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan Housing Need Assessment 2020 prepared by AECOM which states that Middleton St George's housing need figure would be 8 dwellings per year, or 136 over the plan period.</p> <p>Of the 136 dwellings that should be provided in Middleton St George over the Plan period, 27 Affordable Housing units should be delivered. This figure is lower than the 38 households that are projected to be in need of Affordable</p>	<p>Support is welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. MSGPC do not consider it is necessary for the neighbourhood plan to allocate specific sites for development. Policy MSG11 will support the delivery of an appropriate housing mix required by the local community.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>Housing to rent over the same period (AECOM's estimate). AECOM's estimate suggests there is additional potential demand for affordable home ownership of 128 dwellings over the plan period (7.6 per annum). If the majority of new housing is delivered through windfall development on small sites dispersed around the Neighborhood Plan Area, many of these sites will not meet the requirement of providing 11 or more dwellings and so the number of Affordable Housing units will be lower still.</p> <p>The HNA prepared by AECOM concludes that there is clear need to improve affordability in Middleton St George across all tenures and new residential development should ensure a substantial proportion of smaller dwellings. The HNA further states that it will be important to increase the proportion of smaller homes and more affordable types to help rebalance the housing stock in favour of options that are both suitable to the population profile as it evolves over time and that will combat growing affordability challenges.</p> <p>Based on the above, it is important that larger development sites come forward during the Neighbourhood Plan period in order to meet the housing needs of future generations to provide smaller starter homes and improve provision of affordable dwellings within the area where there is clear under provision. To secure necessary affordable housing provision and a range of size and type of housing stock over the Neighbourhood Plan period it is essential that larger development sites, which provide a range of housetypes and size, are able to come forward. The Neighbourhood Plan should, therefore, not prevent sites which would be otherwise supported from coming forward which would make</p>	

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>an important contribution to the housing needs within the area and provide essential diversity to the housing market.</p> <p>For the Neighbourhood Plan to be considered sound we consider that the number of dwellings to be delivered over the plan period should be increased in order to ensure delivery of homes to meet the needs and demands of the area. The delivery of 136 dwellings up to 2036 will not deliver the range of tenure, size and type of housing which is required to meet the needs of the population and would not secure a rebalance to the housing stock in MSG.</p>	
T Bingley - resident	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	Agree, but as above further housing is not needed and affordable housing should have been part of the recent house building frenzy.	Support is welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. It is not possible for the policies within the neighbourhood plan to be applied retrospectively, nor is it possible to place a blanket ban on any new housing development.
Story Homes	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	<p>Whilst Policy MSG11 does not present a housing mix or a recommended split of dwellings based on bedroom number, it does indicate a range of types of dwellings to be included in schemes coming forward within the settlement. Story Homes supports the inclusion of the types of homes listed in this policy but would advise that specific reference is made to emerging Policy H4 – Housing Mix in the emerging Local Plan. This policy will frame the basis for development coming forward in Middleton St George, with regard being had to the Neighbourhood Plan given that the emerging Local Plan sets a defined mix and expectations.</p> <p>It is considered that Policy H4 in the emerging Darlington Local Plan provides a sufficient framework with which the type and amount of residential development should be</p>	Support is welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. MSGPC do not consider it is necessary for the neighbourhood plan to refer to policy H4 of the emerging local plan. Once a new local plan is in place, the policies will form part of the development plan, alongside the neighbourhood plan.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>brought forward against. It is unclear If policy MSG11 in the Neighbourhood Plan adds a sufficient amount of detail to be considered effective and non-repetitive.</p> <p>Basic Conditions Test:</p> <p>Story Homes considers that the Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet the basic conditions test because: e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area): Policy MSG11 does not provide any substantial additional guidance which is not already dealt with through Policy H4 in the emerging Local Plan. The emerging policy suggests an indicative housing mix, which the Neighbourhood Plan does not have regard to.</p> <p>Recommendation: It is suggested that the Policy MSG11 refer to emerging Policy H4 within the policy wording so as to align with the emerging Local Plan. Regard can still be made to the Middleton St George Housing Needs Assessment (2020) and the Neighbourhood Plan should be updated to reflect any changes or reviews of the Darlington Borough Council SHMA (2017). In order to be considered effective and robust, MSG11 should provide clear and evidenced policy as opposed to the vague and nondescript guidance currently put forward. Story Homes suggests that the Neighbourhood Plan Group evidence this policy with a viability assessment in order to fully assess any implications for deliverability.</p>	
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	Support the policy. It is essential that a varied portfolio of housing is provided to meet the needs of all of the community. It is also essential that new developments are granted appropriately to avoid damage to existing assets/residents to maintain the individual characters of the separate parts of the villages.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. MSGPC hope that this and the other policies within the plan will achieve this.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	Support the policy, but consider 'housing sites should' ONLY 'include'...'starter homes and homes for social (not private) rent'. we have more than enough executive homes.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. It is not possible for the neighbourhood plan to state that no private homes should be provided within the plan area, this would not accord with national planning policy.
Middleton Hall Retirement Village	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	I was glad to see reference to housing for “right sizer” homes for 65 years and over groups. Future expansion of Middleton Hall could accommodate some of that demand in the future and accessibility to the Medical Centre and community services that the retirement village may be able to offer, could and should be part of the plan.	Support welcomed and comments noted; amend to include reference to Middleton Hall Retirement Village being an important asset.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG11: Housing mix	This must be the central point in any local plan, supremacy of local needs not developer wishes. Yet, the objective is to 'to seek' and there is no indication of influence, far less success.	Noted, no amendments required. The wording of policy MSG11 states 'to ensure that a range and choice of housing sites is available to meet identified need'.
David Darling - resident	Paragraph 5.6	Again, an excellent idea but how is this policed with the builder?	Support is welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. The provision of affordable housing is managed through the development management process. Decisions are required to be made in accordance with the development plan, which includes the neighbourhood plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
Gladman	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	<p>The above attempts to support the provision of affordable housing in Middleton St George and states that, "All new residential development that contain ten or more open market residential dwellings or are on sites of 0.5 hectares or more, will be required to contribute to the provision of affordable housing."</p> <p>Gladman assert that as currently drafted the policy is more restrictive than the emerging Darlington Borough Local Plan which concluded the Regulation 19 consultation in September 2020. Policy H5 of the Darlington Local Plan Regulation 19 version states, "...the provision of affordable housing will be expected in residential development schemes of 10 or more dwellings..."</p> <p>Gladman recommend that the policies within the MSGNP are sufficiently aligned with the strategic policies of the emerging Local Plan, to avoid risk of the MSGNP failing at examination or ultimately superseded by s38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The policy wording has been informed by other neighbourhood plan policies that have been successful at examination.</p> <p>There is no suggestion within the draft plan that the parish council will determine planning applications. The neighbourhood plan will be part of the development plan, it is therefore considered the wording is appropriate for a development plan policy against which applications will be determined.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		Furthermore, it is reiterated that it is not the responsibility of the Neighbourhood Plan to determine planning applications. Gladman suggest that Policy MSG12 is drafted in a manner which goes beyond the responsibility of a Neighbourhood Plan. Indeed, the PPG makes it clear that the assessment of affordable housing need, alongside the expected development contributions should be set out by the strategic local planning authority. While relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies must accord with the Local Plan.	
Darlington Borough Council	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	<p>I have concerns regarding policy MSG12 Affordable Housing as it states that major development will be required to contribute to the provision of affordable housing but does not set out the level required; it simply refers back to the evidence base to indicate the level and type required. The Darlington 2015 SHMA identifies a substantial need for affordable housing in the borough at 160 dwellings per annum which would be approximately 33% of the annual housing target figure (492dpa). It is important to maximise the amount of affordable housing delivered through market led schemes, however requirements should be set so as to not stifle overall development. The policy is not clear in terms of what is required from a development and there is no viability work in the evidence base published.</p> <p>Affordable housing requirements are set out in the existing Planning Obligations SPD (2013) and the emerging Local Plan. The documents set out specific percentage requirements from developments which have been informed by the relevant evidence base and viability testing. It is therefore not considered necessary for the NP to contain such a policy.</p>	Noted, no amendments required. The policy wording has been informed by other neighbourhood plan policies that have been successful at examination.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>Policy MSG12 is currently unclear in its requirements and should be given further consideration.</p> <p>Given the above issues I would advise reviewing some 'made' Neighbourhood Plans which have policies on housing mix/affordable housing and have been considered to be acceptable and in line with the basic conditions. Further thought could be given to the specific types/sizes of dwellings needed in the area which could be addressed in a policy.</p>	
Miller Homes	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	<p>Policy MSG12 'Affordable Housing' states that on sites of 0.5 hectares or more affordable housing provision will be sought. The level and type of affordable housing to be delivered will have regard to up to date evidence of affordable housing needs, including Middleton St George Neighbourhood Plan Housing Needs Assessment (2020) and Darlington's SHMA and any subsequent updates prior to submitting an application for residential development.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan Housing Needs Assessment states that in Middleton St George, if the emerging Darlington Local Plan is adopted without changes to its draft policies, 20% of new housing on developments providing 11 dwellings or more will be affordable. This, in line with the housing need figure, would mean 27 affordable housing units should be delivered over the plan period.</p> <p>Paragraph 10 of this Assessment further states that this figure is lower than the 38 households that are projected to be in need of Affordable Housing to rent over the same period and if the majority of new housing is delivered through windfall development on small sites dispersed around the Neighbourhood Plan Area, many of these sites will not meet</p>	<p>Noted, no amendments required. The policy wording has been informed by other neighbourhood plan policies that have been successful at examination. MSGPC do not consider it is necessary for the neighbourhood plan to refer to policy H5 of the emerging local plan. Once a new local plan is in place, the policies will form part of the development plan, alongside the neighbourhood plan.</p>

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>the requirement of providing 11 or more dwellings and so the number of Affordable Housing units will be lower still. This would therefore result in a shortfall of affordable housing provision and consequently an under-delivery of affordable housing within Middleton St George.</p> <p>Based on the above there is, therefore, a clear need for larger residential schemes to come forward within Middleton St George in order to ensure that affordable housing needs are met. The land north of Station Road has been assessed as suitable, achievable and developable within 6-10 years with an estimated yield of 109 dwellings within the Council's HELAA which would represent an acceptable development site in the future, providing an important contribution to the affordable housing requirement in the area. The NP should not prevent sites such as this from coming forward over the plan period.</p> <p>Miller Homes support 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 (paragraph 34 of the NPPF). As such, affordable housing policies should not undermine the deliverability of the Plan or the ability to bring sites which would otherwise be acceptable from coming forward. We consider the wording of policy MSG12 to be ambiguous in nature which could lead to excessive demands on developers to deliver higher levels of affordable housing onsite, potentially to counterbalance previous years of under delivery. This in turn could have serious implications on the viability and deliverability of these sites/schemes.</p>	

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		In line with emerging local plan policy H5 'Affordable Housing', we consider that policy MSG12 of the NP should be amended to clearly state the need for a 20% affordable housing requirement on developments for 10 dwellings or more.	
T Bingley - resident	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	As there has been enough 'other housing' built, future housing should just be affordable.	Noted, no amendments required. It is not possible for the policies within the neighbourhood plan to be applied retrospectively, nor is it possible to place a blanket ban on any new housing development. The plan does support the delivery of new affordable housing which is needed.
Story Homes	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	<p>Similarly, Policy MSG12 does not present an affordable housing percentage or figure, it does however, set out the scenarios in which the policy is applicable and also states the Parish Councils preference for an on-site contribution. Story Homes supports the inclusion of the types of homes listed in this policy but would advise that specific reference is made to emerging Policy H5 – Affordable Housing in the emerging Local Plan. For Middleton St George, the emerging policy requirement is set at 20%. It should be noted that as this is not yet adopted policy, it could be subject to change. It is considered that Policy MSG12 should have regard to Policy H5 and also update said policy where necessary as the emerging Local Plan is produced.</p> <p>It is considered that Policy H5 in the emerging Darlington Local Plan provides a sufficient framework with which the type and amount of affordable housing should be brought forward against. It is unclear If policy MSG12 in the Neighbourhood Plan adds a sufficient amount of detail to be considered effective and non-repetitive.</p>	Noted, no amendments required. The policy wording has been informed by other neighbourhood plan policies that have been successful at examination.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>Basic Conditions Test:</p> <p>Story Homes considers that the Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet the basic conditions test because: e) the making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area): Policy MSG12 does not provide any substantial additional guidance which is not already dealt with through Policy H5 in the emerging Local Plan. The emerging policy suggests an affordable housing requirement, which the Neighbourhood Plan does not have regard to.</p> <p>Recommendation: It is suggested that the Policy MSG12 refer to emerging Policy H5 within the policy wording so as to align with the emerging Local Plan. In order to be considered effective and robust, MSG12 should provide clear and evidenced policy as opposed to the vague and nondescript guidance currently put forward. Story Homes welcomes the reference to a viability assessment but suggests that this be investigated further by the Neighbourhood Plan group in order to fully test the deliverability of said policy.</p>	
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	Support the policy as long as the affordable housing is in the village.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. The policy seeks to ensure that affordable housing is provided within the parish.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	Support the policy.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	Support the policy.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	Support the policy. We believe that this policy has been particularly effective of late with developments such as Romangate where affordable bungalows were provided as part of the scheme. This affordable element of any scheme is where the greatest need lies and should be created first (as in the case of Romangate).	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	Support the policy.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	Support the policy as long as the affordable housing is in the village.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. The policy seeks to ensure that affordable housing is provided within the parish.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	Support the policy.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG12: Affordable housing	Support the policy. They should all be 'affordable' to people on 'normal', not hyper- incomes, and young people who live in the village should be given first option to buy or rent. Maybe create a locally controlled market??	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. The definition of affordable housing and how it is calculated is set out nationally.
David Darling - resident	Paragraph 5.11	Will this mean more vehicles combined with extra parking locations?	Noted, no amendments required. Policy MSG13 supports the provision of additional community services and facilities where identified criteria are met. This includes that sufficient off-street parking can be provided.
Martin Walker - resident	Policy MSG13: Community services and facilities	We need to keep the Doctors surgery in the village and if possible have a more central location.	Noted, no amendments required. Policy MSG13 would support the development of a doctor's surgery within the village. It is not possible for the neighbourhood plan to require the doctor's surgery to move to a more central location.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Teesside International Airport	Policy MSG13: Community services and facilities	Policy MSG13 relates to community services and facilities and provides support for these where they meet certain criteria such as, impact on adjacent properties, impacts on highways safety and impacts on adjoining uses. The Plan requires reference to be made to the airport in order to protect the operations and future growth ambitions. Required Change 5 - Page 25, Policy MSG13, insert the following requirement; d) The proposal will not have an adverse impact on the operations at the airport or jeopardise future growth opportunities.	Noted, no amendments required. The airport is a strategic matter, therefore is excluded from the plan. The emerging Darlington Local Plan includes policies that will protect and promote airport operations.
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG13: Community services and facilities	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG13: Community services and facilities	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG13: Community services and facilities	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG13: Community services and facilities	Support the policy. Anything that improves the provision of services and facilities to maintain the fabric of village life is absolutely essential for the MSG identity.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG13: Community	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	services and facilities		
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG13: Community services and facilities	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG13: Community services and facilities	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG13: Community services and facilities	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG13: Community services and facilities	The provision of new/protection of existing facilities and services must be a core requirement for “a sustainable and achievable community”, but then terms used are “supports” and “seeks to resist”. This is weak and frankly makes a nonsense of the vision.	Noted, no amendments required. Policy MSG13 supports the provision of new services and facilities and identifies strong criteria that must be met to allow for the loss of such facilities. The parish council do not consider the policy to be weak.
David Darling - resident	Paragraph 5.12	An essential part of village and community life, there should be more land made available for this valued activity. Even an outlet provided for flowers and vegetables that can used to recycle unwanted garden produce, for community benefit.	Noted, no amendments required. Policy MSG14 supports the provision of new allotments and the protection of existing.
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG14: Allotments	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG14: Allotments	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG14: Allotments	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG14: Allotments	Support the policy. Allotments in addition to contributing to the health and wellbeing of residents also maintain natural open space and contribute to sustainable living, all extremely positive for life in the villages.	Support welcomed and comments noted; amend supporting text to refer to other positive elements of allotments.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG14: Allotments	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG14: Allotments	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG14: Allotments	Support the policy. The allotment sites are an important community asset and the range and diversity of allotment holders has improved significantly in recent years, contributing to environment, health and wellbeing.	Support welcomed and comments noted; amend supporting text to refer to other positive elements of allotments.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG14: Allotments	Support the policy. There should be NO development on these sites under any circumstance (other than sheds, greenhouses and polytunnels). Like biodiversity, it takes years to build up good soil fertility. This cannot be replaced by 'virgin' land alternatives.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG14: Allotments	Should the allotments be combined with green and open spaces (MSG 8 and 9) for stronger protection?	Noted, no amendments required. The local green space designation includes the three allotment sites.
Albert Hill Properties	Policy MSG15: Infrastructure	<p>Policy MSG15 states that new development will be required to provide or contribute to the infrastructure requirements that are related to them.</p> <p>We suggest that the wording of this policy requires amendment so as to provide clarity and allow consistent application.</p>	Comments noted, amend to ensure clarity.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>The current tests for legal agreements are set out in CIL Regulation 122 (2)12 and paragraph 56 of the NPPF, whereby the obligation must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Accordingly, we suggest that reference is made to these tests within the policy wording.</p>	
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG15: Infrastructure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG15: Infrastructure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG15: Infrastructure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG15: Infrastructure	Support the policy. The right infrastructure is critical for sustainable living or for development in any area. It would be interesting to know whether any support for infrastructure projects has been contributed by developers / builders on any of the already granted developments in the village. If any support has been received it certainly has not been used to good effect. The existing infrastructure in the area has certainly deteriorated in the last five years and needs urgent attention along with a greater level of ambition for the area and attention to detail than the recent work in Archer Road!	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. The parish council monitors the provision of infrastructure and contributions linked to new developments. The majority of contributions has been towards education, strategic road infrastructure and minor improvements such as to bus stops. The parish council continues to seek contributions for infrastructure improvements.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG15: Infrastructure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG15: Infrastructure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG15: Infrastructure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG15: Infrastructure	Support the policy. How come the previous and current developments have not contributed or been made to provide anything to the communities infrastructure? I think our 3 councillors have to answer that question.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. It is not possible for the neighbourhood plan to influence previous planning decisions.
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG15: Infrastructure	This is the first, and possibly only, statement that openly commits to a village of the future. Incidentally, the term 'village' is not used in the plan. Does this reveal an expectation?	Noted, no amendments required. A search of the draft plan reveals that the word 'village' is used 19 times within the draft plan. Most frequently within the design vision. Policy MSG15 relates to the provision of new infrastructure required alongside new development.
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG16: Employment and economic growth	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG16: Employment and economic growth	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG16: Employment and economic growth	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG16: Employment	Support the policy. The protection of existing and creation of new jobs requires investment in a number of other areas highlighted within the plan and will undoubtedly rely on	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	and economic growth	support from DBC and on the success of the overall plan to improve the way of life in the villages.	
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG16: Employment and economic growth	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG16: Employment and economic growth	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG16: Employment and economic growth	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG16: Employment and economic growth	Support the policy. It has to be on a small business scale though. No corporates!	Support welcomed and comments; no amendments required. New economic development would be required to accord with the other policies of the development plan to ensure it appropriate for the local area.
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG16: Employment and economic growth	Both these will require significant investment alongside a re-focussed planning approach. Is this likely to materialise?	Noted, no amendments required. The policies within the neighbourhood plan are used to assess development proposals against. Policy MSG16 supports proposals that would result in the creation or protection of jobs, where this can be achieved without significant impact on the built and natural environment and residential amenity.
David Darling - resident	Paragraph 6.4	Should encouragement be given for a local/small office to promote this activity with publications made available for visitors?	Noted, no amendments required. Policies MSG16 and MSG17 would support the principle of such a development.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Historic England	Policy MSG17: Tourism and leisure	<p>Historic England supports the general thrust of the policy. However, we consider that it would be preferable under criteria a. to use the term heritage assets and their setting as a recognised planning term in national policy and that this should also be inclusive of setting, which as the NPPF Glossary at Annex 2 describes is “the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced.”</p> <p>The siting, scale, materials and design respect the character of the surrounding area, <u>and conserve and where possible enhance</u> heritage <u>assets and their setting</u> and natural assets;</p>	Comments noted, amend as suggested.
Teesside International Airport	Policy MSG17: Tourism and leisure	<p>Policy MSG17 relates to tourism and leisure and provides support for these where they meet certain criteria. As per the above, a change is required to make reference to the protection of the airport.</p> <p>Required Change 6 – Page 27, Policy MSG17, insert the following requirement;</p> <p>d) The proposal will not have an adverse impact on the operations at the airport or jeopardise future growth opportunities.</p>	Noted, no amendments required. The airport is a strategic matter, therefore is excluded from the plan. The emerging Darlington Local Plan includes policies that will protect and promote airport operations.
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG17: Tourism and leisure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG17: Tourism and leisure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG17: Tourism and leisure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG17: Tourism and leisure	Support the policy. Any new visitor attractions or the development of existing ones must not damage the existing fabric of the villages, be self-sustaining and be catered for within appropriate infrastructure improvements needed for the villages.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. The policies within the plan would seek to ensure this was delivered.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG17: Tourism and leisure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG17: Tourism and leisure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG17: Tourism and leisure	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG17: Tourism and leisure	Support the policy. It must be discreet, no tourist accommodation. This can be provided by existing means like the Devenport or local people providing airbnb.	Support welcomed; no amendments required. New tourism development would be required to accord with the other policies of the development plan to ensure it appropriate for the local area.
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG17: Tourism and leisure	Both these will require significant investment alongside a re-focussed planning approach. Is this likely to materialise?	Noted, no amendments required. The policies within the neighbourhood plan are used to assess development proposals against. Policy MSG17 supports tourism and leisure proposals where identified criteria can be met.
Martin Walker	Policy MSG18: Transport and new development	Any new housing development needs to provide at least parking for 2 cars excluding the garage. Most garages are too small for the average car.	Noted, no amendments required. Policy MSG18 requires new development proposals to make satisfactory off-road parking provision.
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG18: Transport and	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	new development		
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG18: Transport and new development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG18: Transport and new development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG18: Transport and new development	Support the policy. This has certainly not been the case of late. As far as can be seen, there have been no improvements to the infrastructure within the village meaning that driving, cycling or walking in the area has become a much less pleasant experience. With an ageing population it is essential that these issues are dealt with to avoid the area becoming more difficult for any residents needs.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG18: Transport and new development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG18: Transport and new development	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG18: Transport and	Support the policy. I support the idea, but not further development, other than on an extremely small scale and in line with my previous comments	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required. The neighbourhood plan cannot place a blanket ban on all new development.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	new development		
A Gunnell - resident	Policy MSG18: Transport and new development	Policy MSG 18 – how can any new development not “significantly impact on traffic flows” in a village with 4 routes, some of which are increasingly used as through routes?	Noted, no amendments required. National planning policy is clear that development should only be prevented or refused on highways ground if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
Darlington Borough Council	Policy MSG19: Active travel	<p>In general I support the sentiments behind the approach suggested in paras 7.4 and 7.5 and Policy MSG19, i.e. where appropriate, to improve, extend and protect existing routes as a way of contributing to sustainable travel, health and well-being, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>However, I have some concerns about the use and definition of the title ‘Active Travel Routes’ in terms of what they cover and how they are represented on the Policies Map, and how they relate to the emerging Local Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Active Travel Routes (ATR) are identified on the Policies Map, and these are actually the existing Public Rights Of Way (PROW) which include some Footpaths and some Bridleways. 2. To describe (in Paragraph 7.4) ATR as “.... those routes used by pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders” is therefore misleading as footpaths should not be used by cyclists and horse-riders. 3. Paragraph 7.4 also states that ATRs “....can include established pathways and cycle routes, public rights of way, bridle paths...” Again this does not reflect the ATRs shown on the Policies Map, and confuses the use of the term ‘Public Rights of Way’ which already includes Bridle Paths (bridleways). What are ‘established pathways’? 	Support welcomed, comments noted, amend as suggested.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>4. Reference is also made to 'paths of a more informal nature'. It is not clear what or where these are, or whether people have a right to use them.</p> <p>5. Having included a range of formal (PROW) and informal routes in the ATR definition in Paragraph 7.4, Paragraph 7.5 and Policy MSG 19 then focus on the routes on the Policies Map – that is PROW. I would be more comfortable if the Policy was titled 'Rights of Way and the references to Active Travel Routes be deleted.</p> <p>6. I'm not sure how the second half of Policy MSG19 could be implemented except with reference to PROW which have their own process for objecting to proposed diversions and providing alternatives. It all comes down to definitions again. I would recommend the PC consider using the approach set out in the Low Coniscliffe & Merrybent NP:- Policy LCM 19 Public Rights of Way Proposals to create new or improve existing public rights of way, as identified on the Policies Map, will be supported. Proposals resulting in the loss of all or part of a public right of way, as defined on the Policies Map, will need to demonstrate: a. There is a clear and demonstrable justification for the loss of the route; and b. A suitable alternative route will be provided within an agreed timescale.</p> <p>7. The emerging Local Plan does not refer to Active Travel Routes. Inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan could lead to confusion and non-conformity with the LP.</p>	
H M Bullock - resident	Policy MSG19: Active travel	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Cllr Hazel Bullock - resident	Policy MSG19: Active travel	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Jon Meeks - resident	Policy MSG19: Active travel	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Mike Baun – resident	Policy MSG19: Active travel	Support the policy. The improvements of late to the Whinnies is very welcome and must be built on to improve the experience for both cycling and walking in our area. It has been neglected for far too long and has left us with a disjointed and poor-quality network compared with other areas of the Tees Valley.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Policy MSG19: Active travel	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
P Bullock - resident	Policy MSG19: Active travel	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Policy MSG19: Active travel	Support the policy	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Paul Foster - resident	Policy MSG19: Active travel	Support the policy. Lockdown has made local people feel safer to cycle. To provide more safe cycle routes is paramount to keep this momentum up, as well as providing joined up footpaths that don't just stop, leaving the pedestrian to keep crossing the road.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
Teesside International Airport	Need for additional policy	In addition to the above changes and to allow applicants to understand the issues associated with development near the airport, the introduction of a separate policy making reference to the need to consider the operations at Teesside International Airport thus highlighting the aerodrome safeguarding requirements is required. This in turn would	Noted, no amendments required. The airport is a strategic matter, therefore is excluded from the plan. The emerging Darlington Local Plan includes policies that will protect and promote airport operations.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>lead to efficiency through the determination process as any conflict will be carefully considered and resolved.</p> <p>Required Change 7 - Page 30, insert the following new policy;</p> <p>Policy MSG20: Teesside International Airport</p> <p>Protection will be given to the operations at the airport and future growth opportunities and the airport operators must be consulted where relevant in relation to future proposals. Such proposals should have regard to the Safeguarding Maps set out within the Darlington Borough Local Plan and where relevant, such proposals should be supported by evidence and supporting justification from an airport safeguarding perspective in terms of the impacts they would create including mitigation measures to make development appropriate.</p>	
Darlington Borough Council	Policies map – Oak Tree	No development limits are proposed at Oak Tree in the emerging Local Plan. It also appears that the proposed development limits in the NP have incorporated an additional piece of land to the north west of Denver Drive, in comparison to those set out in the 1997 Local Plan. This area appears to be informal open space and the position of the proposed limits would mean that the principle of development would be acceptable in this location in accordance with MSG4.	Noted, no amendments required. The settlement boundary for Oak Tree has been informed by recent planning permissions. The land to which the council refer has planning permission for the construction of two bungalows (19/00183/FUL).
Darlington Borough Council	Policies map – Middleton St George	A minor point is that the development limits to the very northern end of Middleton St George follow a slightly different line to the emerging Local Plan. You may wish to align with the emerging Local Plan development limits.	Noted, no amendments required. The land suggested for inclusion in the settlement boundary lies outside the parish.
Darlington Borough Council	Policies map – active travel routes	The overview does not include all existing PROW within the area.	Comments noted, amend to include all PROW.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
Healthwatch Darlington	Community actions	<p>I do hope that as a Parish Council you will do your best to support your residents with the listed community actions.</p> <p>In particular “Working with Darlington Borough Council, transport providers and other stakeholders such as Age UK, to seek to develop innovative schemes which improve accessibility to key services and facilities. Particularly, increasing the frequency of bus services to key locations, such as the GP surgery”</p> <p>Perhaps the Parish Council also need to consider digital inclusion and how people who are excluded can access online services especially within the health and care sector due to Covid restrictions. Digital technology is now a part of life and will be used as a matter of course in the future, perhaps you need to take into account how this will affect residents and take into account broadband access, speeds and suppliers, and data access and issues, plus support for those that do not feel confident when accessing online platforms.</p>	Noted, no amendments required. The parish council has been campaigning for a number of years to improve the bus service and will continue to do so.
Mike Baun – resident	Community actions	All of the proposed actions would be welcome, especially if the improvement of our road infrastructure is a priority and we are interested to see further details, including how these are going to be funded.	Support welcomed; no amendments required. The parish council has resolved to increase the precept by 5%, after not increasing it for a few years. This was due to ever-increasing costs, and because projects have been identified by residents and the parish council, which are now included in the list of community actions. The increase will help fund these improvements.
Patrick Bulmer – resident	Community actions	We needs jobs such as shops and more venues for people aged young to 30.	Noted, no amendments required. Policy MSG13 supports the provision of community services and facilities which would include shops and venues. As identified in community action 12, the parish council are looking for a

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
			piece of land for a bike track (environmentally friendly) and are also looking to improve the MUGA.
Lynne Snowball – resident	Community actions	I have recognised an increased sense of community and more co-ordinated approach between different community groups in recent years which gives additional confidence in the community going forward.	Support welcomed and comments noted; no amendments required.
A Gunnell - resident	Community actions	While it would be usual, even desirable, for community actions to be less well defined, the most significant actions are dependent upon DBC and availability of funding. History would suggest that commitment from the first and availability of the second will be hard to come by.	Comments noted, no amendments required.
Dr T A Waites JP and Mrs D V Waites JP residents	Community action 1	There should be action taken against parked vehicles on double yellow lines and against the many vehicles parked on footpaths. Speed cameras should be installed in Middleton Lane; Middleton One Row and Church Lane; 3 roads where excessive speeds are very frequent.	Comments noted, amend to include appropriate reference within community action 1.
Paul Foster - resident	Community action 5	Several wildflower areas where possible would be a bonus, along Yarm road from the allotments to the airport. I think the spectre of the development between the railway bridge and the Virginia estate should be made to plant a wide roadside swathe as a small recompense for the destruction and construction ahead, (probably none of which is anywhere near carbon zero!) rather than the usual turf and railings.	Comments noted, amend to include within the community action.
David Darling - resident	Community action 8	As Acting Chairman for the Community Centre, improving the car parking for Community Centre users would be much improved if the Parish Council removed the 700 plus tons of soil that they dumped there several years ago but any	Comments noted, no amendments required. The soil that is referred too was not something that the new parish council was responsible for, however the parish council are trying to address the issue.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		improvements would be welcome especially if funds were forthcoming to do so. However, what is considered must not be to the detriment of the Community Centre parking facility.	
Friends of the Stockton and Darlington Railway	Community action 9	The route of the S&DR is already a green corridor and the path has been resurfaced between the western boundary of the Parish and Oak Tree roundabout as part of the programme to create a 26 mile continuous walking and cycle route from Witton Park to Stockton Riverside. There are similar proposals to upgrade the path between Oak Tree and St George's Way roundabouts and a route from there east to the parish boundary with Stockton Borough is being investigated. Thus future community action will be to assist in delivering the Fighting Cocks Heritage Hub projects and to assist with the maintenance and management of the green corridor including the walking and cycle path and the access links to it from adjoining housing areas. These actions will include inputs from the Local History Group and the Primary School.	Comments noted, amend to ensure clarity
Historic England	Community action 9	Historic England welcomes the support from the Council towards the delivery of the Heritage Action Zone programme to develop the route of the former Stockton and Darlington Railway line into a green corridor and improving the footpaths to ensure it can be used throughout the year.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Historic England	Community action 10	Historic England supports the intention of the Parish Council to explore options to install information boards at key parts of the parish which will help explain and inspire education of the distinctive character of the area.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
Martin Walker - resident	Community action 11	Overhead cables needs more priority. They make some parts of the village look as if we are in a third world country. Cannot some Section 106 funds be used to put the cables	Noted, no amendments required. The parish council agrees that there is a need to remove overhead cables and community action 11 gives a commitment to working with

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		underground? It would stop us having power cut when the poles are damaged by trees or vehicles.	Darlington Borough Council to deliver this. Section 106 money must be related to the development for which planning permission was granted.
David Darling - resident	Community action 8	Completely agree and the Community Centre would be in an ideal centrally located position to do this.	Support welcomed; no amendments required.
David Darling - resident	Community action 13 (page 32)	Should this not be Action 14? What is a 'gams' area?	Comments noted, amend to remove the two typos.
Paul Foster - resident	Additional community action	<p>As garden space is at a premium, small developments (in line with my previous comments) maybe could be provided with one large communal garden for all to enjoy with purpose built washing line hangouts and growing areas. this would encourage a sense of community.</p> <p>Overall, the planting of more trees, 're-wilding' and more allotments according to demand should always take preference over development.</p> <p>Look up Roz Henderson's Darlington Forest Project, they are doing excellent work.</p>	Comments noted, amend to include an appropriate community action.
Middle Oak Management Ltd	Local Green Space and Protected Open Space Background Paper	<p>Following telephone conversations with Parish Council Chair & Consultant in relation to the issues raised in our letter of 28th September 2020 below is our submission for your consideration before the proposed plan is submitted to Darlington Borough Council for the next stage of the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p> <p>Roads – Are not wide being considerably narrower than minimum residential width. In addition, they are over 60 years old and will need replacing in the next few years. This will inevitably require either reduction or removal of the verges.</p>	Comments noted, amend the background paper to take account of the additional information provided.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>Verges – Significant amounts of these are taken up by accessways and parking bays. As Parking issues are increasing, especially as new younger property owners move onto the estate it is expected that requests for more accessway constructions or widening thereof will be received.</p> <p>2nd World War – The estate has no link to this or the Canadian Airforce personal based at Goosepool during it as it was built in the early 1950's. With the addition of garages and extensions the estate has no architectural significance.</p> <p>Football Pitch – There has never been one on the current Virginia Estate. During MOD ownership the pitch was on the green space to the west of The Spinney which is not included in your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Open Spaces – There is very limited recreational use of these areas primarily dog walking. Even during school holidays local children & young people make very little use of them. The Public Footpath from the railway crossing to Yarm Road is the most used by groups of ramblers.</p> <p>Bio-Diversity – The open spaces make no significant contribution and are mowed regularly during summer to keep them tidy. However, the estate has a significant bird population including house & hedge sparrows, hedgehogs, field mice and toads. In addition, there are a number of mature trees including oaks, hedges and a wooded area with a beck. Over the past 3 years we have been implementing improvements to manage the 3 tree diseases on the estate, introducing nesting boxes in conjunction with the Wilding the Tees Project, exploring possibility of being a orphaned hedgehog release site and increasing the hedging species</p>	

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		<p>diversity to increase food sources. The planned next stage is to revise the mowing programme to develop wild boarders.</p> <p>Maintenance – Increasingly expensive especially roads, footpaths and surface water system in addition to the grounds maintenance. At present this is funded exclusively by an estate fee charge on each property. With the road deterioration requiring major repairs or replacement and the government proposed legislation to require roads maintained by an estate fee charge to be brought up to adoptable standard plus costs of maintaining the surface water drainage system will vastly increase MOM Ltd.'s expenditure. The Open spaces are the only asset that Directors could use as either collateral for loans or develop as an alternative to significantly increase the estate fee charges.</p> <p>Residents – A special Update was issued in September informing residents of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Virginia Estate Local Green Space proposal. All the responses received to date have been against your proposal wishing to see decisions relating to the Virginia Estate verges and Open Spaces remain a Middle Oak Management responsibility.</p>	
Historic England	Design code		
	2.2.3	<p>There are two Scheduled Monuments in the Parish of Middleton St. George, the paragraph here only list one. Additional to Tower Hill motte castle, 370m north-east of Dinsdale Spa which is identified here is Deserted medieval village of West Hartburn, 100m north-east of Foster House.</p> <p>Provide brief description of Deserted medieval village of West Hartburn, 100m north-east of Foster House</p>	Comments noted, amend as suggested.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	2.2.3	<p>We would suggest setting out a table of the 16 listed buildings within the Parish here so that it is clear what they are.</p> <p>Provide a table of the 16 listed buildings.</p>	Comments noted, amend as suggested.
	2.2.4	<p>Darlington is an authority which has an alternative way of identifying non-designated heritage assets. It would be good to provide a brief description of that here as these assets are locally significant.</p> <p>Provide a brief description of the method for identifying non-designated heritage assets used by Darlington, and identify those within the Parish of Middleton St George.</p>	Comments noted, amend to include reference to the DBC criteria.
	General	<p>There are a number of inconsistencies between the draft plan and the Design Code. The draft plan better reflects the origins and the development of the three settlements and acknowledges the pre-1850s elements of settlement morphology which are still apparent.</p> <p>Provide a similar narrative to that used within the neighbourhood plan to describe the development of the three settlements and acknowledge the pre-1850s elements of settlement morphology which are still apparent.</p>	Comments noted, amend to include reference to the pre-1850s elements.
	Maps and figures	<p>We have concerns that the maps provide do not show the whole Parish instead only the settlement area, this is particularly for figure 4 (page 9) which identifies key views, some important views may be present beyond the settlement area.</p> <p>Where possible provide maps with the whole parish identified and a parish boundary.</p>	Comments noted, amend to include map and key view from St George's Church.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
	Page 22	<p>The design code appears to indicate that bay windows are common. Whilst we would agree that bay windows are present on a number of properties along The Front and as alterations, there are many examples of earlier houses where this is not the case. To ensure the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is conserved we would prefer deletion of this sentence as it may set a precedent for less appropriate alterations in the future.</p> <p>Delete reference to bay windows</p>	Comments noted, amend reference to bay windows on The Front as around 16 out of 20 buildings have them but also mention that earlier properties do not have bays.
	Page 22	<p>This section identifies Brick soldier coursing found on much of the historic development on The Front. We would disagree here and instead would state that there are flat arch headers with skewbacks on these properties.</p> <p>Delete reference to “brick soldier coursing found on much of the historic development on The Front,” and replace with are Flat arch headers with skewbacks found on much of the historic development on The Front.</p>	Comments noted, amend as suggested.
	Page 32 – context C4 and C6	<p>It would be helpful here to provide some descriptive background over what is meant by Middleton Farmland, River Tees Valley landscape under C4 and examples of village identity specific to the Parish to give some context.</p> <p>Provide a brief description of Middleton Farmland and River Tees Valley landscape.</p>	Comments noted, amend to refer to section 2.2.1.
	Page 33 – L1 Landscape	<p>In light of L1 mentioning the importance of development responding to the pattern of field enclosure, hedgerow and other landscape features adjacent to the village, we would recommend that this is picked up under 2.2.1 as it currently does not mention this.</p>	Comments noted, amend to include description in 2.2.1.

Consultee	Policy/ Para	Comment	Response/ proposed change
		Under 2.2.1 page 8 describe the character of the landscape of field enclosure, hedgerows and other landscape features adjacent to the village to ensure consistency.	
	Page 33 – L2 views and vistas	It would be useful here to refer to figure 4 here for key views and the Conservation Area Appraisal. Under 2 mention that key views and vistas are identified under figure 4 and area also identified by the Conservation Area Character Appraisal.	Comments noted, amend as suggested.
	Page 35 - positive	We have concerns that the positive example of boundary treatment could be detrimental to the character and appearance of the parish and in particular the Conservation Area given the height and the impact this would have on the street scene, this example is in conflict with policy D.2 Choice of boundary treatment page 43. Provide a better example of suitable boundary treatment with low boundary walls as per policy D2.	Comments noted, amend to include changed picture and caption to reflect low front boundary walls on main streets.
	Page 36 - Positive example semi-detached house	The semi-detached example given as a positive on page 36 conflicts with the historical grain of Middleton St George and Middleton One Row. Mention that this may not be suitable in all locations.	Comments noted, amend to replace with a negative example to reinforce what is not allowed or characteristic for Middleton St George.