CHAPTER FOUR – PROSPEROUS DARLINGTON
CSS – Supporting the Local Economy

CSRPO/0042/EH Alan Hunter English Heritage N/A Objection Figure 4.1 would be of more help to those not familiar with the names and locations of key sites referred to in CSS if it were better annotated. Agreed. As it relates to areas it should follow the approach of other diagrams within the CSS. Minor changes to the presentation of the diagram required.

CSRPO/0042/EH Alan Hunter English Heritage N/A Objection We are advised in Paragraph 4.1.21 that the Council’s preferred option is to accommodate all developmental options and scenarios identified in Para. 4.1.18. I am at a loss to understand how, for example, the Council can alloy concerns about the relocation of businesses to peripheral greenfield sites or to be directional / interventionist in spatial terms when it seeks to accommodate options 1© and 2©. Some of the options described appear contradictory. The paragraph referred to is intended to demonstrate that the strategy seeks to retain flexibility about the nature of employment growth to more take account of the needs and desires of businesses, whilst not moving away from the broad framework contained within the document.

CSRPO/0042/EH Alan Hunter English Heritage N/A Objection Paragraph 4.1.14 describes Faverdale East Business Park and Morton Palms as providing a ‘better’ business environment than more established commercial areas. What constitutes ‘better’ rather depends on the perspective of the user and some might consider a town centre site as better suited to their needs. It would be more helpful to describe these fringe sites as ‘alternative’ rather than better. Agreed. Minor wording changes required.

CSRPO/0042/EH Alan Hunter English Heritage N/A Support Paragraph 4.1.12 calls for the development of ‘edge of town’ commercial development to be complemented by development in the town centre and on its fringe. EH supports the view that the former should not be at the expense of the latter. Support noted.

CSRPO/0043/JH Julie Hetherington Resident N/A Objection As a resident of High Grange I have concerns regarding the proposed expansion of A68 and Faverdale Industrial Estate. We already have problems with HGV’s parking on Rotary Way to the rear of our property generating noise through the day and night by leaving engines and refrigeration units running. Environmental Health, Vosa and the Police are looking into this problem before making it worse by attracting more industry and traffic to the area which would have a huge detrimental effect on the quality of our lives and the value of our property from noise and pollution. None

CSRPO/0003/CJp Charles Johnson DBC (Councillor) N/A Objection Page 50 CSS Local economy: I am not in favour of naming specific developments in a long-term strategy. Advance manufacturing should be referenced, as it is a key player in economic recovery both locally and nationally. None

CSRPO/0063/MBC M Darnton Resident N/A Comment Theme 1 Issue 6 - Reducing carbon footprint – localizing employment Comments: Each Morning and evening the roads around Darlington are full of people leaving and entering Darlington. Localising its resident’s employment would reduce the need to travel. It has been said once by an eminent politician that if you want to find work ‘Get on your bike’. In 2010 in Darlington, Page: 2Help plan the future of Darlington - Ref. 252452

Detailed Comments nothing short of a 2.0ltr Diesel or Intercity High Speed Train would suffice: Changes: Create and publicise a report which details the sectors in which its residents over the next 15 years are likely to work and be innovative and a beacon to other authorities by developing plans that meet the needs of its residents. This would reducing the need for travelling out of the town. It is an objective of the LDF to create a more sustainable community and in doing so, to encourage as many people as possible who live in Darlington to work in Darlington and vice versa, by ensuring that the opportunities for work and a choice of attractive places to live are available. Ultimately, it is people’s choice where they work or live. None

CSRPO/0034/SAINS N/A Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd Turley Associates Objection It is considered that Draft Policy CSS should be updated in accordance with PPS4 which was issued in December 2009 and which contains a positive presumption in favour of all types of development, which secure economic growth. Draft Policy CSS should therefore be expanded to reflect PPS4 guidance to include wider acknowledgement of the types of development that constitute employment generating uses, including retail development. The policy will be revised to ensure that it reflects the updated guidance within PPS4.

Minor changes to policy to reflect updated guidance in PPS4.
Whilst our client recognises the need to safeguard employment uses in suitable locations, the Cleveland Street site is no longer considered viable for this use. Our client supports the focus of employment land provision as outlined in the draft policy which envisages the development of more prestige employment sites at Central Park, Lingfield Point, and Morton Palms, where investment and jobs are being channelled into these locations. Albert Hill no longer provides the most suitable or viable location for employment provision and our client would request that the Council no longer seeks to safeguard land for employment uses through the Local Development Framework. Ward Bros (Steel) have already begun the process of relocating to a site on the north side of Cleveland Street. The wider Cleveland Street site extends to over 8 hectares and the current uses do not represent an efficient use of the land given the sites sustainable location. The Cleveland Street site is unlikely to ever be viable for redevelopment for entirely employment uses due to land values. Given the previous uses of the site and the potential likely remediation costs, replacement industrial uses or an alternative office development is unlikely to generate sufficient land values to justify the continued allocation of the site for employment use. However, there may be an opportunity within the site for a mix of uses including some employment uses as part of a comprehensive redevelopment.

We therefore consider the Cleveland Street site to be unviable and as such it should not be safeguarded for employment uses. Our client therefore generally supports the Council’s approach in draft policy CS5 only to safeguard employment uses that are viable and in more suitable locations.

The allocation of specific sites that will make up the employment land portfolio will be dealt with in the emerging Accommodating Growth DPD. Whilst the CS identifies broad areas, and refers to existing sites, it maintains an element of flexibility.

Comments noted

None

CSRPO/0037/NWL  
Mr. Steve Wharton  
Northumbrian Water Limited  
Northumbria Water Limited  
England and Lyle  
Preferred Policy CS5 makes provision for 235 hectares of additional land for general and mixed-use employment to 2021, plus 69 hectares to 2026. A further 125 hectares is provided for the key employment locations at Faverdale and Heighington Lane. In its previous representations relating to issue 14 (sustainable employment provision) in the issues and options report, NWL commented that the future mixed use development of existing employment locations could significantly increase the type and quantity of demand for sewerage and water services that has been allowed for in the current employment allocations. Reflecting the NWL’s comments in relation to CS5 in the October 2008 Preferred Options report, the Company would therefore request close liaison at the earliest possible stage to discuss any proposed alternative uses for allocated employment sites and their implications for water and sewerage system capacities.

Comments noted

None

CSRPO/0053/HPC  
John Robinson (Parish Clerk)  
Hurworth Parish Council  
N/A  
Support  
Fully detailed employment analysis is not included in the report, but the following conclusions can be reached. Our working population is largely employed in the following areas: Government offices, Retail and Wholesale, Services, and Finance. Darlington, in the long term, must surely generate external revenues, these to come from exports and sales to other regions. We should not be dependent upon grants and government subsidies. Hence the LDF needs to address how we can provide an infrastructure and incentives to encourage business generators to establish business units within the Darlington confines. The business model has now changed and emphasis should now be targeted towards: Software development and associated services; Telecoms; IT products, web sales distribution, Manufacture - Policies should be in place to support and preserve the industry, which is still operating in the DBC. What do they need to allow them to prosper and expand? A marketing policy will need to be put in place to attract new business enterprises, and this should be emphasised in the LDF. One of the monitoring factors could be to raise external revenues, via industrial production, from 10 to 15 percent, with the 15-year targets.

Comments noted

None

Whilst the CS is a strategic level document, CS5 is considered to have the flexibility to allow for the needs of modern businesses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Objection/Support</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Office for the North East</td>
<td>Mary Edwards</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>The Secretary of State objects to draft Policy CS5 because it conflicts with PPS12: Local Spatial Planning paragraph 4.1(3) which states: “a delivery strategy for achieving these objectives. This should set out how much development is intended to happen where, when and by what means it will be delivered.” The draft policy fails to indicate when development is to be delivered even in broad terms. This additional information within the draft policy would enable more effective monitoring to be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRE Darlington District Committee</td>
<td>Gillan Gibson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>CPRE objects to the continued inclusion of the Faverdale Reserve Site. The Faverdale reserve site is a Key Employment Location identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy as a site that could contribute to regional economic growth. The Core Strategy must include this land as a strategic employment location in order to conform to the RSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Northeast</td>
<td>Wendy Hetherington</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>One North East supports the policy’s intention to pursue a continuous and diverse supply of employment land to meet the needs of existing and future economic development in appropriate locations across the Borough. The inclusion of Faverdale within the focus of employment land provision is also noted. We note the intention to complement this draft-revised policy by the provision of a separate LDF Development Plan Document addressing how the growth will be accommodated. One North East would welcome involvement in this process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel Airports Limited</td>
<td>Stephen Gaines</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support references to DTVA throughout document in particular CS1, 5,6 and 19. Welcome reference to safeguarding land in respect of renewables but may also need to address this issue further in terms of other land uses in other DPDs and plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East Planning Body</td>
<td>C. Megginson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>This policy aims to provide a continuous and diverse supply of employment, to meet existing and future need, by providing for 235ha of land to general and mixed-use employment across the borough to 2021. This is consistent with RSS policy 18. A further 69ha is provided to 2026. 16. RSS policy 20 identifies Faverdale and Heighington Lane West as key employment locations. Policy CS5 makes 125ha of employment land available at these sites, and is consistent with RSS policy 20. The NEPB would support the inclusion of measures to ensure the sustainability of key employment sites as detailed in RSS policies 20a to 20e. 17. Policy CS5 indicates that other sites contributing to the employment land supply will be on previously developed land, and located with the urban area. This is consistent with RSS policies 4, 5, 12 and 18. RSS policy 5 advocates the phased release of land for development, and the NEPB would welcome such an approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesco Stores Limited</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>There is no evident quantitative or qualitative justification for significant additional convenience provision in these areas during the plan period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to local circumstances, whereby much of Darlington’s employment land supply is made up of land within existing employment sites, save the Key Employment Locations, or land with a special offer to meet the needs of different occupiers, there is considered to be little merit in the phasing of employment sites other than the benefits of monitoring, which is a commitment made in the Implementation framework. In the case of Darlington, officers consider that a restrictive policy framework may act to stifle economic development and so have taken the approach of identifying broad areas that will be the focus of economic development over the plan period. Whilst a phased approach would be a useful monitoring tool, the approach taken will require maintenance of an up-to-date assessment of the demand for employment land, taking into account the wider spatial vision of the area or where monitoring reveals an excess or shortfall of employment land. Whilst allowing for flexible and responsive policy could potentially mean that certain areas come forward early in the plan period, if this is the case and monitoring suggests that there is an under-supply of employment land to meet the longer term needs or changing trends, there may be a need to find additional land for employment purposes.
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CSRPO/0023/HA

Kyle Maylard
Highways Agency
N/A

Comments

Whilst the Agency is generally supportive of the approach to support sustainable growth of tourism through locating visitor accommodation where it is accessible by sustainable transport, it still has concerns regarding the promotion of a strategic tourism opportunity adjoining the A68/A1 (M) interchange. Whilst further details to support this proposal are not currently available, consideration of the potential impact on the SRN both from the site and cumulatively with other development proposals will need to be considered and discussed with the Agency before this proposal can be supported.

CSRPO/0020/TT

Rose Freeman
The Theatres Trust
N/A

Support

We support this extended policy, which specifically mentions the Civic Theatre. We note at 4.2.12 c) that Darlington is to be positioned as a "rural city" and look forward to learning the significance of this term at the next stage. This term was queried at 4.2.6 in the previous document but no explanation has been supplied although it is an entry in the Dictionary of Urbanism.

CSRPO/0030/ca

C. Ardon
Resident
N/A

Comments

Since the loss of Bath Hall, the facilities for listening to music of all shades have been limited. The Central Hall in the Dolphin Centre provides limited space and facilities whilst the Civic Theatre is not viable because the individual seats are too close together and thus uncomfortable. Also, performers on stage tend to find the sound disappears above them rather than towards the audience. RECOMMENDED CHANGE: There are plenty of music groups who would relish bigger premises than e.g. the Arts Centre and a purpose built concert hall would bring many benefits to the town. We do not need to compete with huge halls like the Sage, but a building able to cope with, say 1000 - 2000 performers and listeners would be a long-awaited asset to the town.

CSRPO/0036/MILLEN

N/A

Miller Homes Limited
Pegasus Planning Group
Support

Support the promotion of the area around the A68/A1 (M) interchange for a strategic tourism opportunity.

CSRPO/0056/HUME

L Hume
Resident
N/A

Support

My main interest [is] at the town fringe area and with all the original buildings in that area ie. Civic Theatre, Cricketers Arms, Greyhound Hotel I believe that their inclusion into your schemes could preserve some of the original character of the town. Similarly the Central Park area could include the Albion pub as an example.

CSRPO/0029/MS

Mary Griss
Resident
N/A

Objection

I am a regular user of the Arts Centre, both as a member of the Darlington Field Club, which uses the clubroom on a weekly basis, and also a participant in courses there. The policy undertakes to safeguard and enhance attractions such as the Head of Steam, Civic Theatre and Football Stadium. What about the Arts Centre? Are we to assume that their building will continue to be taken over by the sixth form college? Will it be relocated to the proposed cultural quarter? RECOMMENDED CHANGES: I would like to see written commitment in the plan regarding the survival of the Arts Centre in Vane Terrace, whatever plans there may be for the establishment of a cultural quarter in the Borough Road Area. After all, it probably has a higher footfall than the football stadium!

CSRPO/0003/Cjo

Charles Johnson
DBC (Councillor)
N/A

Query

Page 53 CS6 Tourism: I am unsure how much "benefit "is brought to an area by static or touring caravans or camping sites.

CSRPO/0042/EH

Alan Hunter
English Heritage
N/A

Comment

Under the heading of 'providing visitor accommodation' Para. 4.2.12 looks at the options for promoting an enhanced tourism and cultural offer. However, whilst options (a) to (e) appear to deal appropriately with the high level consideration of strategic direction related to the branding and image of the borough, Options (f) and (e) deal only with where any hotel development required to support the growth in visitor numbers would be located. The latter do not read as strategic options for providing the tourism and cultural offer - they represent a response to accommodate those needs / wanting to stay in the Borough in order to experience and enjoy the enhanced cultural attractions.

CSRPO/0042/EH

Alan Hunter
English Heritage
N/A

Objection

Linking indicators to developments granted or permitted is flawed. They may never materialise. It would be better to link indicators to developments established and bedroom spaces created. This would be consistent with other indicators elsewhere in the document (See monitoring indicator NI155/Core H5 - delivered).

CSRPO/0042/EH

Alan Hunter
English Heritage
N/A

Comment

The provision of hotel accommodation to meet the needs of the market, complemented by a range of visitor accommodation is part of the strategy to promote an enhanced culture and tourism offer. Accommodating the needs of additional visitors to the borough is considered to be an essential part of providing for an enhanced tourism and cultural sector. The monitoring of the number of permissions for tourism and cultural developments is a useful way of understanding the needs and desires of the market. However, it is agreed that the number of completions in this sector is an important indicator.

CSRPO/0042/EH

Alan Hunter
English Heritage
N/A

Objection

The addition of an indicator to monitor actual completions in tourism and cultural sector.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSRPO/0042/EH</th>
<th>Alan Hunter</th>
<th>English Heritage</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under the heading of 'Making it Happen' we are informed that the private sector funding will be used to establish a hotel at Central Park, despite its acknowledged threat to town centre regeneration.</td>
<td>The policy is not intended to acknowledge the threat of the Central Park development to Town Centre regeneration, but instead concludes that its specific prioritisation would be inconsistent with the overall economic growth aspirations of the Borough. It is not therefore the purpose of this policy to restrict the development at Central Park, but simply not to consider it to be of a type that would attract visitors from a much wider area than Darlington itself and would be of a size that would not be possible to accommodate in a more central area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSRPO/0042/EH</th>
<th>Alan Hunter</th>
<th>English Heritage</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have called into question the efficacy of a new visitor attraction at the motorway junction. As set out in the policy, it appears to conflict with the objective above it, which promotes provision in and around the town centre.</td>
<td>Such a facility would be of a type that would attract visitors from a much wider area than Darlington itself and would be of a size that would not be possible to accommodate in a more central area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSRPO/0042/EH</th>
<th>Alan Hunter</th>
<th>English Heritage</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised Draft Policy CS6 should commit to safeguarding and enhancing the basic cultural heritage infrastructure of the Borough (that contributes to local distinctiveness), namely areas, buildings, features, structures. This might be regarded as the cultural DNA or character of the Borough.</td>
<td>Noted. These issues are addressed in Chapter 7 of the CS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSRPO/0042/EH</th>
<th>Alan Hunter</th>
<th>English Heritage</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.2 deals with creating a vibrant tourism and cultural offer. EH fully agrees that the cultural offer can support regeneration initiatives. It is important, however, not to define the cultural offer too narrowly in terms of attractions, facilities, or events. Nor should it, important though the likes of Piercebridge and Ulnaby undoubtedly are, be thought of only in terms of those more high profile 'set pieces'. The environment is a holistic entity, contributing to a sense of place and local distinctiveness throughout the entire Borough, and thereby enhancing its economic attractiveness.</td>
<td>It is agreed that the environment as a whole, is part of what makes Darlington an attractive place to visit and to live in, and consideration will be given to some minor wording changes to address this. However, the importance of the environment as a whole is addressed elsewhere in the strategy and these assets are safeguarded and enhanced through these other policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSRPO/0042/EH</th>
<th>Alan Hunter</th>
<th>English Heritage</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para. 4.2.15 refers to a call to broaden the definition of tourism. Whilst I have found no objection to this, I am unclear as to where that definition, existing or new, is to be found.</td>
<td>The Para refers to the wider types of tourism to include other types of tourism or culture, not usually defined under the broad term of tourism. Whilst these types of attraction are included in the policy, it does not preclude other types of tourism not mentioned in the policy. The word definition came from consultation responses to draft policies and should perhaps be clarified by referring to them as different or alternative types of tourism / culture, rather than providing a single definition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSRPO/0042/EH</th>
<th>Alan Hunter</th>
<th>English Heritage</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If, as suggested in Paragraph 4.2.14, the provision of a hotel at Central Park could be inconsistent with economic growth aspirations, the CS should do more than simply not prioritise it as a location, it should positively restrict it, otherwise the market may decide for the Council.</td>
<td>The Para indicates that prioritizing the provision of a hotel at Central Park would be potentially inconsistent with the Borough's economic growth aspirations if it meant the development of sequentially preferable sites were restricted. It does not mean that the development of the site would prejudice the economic growth of the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSRPO/0042/EH</th>
<th>Alan Hunter</th>
<th>English Heritage</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para 4.2.7 promotes the idea of a strategic visitor attraction at the A68/A1 (M) junction. It is not clear what the focus / theme of this attraction would be, how convenient its location would be for residents of the Borough, how sustainable it would be (in attracting essentially car borne visitors) or how it would help to sustain the town centre.</td>
<td>As this is a strategic level document, it does not go to the detail of identifying the type of tourism opportunity identified. This would be addressed in other later, more detailed planning documents or through specific proposals. The necessary infrastructure and transport facilities would need to be in place to ensure that the development was sustainable and accessible by a choice of means of transport and not simply a car borne destination. Such a facility would be of a type that would attract visitors from a much wider area than Darlington itself and would be of a size that would not be possible to accommodate in a more central area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>