

## Comments for Planning Application DM/20/02046/FPA

**ON** OnlineApplications@durham.gov.uk <OnlineApplications@durham.gov.uk>  
Thu, 17 Oct 2024 1:55:19 PM +0100  
To "clerk" <clerk@coxhoeparishcouncil.gov.uk>

---

## Comments for Planning Application DM/20/02046/FPA

Dear Sir/Madam,

Mrs Sophie Taylor,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 17/10/2024 1:54 PM from Mrs Sophie Taylor.

### Application Summary

Address:	Grange Farm Coxhoe Durham DH6 4HH
Proposal:	Demolition of existing farm outbuildings and erection of 83 dwellings (Amended description 14/05/2024)
Case Officer:	Callum Harvey

---

[Click for further information](#)

### Customer Details

Name:	Mrs Sophie Taylor
Email:	<a href="mailto:clerk@coxhoeparishcouncil.gov.uk">clerk@coxhoeparishcouncil.gov.uk</a>
Address:	1 Front Street East, Coxhoe, Durham DH6 4DB DH6 4DB

---

### Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Parish/Town Council
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

---

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Coxhoe Parish Council formally objects to this application on the inability of Durham County Council to 'require' the developer to make a S106 Primary Education Contribution to Coxhoe Primary School, which DCC acknowledges will be at capacity (full) in the academic year 25/26. Because of its own policy, and the developers stated unwillingness to make a s106 primary education contribution unless it is 'required' to do so by DCC, Coxhoe Parish Council cannot support this application.

DCC's Policy states that a primary contribution will be required if there are insufficient primary places within 2 miles of a development. The front of this development is a 1.7 mile walk to Bowburn Primary School and 1.8 mile walk to Kelloe Primary School, but only 0.6 miles to Coxhoe Primary School, which is the village school and the one that most parents from the village will want to choose to send their children to.

This and other developments will leave the village school oversubscribed and leave the village where it was back in the year 2000, where new developments closer to the school will result in children from existing properties further from the school not being allocated places on the 'distance to school' criteria.

The strict application of the 2-mile criteria may be deemed acceptable in urban areas, but for young children from this development and their parents being expected to walk 1.7 miles to school between villages on fast, and at times unlit, busy country roads we believe is an unreasonable expectation. We believe that this will lead to even more children being driven to school, increasing CO2 emissions and exacerbating parking and existing traffic problems around Bowburn and Kelloe schools. The 2-mile policy is a DCC policy not a national standard.

Are DCC and the developers saying that it is acceptable to require parents and children to have to walk or drive 1.7 miles to school when their village school is only half a mile away? It seems to hinge on the word 'required' in the DCC Policy. It is also a direct contradiction of DCC's own policy to "to help pupils walk or cycle to school with their parents or carers when possible" by forcing them to attend a school not within a manageable walking distance.

In the DCC Education comment posted on the portal 28 September 2020 they stated the requirement for a £441,090 s106 contribution for 30 additional children to primary places at Coxhoe Primary School the original proposal. The school has not increased in size nor the demand reduced, but on the reduction of the proposed development to 83 properties, DCC Education Department in their updated comments posted on the portal 23 July 2024 no longer 'required' any contribution from the developers for the now 22 additional primary children as there were now places available at Bowburn and Kelloe, which are within 2 miles of the development, which there presumably also were in 2020? It is estimated that the s106 contribution for 22 additional children would be approximately £323,466.

It is noted the census data quoted is from 2021 and that the estimated number of pupils at these schools is woefully out of date and takes no account of recent major developments such as Integra 61 that expansions to those schools were built to accommodate. DCC and builders can't keep building and keep counting the same empty places as others?

Coxhoe Parish Council wrote to the developer 19 August and requested that they make a voluntary s106 contribution to Coxhoe Primary School. The developer replied to Coxhoe Parish Council 19 September rejecting that request stating that they: 'can only be bound by what Durham, as planning authority have requested from us. They in turn need to make sure that all planning obligations meet the tests that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, therefore cannot request planning obligations above and over that test when they are not required. As such, we are unable to commit to providing planning obligations over and above those requested by the Local Planning Authority.'

Coxhoe Parish Council have asked their County Councillors to ask DCC to 'request' a voluntary primary s106 contribution from the developer although according to their current policy DCC cannot 'require' it.

Coxhoe Primary School Governors have asked their MP Alan Strickland to 'request' a voluntary primary s106 contribution from the developer because according to current DCC policy DCC cannot 'require' it.

Coxhoe Parish Council have been advised by Miller Homes, who have also recently lodged a planning application for 100 additional homes, that they are expecting to make a £392,000 s106 Primary contribution to Coxhoe Primary School despite their site being within 100 meters of the school, because of the impact their development will have on the school and village. It is also noted that Barratt homes whose development is nearing completion, have already similarly made a £375,000 s106 contribution to additional places at Coxhoe Primary.

The Governors of Coxhoe Primary School have a design for an extension which could accommodate all of these additional primary school children from these developments costing approximately £1.2m which could be built in phases with the extra places rightly being fully funded by the developments creating the additional demand.

In 2020 this development appeared prepared to provide the s106 funding for the additional primary places created by their development, in addition to the secondary and NHS contributions required. Unless they are prepared to provide

this voluntarily, if they cannot be 'required' to by DCC, Coxhoe Parish Council must oppose this development and request that DCC's Planning Committee also reject it.

We will also be obliged to make public the apparent inability of DCC to 'require' the developer to make the appropriate contribution for their impact on their village school and the developers unwillingness to do this unless obliged to and to seek public support for such a contribution from the development.

---

Kind regards

---

**Customer Notice**

We have recently updated our terms and conditions for all our services, including making some important updates to our privacy notices. To find out more about how we collect, use, share and retain your personal data, visit: [www.durham.gov.uk/dataprivacy](http://www.durham.gov.uk/dataprivacy)

Help protect our environment by only printing this email if absolutely necessary. The information it contains and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are only intended for the person or organisation to whom it is addressed. It may be unlawful for you to use, share or copy the information, if you are not authorised to do so. If you receive this email by mistake, please inform the person who sent it at the above address and then delete the email from your system. Durham County Council takes reasonable precautions to ensure that its emails are virus free. However, we do not accept responsibility for any losses incurred as a result of viruses we might transmit and recommend that you should use your own virus checking procedures.

---