



DARLINGTON

Borough Council

Greater Faverdale (Burtree Garden Village) Design Code SPD

Consultation Statement

August 2022



Introduction

Greater Faverdale, also referred to as Burtree Garden Village, will be a distinctive new community in north-west Darlington. The Council's vision for Greater Faverdale is to create an outstanding mixed-use development which will provide a minimum of 2000 new homes and approximately 200,000m² of modern business and industrial space. An attractive new neighbourhood, with related local facilities including a primary school, Greater Faverdale will be set within a landscape which retains and enhances much of the existing greenspace within the 178-hectare site.

The recently adopted Darlington Local Plan 2016 – 2036 required the Council to create a Design Code Supplementary Planning Document for Greater Faverdale within six months of the adoption of the Local Plan. The SPD sets out the strategic design requirements to be provided in the future site development masterplan. The Draft SPD has been written by DesignNE with regard to the Inspectors Report, Local Plan Policy H11 - Greater Faverdale Site Allocation, the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, and the National Model Design Code produced by DLUHC (July 2021).

Who Was Consulted?

Individuals and organisations who commented on the Greater Faverdale Allocation in the Local Plan examination were written to and encouraged to participate as were the normal statutory planning consultees and all Parish Councils.

In total, over 120 consultees were notified of the consultation.

How Were They Consulted?

The Council sought comments on the Draft SPD during a consultation that ran from 7th April 2022 until 6th May 2022.

An e-version of the Draft SPD was made available to view on the Council's Online Consultation Portal. Physical copies of the Draft SPD were made available for viewing at the Town Hall by appointment with the Customer Contact Centre.

Comments were accepted via the Consultation Portal, by email to planning.policy@darlington.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Darlington Borough Council, Feethams, Darlington, DL1 5QT.

The consultation asked the following questions:

1) Does the Draft Greater Faverdale (Burtree Garden Village) - Design Code SPD follow the National Model Design Code from July 2021?

- a. If no, please explain your reasons why the Draft SPD does not follow the National Model Design Code from July 2021

2) Do you consider that the documents have identified the key characteristics of Greater Faverdale (Burtree Garden Village)?

- a. If no, please explain your reasons along with any suggestions for changes or additions to the key characteristics.

3) Do you consider that the outlined strategic design principles for Greater Faverdale (Burtree Garden Village) can be effective in securing high quality design development?

a. If no, please explain your reasons along with any suggestions for changes or additions to the draft detailed design principles.

4) Overall, do you have any other comments regarding the Draft Greater Faverdale (Burtree Garden Villages) Design Code SPD?

Response

The Consultation period from 6 April 22 – 6 May 22 returned nine separate responses to the Draft SPD Greater Faverdale (Burtree Garden Village) Design Code.

The responses received have been summarised in Appendix A.

Responses were received from:

- Esh
- Hellens Land/Homes England
- Historic England
- National Highways
- Natural England
- The Coal Authority
- North Yorkshire County Council
- Sport England
- 1 Member of the Public

The consultees made comments on the linkage between the adopted Local Plan Policies and the ambitions and enforceability of design principles mentioned in the Draft SPD by the planning application determination process.

Based on the returns and validity of the comments the Planning Policy team changed the context of the SPD in several places and asked DesignNE to prepare a final Version to be sent to Cabinet and Council for their approval and adoption.

Appendix A

Greater Faverdale/Burtree Garden Village Design Code SPD Consultation – General Responses.

Consultee Name	Relevant Part of Design Code	Summary of Comment	Officer Response	Suggested Change
Coal Authority	All	No specific comments to make.	Noted	None
Esh	All	Esh ask that where ‘must have’ or ‘shall’ or ‘adhere to’ are used, the wording is altered ‘where possible’. In order to prevent developers from being tied to requirements that may be unrealistic/undeliverable.	Noted	None
Hellens Land/Homes England		HLL & HE recognise the benefits of a Design Code for the Garden Village and are supportive of the majority of the content and the spatial design related objectives of the SPD. However, given the increased importance of Design Codes within NPPF and the weight that is placed on their content along with the increased weight to be afforded to the Design Code as an SPD, HLL&HE are concerned regarding a number of additional requirements akin to development management policies contained in what should be an aspirational document that works within the policy parameters established by the recently adopted Darlington Borough Local Plan. Furthermore, the content of parts of the document do not accord with Planning Practice Guidance and the National Model Design Code.	Acknowledged that an SPD cannot contain policy, so we need to be mindful of detail.	None
Historic England	All	No comment to make on the draft document	Noted	None
National Highways	All	Consider the large majority of the Design Code to not be of particular relevance to National Highways. The SPD does not raise any issues, subject to the assessments and mitigation being delivered as set out in the Local Plan and IDP. National Highways welcome a number of references in the Design Code to providing facilities and initiatives to encourage sustainable travel to and from the development.	Noted	None
Natural England	All	Consider that the Burtree Design Code is unlikely to have major effects on the natural environment. Natural England therefore has not provided specific comments, but advise the following issues are considered: 1. Green Infrastructure: a. The SPD could consider make provisions for Green Infrastructure (GI) within the development to provide multi-function benefits.	Noted GI Strategy will be devised at application stage. These are probably more detailed Masterplan/Application stage considerations.	None

		<p>2. Biodiversity Enhancement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within the development, in line with Paragraph 118 of the NPPF. b. Consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roosts or bird box provision, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. Natural England suggest the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD as an example of good practice. <p>3. Landscape Enhancement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment. <p>4. Further Design Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity. 		
North Yorkshire County Council	All	No comments to make on the consultation as there are no major anticipated impacts on North Yorkshire residents or services.	Noted	None
Mrs Jean Shearn	All	<p>Consider that the Burtree Design Code is well researched, detailed and relates topography, habitat, and the built environment to environmental and health concerns.</p> <p>Makes the following general comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Design Code <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Praises the traffic light system stating the idea is simple, easy to comprehend, while being sufficiently vague to allow for variation. 2) The Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Believes quality housing built with sustainable materials, and using green energy, makes good sense but suggests the cost of finished products will be high. Questions what provision is being made for variable costs for houses within the project? b. Concerned that the overall plan does not appear to make provision for people with differing needs, such as the elderly or disabled persons. Notes that the plan does 	<p>The design code is intended to cover all forms of residential dwellings including those for the elderly/adaptable homes as per Policy H4.</p> <p>Electric vehicle charging in Policy IN4 and improved sustainable transport H11.</p>	None

		<p>mention vulnerable accommodation to be located away from the flood plain but is concerned vulnerable residents are to be isolated from other inhabitants rather than integrated amongst them.</p> <p>3) Travel</p> <p>a. Believes that the emphasis on travel without the car is desirable but overly optimistic. Observes that West Park was also to be a car-free settlement, but cars proliferate there. Provision ought to be made to house and park electric cars, bikes, and chairs.</p> <p>4) Building</p> <p>a. States that the standards are high, particularly in relation to environmental damage during the build. However, questions if builders will understand the value of soil, habitats, and roots. Observes that to protect the environment the project needs to be managed by knowledgeable professionals and that this oversight will be costly.</p> <p>5) Energy Provision</p> <p>a. Suggests there is an opportunity here to develop a community sourced energy supply system.</p> <p>6) Green Spaces</p> <p>a. Asks clarification regarding whether the green infrastructure around would be open to public access or be restricted to residents.</p>		
Sport England	All	<p>Sport England have reviewed the Design Code in relation to the following aspirations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sporting infrastructure keeps pace with housing growth. • Residents are encouraged to be more active be the layout and design of new development (Active Design). <p>Sport England note that Darlington’s status as a Healthy New Town pilot, and Greater Faverdale’s identification as a Garden Village by DLUHC, mean that it must seek to adhere to the Building for a Healthy Life design toolkit. Sport England considers that a significant number of the toolkit’s</p>	Noted	None

		<p>12 considerations are in synergy with Active Design’s 10 principles and are delighted that a traffic light system will ensure that at each stage of the development will be anchored to the achievement of green lights against the toolkit’s 12 considerations.</p> <p>State that they find considerable evidence of putting health into place running as a ‘golden thread’ through the SPD and are therefore in overall support of the SPD. These include ensuring that new homes will have cycle storage and anticipating the changes needed to Burtree Lane to ensure that cycling and walking journeys are not thwarted at the development’s edge.</p> <p>However, Sport England do suggest that research shows there is a tipping point in people’s propensity to walk to destinations as opposed to using the car – and this figure is around 800m. Therefore, a mix of land uses such as homes, shops, jobs, relevant community facilities and open space should within this threshold. Ideally those land uses subject to linked trips (schools, shops, and community facilities such as GPs and libraries) should be co-located.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

Greater Faverdale/Burtree Garden Village Design Code SPD Consultation – Specific Responses.

Consultee Name	Relevant Part of Design Code	Summary of Comment	Officer Response	Suggested Change
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 3, 8	<p>HLL & HE state that Policy H11 does not require strict accordance with the Design Code and the reference to strategic design requirements in Policy H11, rather than additional policy requirements, also demonstrates the intended relationship between the development plan and the SPD. As such, the third paragraph on page 3 of the consultation document could also make this explicitly clear, as could the planning context on Page 8.</p> <p>On Page 3, they request the text be altered as follows:</p> <p><i>“This design code (DC) has been commissioned by Darlington Borough Council (DBC) to assist the Council in its statutory planning role to secure and maintain the highest standards of design for the proposed development of Greater Faverdale as identified in the adopted Local Plan.</i></p> <p><u>For the avoidance of doubt the Design Code is an aspirational document which seeks to guide the broad design strategy and will be viewed in the context of wider planning policies and material considerations”</u></p>	<p>Acknowledged and suggested changes made.</p> <p>P.8 Leave as is as there is no need to repeat the wording already in Policy H11.</p>	<p>Pg 3: Last Para – suggested additional sentence</p> <p><i>‘The Design Code aims to set out the Council’s expectations in order to guide the broad design strategy and will be viewed in the context of wider planning policies and material considerations’.</i></p>

		<p>On Page 8, they request the text be altered as follows:</p> <p><i>Planning Context Following an Examination in Public during 2021 a Government Inspector found the Darlington Local Plan to be sound, saying it was justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The Local Plan was adopted by Darlington Borough Council in February 2022 and included a policy H11 below which identifies Greater Faverdale as a location to facilitate the delivery of a high-quality mixed-use community with education, employment, housing, and open space. This is intended to provide the right economic and environmental conditions to support a sustainable new community to the west of Darlington. As required in the final Inspectors report regarding Policy H11 Greater Faverdale Site Allocation this related Draft SPD Design Code is to be produced within 6 months from adoption of the Local Plan and also reflect the requirements of the NPPF 2021 and the National Model Design Code produced by DLUHC July 2021. <u>For clarity, Policy H11 requires forthcoming planning applications at Greater Faverdale to have regard to the strategic design requirements established in this SPD</u></i></p>		
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 5	<p>It is noted that the introduction at page 5 references “Homes England working in partnership with Hellens Group and the local planning authority” whilst this is the case in practice, all parties are not aligned presently on the content of the document and its wording as such this should be referenced as a Council document</p>	Agree with suggestion.	Remove reference to Hellens/Homes England.
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 12	<p>Note that when clarifying the role of Design Code, Page 12 states:</p> <p><i>“The draft SPD DC will be further considered by the Council following a period of formal public consultation and related feedback. When finally <u>approved it will thereafter be used as a development management tool</u> to check that the proposals brought forward for the new garden village <u>meet the very high design quality thresholds before granting consent for the initial strategic masterplan and the subsequent detailed elements within it</u>. As the DC is intended to be used throughout the implementation period for the garden village it will be periodically reviewed and where appropriate updated.”</i></p> <p>Suggest that the underlined references above are at odds with Policy H11 which simply requires development proposals to have regard to strategic design requirements.</p> <p>Furthermore, HLL & HE consider this references the approved document as a development management tool,</p>	Minor changes to wording to ensure consistency with Policy would be beneficial.	Required/expected

		which is noted, but when combined with some of the more onerous, policy like, requirements, this reference further indicates that the SPD could be interpreted and used incorrectly in a similar manner to a DPD.		
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 12	<p>Page 12 of the Design Code refers to a “traffic light system” for assessment of forthcoming planning applications. Page 16 references explicitly that “each phase of the garden village must achieve a minimum of 9 green lights (and no red lights)”.</p> <p>HLL & HE do not object to the use of a “traffic light” system for considering proposals in the context of the aspirations of the SPD. However, they consider this sentence unnecessarily prescriptive, and that setting quantifiable targets, which can seemingly be assessed subjectively and without consideration for constraints for an individual application or plan viability could indirectly result in an adverse effect on delivery.</p> <p>If a future phase of development did not achieve 9 “green lights” but otherwise demonstrated having regard to the Design Code, and its objectives as required by Policy H11, it is unclear for the applicant and the decision maker, as to which target takes precedence in the context of the importance placed on the Design Code within NPPF.</p> <p>HLL and HE request that, in order to maintain the use of a traffic light system, the text on Page 16 is amended to state:</p> <p>“The aspiration will be for each phase of the garden village to aim to maximise the number of green lights (and avoid any red lights) where it is possible to do so”.</p> <p>HLL & HE suggest that in the absence of a clear and agreed structure of assessment for green, amber, and red topics, this change of emphasis retains the means of seeking to enhance design as best as possible in the context of that particular phase or planning application. However, it removes the more explicit and untested policy like requirement for a specific number of “green lights” in order to be acceptable and ensures that Policy H11 remains the primary guide for decision making.</p>	This relates to the ‘Building for healthy life rating’.	“The expectation is that each phase of the garden village will aim to maximise the number of green lights (and also avoid any red lights) in order to achieve 9 green lights or more which is also considered the threshold for a BHL Commendation and thus eligible for separate formal accreditation.
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 15	<p>Suggest that the reference to 20mph speed limits should be clarified to exclude the primary routes through the site in case 30mph is required on the bus route.</p> <p>Furthermore, HE & HLL suggest references to a bus service every 20 minutes is at odds with agreements with Arriva for a bus service every 30 minutes. They note the service</p>	Is open to interpretation and would not necessarily restrict the spine road. Traffic Assessment will be able to consider in more details impacts on traffic flows.	None

		<p>frequency has been discussed and agreed in principle with Council Officers.</p> <p>Additionally note that the requirement of all housing to be within 5 minutes' walk of a bus stop is a different means of measurement to that set out in Policy IN2 (80% of dwellings within 400m of a bus stop). Suggest that these references should be updated to reflect the Local Plan.</p>		
Hellens Land/Homes England	Pages 19-20	<p>HLL & HE do not object to the strategic guidance contained within these sections of the Consultation Document and share the aspirations of the document.</p> <p>However, they consider references stating that <i>"the project will have failed"</i> if it does not achieve some of the referenced goals to be unhelpful.</p> <p>To avoid such references being used in objection on subjective matters of design HLL & HE request that the language is amended in a positive manner to state that "proposals which meet these objectives will be considered favourably" or similar.</p>	Read in context with the rest of the section there are not considered to be any issues.	None
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 21	<p>The Main Streets sub-section on Page 21 prescribes design requirements for the width of roads on key vehicular roads. HLL & HE do not object to this information being included within a Design Code but seek adequate flexibility in these section of the text.</p> <p>As an example, HLL & HE mention the reference on Page 21 to a consideration of a maximum street width of 5 metres rather than 6.7 metres. They suggest this does not take into account the conclusions of design discussions taking place between the Council's highways officers with HLL & HE's highways consultants.</p> <p>They state that these discussions have established that the minimum width on these routes would be 5.5-6m to enable bus provision. HLL & HE therefore request that a range of 5.5- 6.7m.</p>	Confusing recommended road widths not what current adoption standards may be. What is being said in the code is not inconsistent with discussions that have taken place.	None.
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 23	<p>Page 23, Shared Surfaces (Village Centres), states that the area of the village centres must be designed to be shared between pedestrians and cyclists and includes specific carriageway widths.</p> <p>However, HLL & HE state it is important to avoid potential conflicts with the central link road and its relationship with the village centre. They observe that shared surfaces are unlikely to be appropriate or acceptable here and the Design Code should enable sufficient flexibility or explicitly state this does not apply to the link road.</p>	There is not necessarily a conflict here and it does not need to apply to main junctions if inappropriate.	None

Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 23	<p>Page 23, Walking, states that <i>“streets and paths must connect people to places and public transport services in the most direct way, making car-free travel more attractive, safe, and convenient.”</i></p> <p>Whilst there is no objection to this in principle, HLL&HE support this principle but observe that to retain and protect natural features such as trees, root protection areas, and hedgerows that the most direct routes are not always possible or desirable and strictly requiring connections via the direct route could be counterproductive.</p> <p>HLL & HE request the text is amended to state <i>“streets and paths must connect people to places and public transport services in the most direct way possible (taking into account environmental or other constraints)”</i></p>	Noted but common sense will be applied.	None
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 24	<p>Whilst the aspirations for public spaces are supported, it is intended to include courtyard parking and HLL & HE would be appreciated flexibility on this point.</p>	This would not be in conflict with the possibility of courtyard parking. There is sufficient flexibility to allow this if appropriate.	None.
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 25	<p>For Page 25, Landscape, Nature and Open Space, with regard to the design objective which states that <i>“new attenuation ponds and swale features designed also to include an element of permanent water for aesthetic function, and with gently shelved”</i>, HLL & HE request this should be removed or reworded mindful of potential objections associated with bird-strike that often result from permanent water and/or landscape planting associated with this kind of feature.</p>	Noted and alternative wording suggested.	New attenuation ponds and swale features designed also to include an element of permanent water for aesthetic function, and with gently shelved margins capable of supporting marginal species to improve biodiversity mindful of designing out issues regarding possible bird strike risk in relation to the Tees Valley Airport located to the SE of Darlington.” Policy IN5 Ref
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 26	<p>Reference is made on Page 26, Homes and Buildings, to the retention of buildings. However, HLL & HE comment that, notwithstanding heritage requirements and considerations, it will be necessary to demolish most of the existing buildings on site. As such they request this reference is removed or amended to clarify this.</p>	National policy to retain and reuse.	None
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 27	<p>HLL & HE are supportive of the design aspirations in the Design Code for employment areas. However, they observe that Page 27, Employment Areas, includes ten bullet points which state development will be “required” to achieve.</p> <p>To ensure that the wording of the document reflects its role as a strategic design guide, HLL & HE would like this amended to state that “designs should aim to achieve the following objectives” or “applications which are able to comply with a number of the following objectives would be viewed favourably”. They consider this would assist in avoiding a scenario where the bullet points could be considered a fixed development management requirement.</p>	Noted and alternative wording suggested.	Use an alternative to ‘Required’ – ‘... is expected to be considered or included’ ?

Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 35-41	<p>Regarding Character Areas, Pages 35-41, HLL & HE state that whilst the broad character areas are supported, there are specific design references within the Design Code which require further consideration and/or removal to avoid conflict with the emerging design:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) With regard to the southern gateway, the Design Code aims to “<i>provide a distinctive southern gateway arrival with houses fronting on.</i>” However, HLL & HE consider this will not be possible to achieve having considered landscaping and tree retention requirements. 2) At the Faverdale North Extension, the Consultation Document states “<i>the access into the Garden Village from Rotary Way and therefore the first views up the new North-South Village Street must shout out that this is somewhere different. A new place where quality is evident in buildings and landscape, where pedestrians and cyclists are seen as more important than vehicles and the health and well-being of its communities is important.</i>” In this instance the link road, cyclists and pedestrians need to be segregated and this could be better clarified here. 3) At Whessoe Grange North there is reference to an “<i>opportunity to boulevard with bold tree planting leading the eye to the focal point village green – drawing on other local village precedents.</i>” However, HLL & HE understand from prior design discussions with Officers that tree lined verges are no longer wanted for technical reasons. 4) At Whessoe Grange Park, HLL & HE consider that it is unlikely that a link to the Argos site would be deliverable and that this should be removed. HLL & HE also mention that it is important the Design Code recognises that a District Licence is in place with Natural England regarding Great Crested Newts. 5) At Burtree Dene Beck, HLL & HE note the reference to allotments providing a buffer to the motorway. However, they state this provision is more likely to be central and suitable flexibility in the wording would avoid conflicts in due course. 6) At High Faverdale, the Design Code states that existing site levels should be retained. HLL & HE comment that, whether in the High Faverdale character area, or the site more generally, this is only appropriate where possible and viable. 	Many of these are detailed design comments not for consideration at the moment.	<p>Pg 38 Whessoe Grange Pk: Greater crested newts Natural England District Licence – any ref. to be added?</p> <p>Pg 39 Burtree Dene Beck: Allotments – ‘could’ perhaps instead of ‘would’ as in ‘... could also be an appropriate further buffer next to the motorway’</p>
----------------------------	------------	--	---	---

		Furthermore, the suggest that retaining walls throughout the site may not provide the desired character, in addition to adding unnecessary cost.		
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 44	<p>Page 44, Internal Layout. Space Standards, states “<i>All dwellings in the Garden village will have and exceed a minimum space standard. As a base level these will be in line current national space standards, and should those standards change, be updated to reflect the new national requirements. Internal volume is also important as well as floor area and the floor to ceiling height are to be a minimum of 2.4m but ideally 2.5/2.6m particularly on the principal floor</i>”.</p> <p>HLL & HE consider that this is drafted as a development management policy beyond the scope of an SPD and in direct conflict with the adopted development plan and Policy H4, which establishes requirements for housing type, size, and tenure.</p> <p>HLL & HE comment that there is no requirement within the development plan for housing to meet national space standards, and this SPD could be deemed to require developers to go even further and exceed such standards, whereas this would not be a requirement for other allocated housing sites.</p> <p>They comment that this has not been accounted for in Local Plan viability and as such this reference should be removed and floor to ceiling heights should not be specified. Alternative HLL & HE suggest they could be explicitly referenced as aspirational where it is possible and viable to achieve.</p> <p>Furthermore, they note, it is also stated in the Design Code that:</p> <p><i>“At least 90% of homes are to meet building regulation M4(2), ‘accessible and adaptable dwellings’, and at least 10% of new housing will meet building regulation M4(3), ‘wheelchair user dwellings’. As a minimum, the new Garden village is to meet this benchmark”.</i></p> <p>HLL & HE suggest that as currently worded this could also be interpreted as a policy requirement whereas adopted Policy H4 of the Darlington Borough Local Plan only requires 45% of dwellings to meet M4(2) standards and 9% of dwellings to meet M4(3) standards. This would require twice as many dwellings at Burtree Garden Village to meet M(4)2 standards and a 1% increase in M4(3) category dwellings than elsewhere in the Borough without the evidence or consideration of impacts upon Local Plan viability.</p>	Noted and alternative wording suggested and figures updated.	<p>Consider omitting specifics whilst maintaining the reference – ‘expected’ as opposed to ‘required’?</p> <p>Correct Local Plan % reference for accessible homes M4(2) & M4(3) – 45% & 9% replacing 90% & 10%</p>

		<p>HLL & HE request that these requirements should be removed to avoid conflicts with the Local Plan or simply reflect the Local Plan as follows:</p> <p><i>‘At least 45% of homes are to meet building regulation M4(2), ‘accessible and adaptable dwellings’, and at least 9% of new housing will meet building regulation M4(3), ‘wheelchair user dwellings. As a minimum, the new Garden village is to meet this benchmark’.</i></p>		
Hellens Land/Homes England, Esh	Page 45	<p>Page 45, Materials and Detailing, discourages the use of UPVC. HLL & HE comment that viability needs to be considered here as it would not be viable to include timber alternatives across the entire site. They suggest including text such as “notwithstanding viability considerations” to provide context here would be welcome.</p> <p>Esh also comment that timber and aluminium are unviable alternatives to UPVC.</p>	<p>UPVC not considered a sustainable material so we will not actively encourage its use.</p> <p>Viability comes into the overall development calculations.</p>	<p>Leave as it is – also a typo ‘prescriptive’ instead of ‘The Council does not wish to be proscriptive ...’</p>
Hellens Land/Homes England, Esh	Page 45	<p>Page 45, Daylight and Windows, sets out specific targets for daylight within rooms. HLL & HE do not expect it to be onerous to achieve these adequate levels of daylight but consider that that this prescriptive development management style requirement could result in the need for daylight and sunlight assessments at Burtree Garden Village that would not be required on the majority of sites elsewhere in Darlington.</p> <p>The observe that Darlington Local Plan Policy DC4 requires development to ensure that it provides adequate access to sunlight and daylight but does not specify percentage targets for kitchens, living rooms or the working plane. The believe the percentages listed in Design Code would not result in a higher level of design but would result in inconsistency between the development plan and the SPD and unnecessary additional requirements for planning applications.</p> <p>To resolve this, they suggest the Design Code could remove the specific targets and match the requirement of the Local Plan, potentially retaining the reference to BS: 8206-2:2008 Lighting for Buildings – Part 2: Code of Practice for daylighting as an aspirational guide which would bring the content of the SPD closer to Policy DC4.</p> <p>Esh also comment that having all properties to undergo daylighting calculations massively onerous and the requirements are way above building regs compliance.</p>	<p>Noted and emphasis will be reduced.</p>	<p>Omit details and simply leave ref. BS 8206-2:2008 Lighting for Buildings – Part 2: Code of practice for daylighting?</p>

<p>Hellens Land/Homes England, Esh</p>	<p>Page 45, 46</p>	<p>Page 45 and 46, Designing for Climate Resilience, states “<i>All dwellings should strive to be substantially better than present building regulations. To only aim for current building regulations means that the dwellings are only just legally acceptable. This is not good enough for this aspirational development</i>”.</p> <p>HLL & HE recognise this aspiration but consider the viability implications of requiring higher building standards than on other development sites in Darlington are unevidenced and this reference should be removed. Esh considers that the requirement to be contrary to existing policy.</p> <p>The Design Code also states that “<i>As a minimum the development will adhere to the RIBA Climate Challenge 2030 and the local Darlington Climate Emergency targets corresponding to the years 2025 and 2030 whilst also anticipating the prospective 2025 Future Homes and Building Standard</i>”.</p> <p>HLL & HE observe that the RIBA Climate Challenge 2030 includes challenging targets in relation to operational energy, embodied carbon and water use. Whilst they consider this a positive objective, there is no national or local policy basis for a minimum threshold of compliance to be imposed, and as with other requirements of the SPD consider that the implications of this have not been tested in Local Plan viability. Esh additionally consider the requirement to be far beyond policy compliance.</p> <p>HLL & HE consider this should be framed as an aspiration but not a development management requirement so as to avoid conflict with Policy DC1.</p> <p>HE & HLL, and Esh, also draw attention to the Design Code requiring an unspecified percentage of dwellings to meet “Certified Passivhaus standards”. Esh, HLL & HE recognise that this is a positive objective, and that an unspecified percentage target enables some flexibility, but consider there is no policy basis for this requirement. They request this reference be removed, or as a minimum replaced with words to the effect of “The use of low energy standard certifications such as Passivhaus should be considered where deliverability considerations allow”.</p> <p>HE & HLL also suggest, In the context of the requested changes, that the checklist of questions and requirements for the developer and decision maker on Page 46 should also be removed to avoid conflict with the development plan.</p>	<p>Amended wording suggested.</p>	<p>Consider introducing ‘work towards meeting’ as in ‘As a minimum the development will work towards meeting the RIBA Climate Challenge 2030 and the local Darlington Climate Emergency targets corresponding to the years 2025 and 2030 whilst also anticipating the prospective 2025 Future Homes and Buildings Standard.</p>
--	--------------------	--	-----------------------------------	---

Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 47	<p>Page 47, Vehicular Parking – Standards and Design Requirements, establishes a set of parking “restrictions”, which include references to garages whereby “<i>Garages will not be relied on for everyday car parking</i>” and to Electric Vehicles whereby a mix of active and passive charging points will be included in the design.</p> <p>HLL & HE comment that, with regard to the restriction on the use of garages, this approach is contrary to the Tees Valley Highway Design Guide which considers garages to represent usable parking spaces (and is the document which IN4 requires planning applications to consider).</p> <p>HLL & HE suggest this reference should be removed for this reason and more generally, the reference to “parking restrictions” to be applied should be re-worded as parking guidelines with reference back to the Tees Valley Highway Design Guide as the primary document.</p>	Alternative wording suggested.	Consider amending ‘Garages will not be relied on for everyday car parking.’ to <i>‘For garages to be considered as counting towards everyday parking provision they should meet a minimum dimension of at least 6m by 3.5m which also enables sufficient space for secure bicycle storage’</i> in order to avoid conflict with LP Policy INF4 and present Tees Valley Highway Design Guide (the latter however is likely to require updating/amending in response to the anticipated Manual for Streets 2022 due for publication later this year.
Esh, Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 48	<p>Page 48, Waste, Recycling and Utilities, requires the delivery of “<i>High speed (Ultrafast gigabyte) broadband connectivity must be a feature of the development to encourage a ‘live/work’ balance. All homes must have access</i>”.</p> <p>HLL & HE consider that this goes beyond the requirements of Policy IN4 which requires delivery of a lower specification at “superfast”. Esh, HLL & HE suggest they aspire to provide homes with the best broadband speeds available, but that this is dependent on the communication network providers. They request the reference be amended to align with Policy IN4.</p>	This is now national policy.	So should reference ‘gigabyte enabled’ for new residential and industrial areas, or subsequent national requirement.
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 48	<p>HLL & HE suggest that the Design Code reference to Electric Vehicle Charging points goes beyond the scope of Policy INF4 and the requirement for each property to have a 13-amp socket at a minimum.</p> <p>The Design Code currently requires: <i>Active: 20% charge point provision for residential parking bays Passive: 40% of parking bays Definition of “active” and “passive” provision of charge points: Active - A socket connected to the electrical supply system that vehicle owners can plug their vehicle into. Passive - The network of cables and power supply necessary so that at a future date a socket can be added easily</i>”.</p> <p>They suggest this should be amended to clarify the requirement of INF4 and set the 20% and 40% targets as aspirational whilst recognising policy compliance via a 13amp socket as this is the design requirement that has been considered in evidence and Local Plan viability.</p>	Amended wording required.	Should be brought into line with IN4 ,or any subsequent requirement imposed nationally.

Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 48	On Page 48, Hard Landscaping, one aspiration references a need to “ <i>avoid over-engineered or urbanised solutions at the northern boundary; with the new entrances designed to retain rural character</i> ”. HLL & HE request that this is amended to include reference to the creation of a new roundabout on the northern boundary as this is a Council requirement.	Amended wording suggested.	Should the anticipated Highways Dept requirement for a ‘roundabout’ onto Burtree Lane be specifically referenced in relation to ‘Avoid over-engineered or urbanised solutions at the northern boundary; with the new entrances designed to retain rural character’
Esh	Page 49	Esh note the provision of newt ponds is not currently proposed.	As part of district newt licence will be required on the overall site.	None
Hellens Land/Homes England	Page 50	<p>HLL & HE state they have considered the need for allotment space and/or community gardens within the masterplan for the Garden Village and are supportive of this feature of the Design Code.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the SPD adds a requirement to show consideration of the Town and Country Planning Association’s Guide 10 to Edible Garden Cities and includes an extract of this which identifies a need for 50% of a Garden Village as open space, half of which is to be public.</p> <p>Whilst the Burtree Garden Village will be landscape led and provide a greater amount of green space than a standard urban extension, HLL & HE believe some caution is required regarding citing percentages of land take for open space which could be interpreted as a fixed target rather than an aspiration.</p>	Noted	Omit ref. to Extract from TCPA Guide 10 Edible Garden Cities recommending ‘... at least 50% of a new Garden City’s total area will be allocated to green infrastructure (of which at least half is to be public), ...’