### CHAPTER SEVEN – A DISTINCTIVE, GREENER, CLEANER ENVIRONMENT

**CS14 – Local Character and Distinctiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comments (incl Para numbers)</th>
<th>Officer comments</th>
<th>Proposed changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSRPO/0028/ANPC</td>
<td>Norman Welch</td>
<td>Archdeacon Newton Parish Council</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Landscapes must be safeguarded as the largely unspoilt approach viewpoints from all directions are on the most attractive features of the town.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRPO/0008/ANEC</td>
<td>C. Megginson</td>
<td>North East Planning Body</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Principles of protecting and enhancing the Borough’s distinctive built and natural townscapes and landscapes are consistent with RSS policies 8, 31 and 32.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRPO/0042/EH</td>
<td>Alan Hunter</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Broadly support the content of this section but would like some changes to CS14: The distinctive qualities of the Borough’s built, historic and natural environmental assets will be protected. Protecting, enhancing and promoting the quality and integrity of Darlington’s distinctive designated, or otherwise nationally significant, national built heritage and archaeology...</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRPO/0042/EH</td>
<td>Alan Hunter</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Monitor indicators should refer to new, and update character appraisals, and Management Plans. Up to date Conservation Area Character Appraisals are important tools for informing decision making, but they must be accompanied by management plans containing specific actions for improvement. A further indicator should be the removal or reduction in level of risk to assets on Heritage Risk Registers.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRPO/0059/NE</td>
<td>Tracy Jones</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Support inclusion of CS14 in the Core Strategy. Implementation framework – should also include Tees Valley BAP.</td>
<td>Add Durham BAP to the implementation framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRPO/0042/EH</td>
<td>Alan Hunter</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Table 2.1 sets out the issues for the CS to address but it is disappointing that CS14 has no cross-cutting contribution e.g. attracting economic investment or promoting and improving the town centre especially when, Table 2.2 recognises that improving livability by improving the environment, cultural assets, and retail offer of the area is a priority for achieving economic competitiveness. It is inconsistent with the SA.</td>
<td>CS14 will be amended to reflect the cross cutting themes in the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRPO/0019/CPRE</td>
<td>Gillian Gibson</td>
<td>CPRE Darlington District Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Generally support CS14 but does section (III) protect non listed individual buildings of merit which are outside the conservation areas or other areas mentioned like an old, fine building from demolition where the developer can make more profit from demolition and rebuild than from a refurbishment? A local list is noted and could be a useful way forward, though more detail of how it would operate and timetable for introduction would be helpful. Are settings of buildings in the areas, which are currently, low density, like the west end of Darlington included? Can this policy resist pressure for the building of dwellings in the gardens of large houses and the resulting town cramming? If CS14 III does not deal with the above concerns where is the provision elsewhere to do so?</td>
<td>CS14 protects nationally protected and designated buildings, features and settings, as well as those in Conservation Areas, that reflect the railway, industrial and Quaker heritage and those on the local list (which is currently being prepared) and those on the local at risk register. Should a building, feature, landmark and/or setting fall into these categories then CS14 would afford it protection and seek to enhance them where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRPO/0059/NE</td>
<td>Tracy Jones</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td>Policy/Para. No.7.1.6 /7.1.7.1.8CS14: 7.1.6 The European Landscape Convention (ELC) defines landscape as ‘an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors’. Encourage the ELC objectives to be embedded within strategies and policies at the local level. Based on this definition of landscape, the term ‘built and natural townscapes and landscapes’ could be replaced simply by ‘townscape and landscape’. Landscape character is created by the interaction of geology and soils, biodiversity, land use, historical character, and people’s experience of the landscape. 7.1.6/7.1.7 The three landscape character areas referred to are now known as National Character Areas: Tees Lowlands, Durham Magnesian Limestone Plateau, Durham Coalfield Pennine Fringe. 7.1.10 Links should be made to CS17 on green infrastructure.</td>
<td>References to landscape character areas (7.1.6/7.1.7) and links to CS17 natural townscapes and landscapes’ more appropriately describes landscape in Darlington at a local level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CS15 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity

CSRPO/0058/EA  Liz Lightbourne  Environment Agency  N/A  Support  Please see that protection and improvement of watercourses and wetlands have been highlighted. River restoration should also be encouraged and green buffer strips created where new development is proposed near watercourses consistent with PPS9. Please see the aim to protect and enhance biodiversity in the CSRPO and that previous comments have been taken into account. Strongly support policies in relation to biodiversity including CS2, CS4, CS15 and the supporting text and CS17 is in line with PPS9.

Comments welcomed and noted.  None

CSRPO/0022/HA  Kyle Maylard  Highways Agency  N/A  None  No comment.

Noted  None

CSRPO/0059/NE  Tracy Jones  Natural England  N/A  Objection  Some comments made on earlier drafts are repeated and should be re-considered and CS15 amended. What is meant by sufficient level of habitats (is this range, quantity or quality)? What is meant by ‘maintaining the sustainability’ of the target priority habitats and species? (1) We suggest this should be reworded to conserving, restoring, enhancing and delivering appropriate management to maintain and enhance the integrity of sites identified as having high biodiversity and geodiversity value including…(2) this should be reworded as there are other mechanisms to protect and extend the priority habitats network alongside provision in new development, such as use of agric environment schemes, biodiversity enhancements to the existing green infrastructure network, different environmental management regimes for example roadside verges etc (3) this should be reworded to ‘ ensuring that new development would not result in any net loss of biodiversity value and where appropriate delivers biodiversity enhancement and geological conservation as part of good design.’ (4) this should be reworded to ‘where appropriate restrict or manage access and usage in order to conserve an areas existing biodiversity value whilst enhancing biodiversity along access corridors and linking habitat networks. (5) Hedgerows should be added to the list. Delivery Organisation – Natural England should be added here – through the use of Higher Level and Entry Level Environmental Stewardship.

Further consideration of comments required. 1), 4) 5) and delivery will be amended accordingly to reflect comments made3) No change required

Comments welcomed and noted.  None

CS16 – Protecting Environmental Resources, Human Health and Safety

CSRPO/0058/EA  Liz Lightbourne  Environment Agency  N/A  Support  Support the first line to locate more vulnerable activities outside of high risk flood zones. Recommend that the second sentence is reworded to clarify that only if the Sequential and Exception Test is passed will it be considered in higher risk areas. It should be stated that the development itself mitigates flood risk and does not cause or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere. Strongly support the aim to encourage SuDS in new development but recommend that it is considered for existing development e.g. retrofitting.

Noted.  It is not the purpose of this document to require retrofitting of SuDS.

Appropriate references to the Sequential and Exception Test will be incorporated in the supporting test.

Comments welcomed and noted.  None
Para. 7.3.1 states that the Borough's natural environment is a valuable, but fragile resource as is the built and historic environment, which should be protected. Heritage assets are a finite resource that once gone, are gone forever. Conservation of the historic environment reduces the waste removed to landfill, reducing the demand for natural resources, reducing the energy required to manufacture and transport new building materials for construction afresh. CS16 does not exclude such considerations, but would urge references to them to be more explicit.

These matters are appropriately identified in CS2, which requires all development proposals to make efficient use of land, existing buildings and resources and incorporate measures to reduce carbon emissions, reduce energy management and adapt to climate change.

Comments welcomed and noted

Mr. Steve Wharton
Northumbrian Water Limited
England and Lyle

Support

Para 7.3.7 and 7.3.9 NWL’s previous representations requested explicit reference to the inclusion of sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS). Support the reference to SuDS in Para 7.3.7; it is important that this policy context is retained in the submission Core Strategy. Town Centre Fringe is drained by a combined sewerage system and NWL urge that there are benefits from re-directing surface water into the Skerne to reduce the risk of sewage flooding in the town centre, reduce the foul discharges from the sewer overflows helps the environment and reduces the power and treatment costs of dealing with surface water through the sewerage system. These should be explicitly embraced in policies in the Darlington Town Centre Fringe AAP. NWL supports the reference to ‘integrated drainage solutions’ in Para 7.3.9 and it is important that this policy context is retained in the submission Core Strategy.

Comments welcomed and noted

C. Megginson
North East Planning Body

Support

Aim of reducing the risk of flooding and water pollution is consistent with RSS policies 34 and 35. In order to reinforce this policy, would support the inclusion of a requirement for Sustainable Drainage Systems to be incorporated in planning applications. Reducing air, land, light and noise pollution are consistent with RSS policies 2, 8 and 37.

The use of SuDS is discussed in para 7.3.7 of the supporting text and is also required through the incorporation of sustainable building standards in CS2. Further detailed guidance on incorporating SuDS is set out in the Council’s adopted Design SPD.

Comments welcomed and noted

Gillan Gibson
CPRE Darlington District Committee

Support

CPRE supports this policy.

No comment.

No comment.

Charles Johnson
DBC (Councillor)

Objection

The broad statement about developments which have an adverse impact should be avoided. This could result in many industrials looking elsewhere when we need to boost manufacturing.

Development which have an adverse impact on environmental resources should be avoided' is consistent with national guidance and will remain in CS16. However this should not discourage manufacturing to locate in the Borough; mitigation would be required to ensure that environmental resources were adversely impacted upon, required by CS16.

Comments welcomed and noted

Deb Roberts
The Coal Authority

Support

Within Darlington, there is a small area of past coal mining legacy in the north of the Borough. Whilst it is unlikely that any development will be proposed in this particular area of Darlington, consider it important that a requirement is included within the CS for developers to consider ground conditions and land stability. Pleased to note that CS16 addresses the requirements of PPG14, Para 7.3.2 sets an appropriate justification for CS16, by acknowledging Darlington’s industrial heritage and resulting legacy.

Comments welcomed and noted

Liz Lightbourne
Environment Agency

Objection

Tees Valley SFRA is a good starting point for allocation of development outside of flood risk areas but strongly recommend that the Darlington SFRA be used at a more site specific level and to inform the Sequential Test. CS16 a) it should be stated that areas at risk from river flooding from Main Rivers and Ordinary Watercourses" as Cocker Beck is classified as a Main River. CS16 should be supported by the Darlington SFRA and its recommendations.

Noted. The Darlington SFRA is an important part of the LDF evidence base and has helped inform the Core Strategy. It will also be used to help inform the Core Strategy Sequential Test paper that will be produced to accompany the submission Core Strategy.

CS16 will be amended accordingly.
Objection

A main area of concern is flooding, not only in regards to Croft House but also Cree Beck. Regardless of the development of Croft House, the flood risk, when the Tees flows at more than 700cu m/sec, when flooding occurs, nothing in the new development or existing area will stop it. Want CS16 to state and reassure residents how DBC and the EA intend dealing and preventing flooding. Identify not giving planning permission to future development, but how will communities already there and suffering be assisted. Will the Croft House development be refused as it falls within these proposals? In Appendix 6 section 11 states 'Flood Risk, none identified'. This requires amendment. Several parts of Hurworth are prone to flood risk and recently a Flood Warden Scheme has been established, along with major areas of Neasham. Plans have been put forward (and apparently approved) to allow the construction of houses at Croft House in Hurworth Place. Also have recently had major issues of flooding in Cree Beck. This is likely to further inflate the flood risk and could cause serious damage and grief to adjacent residents. Strongly urge you to revisit Appendix 6 and CS16 and correct the information contained therein.

CS16 sets out how new development will, once the Core Strategy is adopted ensure there is no detrimental impact on the environment, amenity and health and safety of the community from a range of issues including flood risk. The Croft House application is being considered under the adopted Local Plan and concerns should be raised through the planning application consultation process. The Environment Agency should also be contacted to discuss the issue of flood risk to existing properties. Appendix 6 refers to a specific site within Hurworth (SHLAA 17) where the Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment considers it is possible to develop the site leaving a small part of the north eastern corner as open space to allow water to be stored and drained in times of flood risk. This does not apply to the whole village.