



Compulsory Purchase Order Decision

Inquiry Held on 18-19 January 2022

Site visit made on 21 January 2022

by Patrick Hanna MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 February 2022

File Ref: APP/PCU/CPOP/N1350/3271399

- This Order was made under Section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 by Darlington Borough Council on 28 January 2021.
 - The purposes of the Order are to facilitate the carrying out of development, redevelopment and improvement on or in relation to the land comprising the demolition **of existing buildings and the construction to new station 'gateways' consisting of** multi-modal transport interchanges, new public realm and multi-storey car park with station shell and related infrastructure which development, redevelopment or improvement is likely to contribute to the achievement of the promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental well-being of the **Acquiring Authority's area**.
 - The main grounds of objection relate to lack of economic, environmental and social benefits, including lack of causal link to CPO; no planning permission; funding not guaranteed; viability; inadequate negotiation; inadequate justification for inclusion of plots; alternative options not demonstrated; lack of evidence for parking need; loss of homes; loss of business premises; and safeguarding of electricity assets.
 - When the inquiry opened there were 5 remaining objections. No objections were withdrawn, and no late objections were lodged.
-

Decision

1. The Darlington Borough Council (Darlington Station Gateway) Compulsory Purchase Order 2021 is confirmed with the following modification: Substitution **of the word 'pink' with the word 'lilac'** in paragraph 2 of the Order.

Procedural Matters

2. The inquiry into the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) was held in conjunction with the Stopping Up of Highways (North East)(No.) Order 202 application (SUO)¹. Whilst these are separate Orders, the Stopping Up Order (SUO) application has a close relationship to the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO). The SUO is subject to a separate report to the Secretary of State for Transport.
3. At the start of the inquiry, the Acquiring Authority (AA) for the CPO confirmed that all the statutory formalities had been complied with and the convening notice was taken as read. No points were taken to the contrary. The AA provided detailed legal submissions² in respect of human rights, and I return to this matter later. Five late letters of support were also received at that time³.
4. I have viewed the sealed Order map and this shows the areas of land to be **acquired coloured in lilac, notwithstanding the AA's description as pink.**

¹ SUO case ref: DPI/N1350/21/26/SUOH

² **Annex to AA's opening submissions**

³ From Transpennine Express, Tees Valley Mayor, Northern Trains Ltd, Transport for the North, and Darlington Association on Disability

5. Examination of the draft Darlington Borough Local Plan (DBLP) took place in May and June 2021 and consultation on main modifications was concluded in November 2021. The DBLP was adopted on 17 February 2022, after the close of the inquiry. Parties had already been provided with opportunity to comment on the draft DBLP in their submissions to the inquiry, and no objections to the CPO were made with particular regard to the development plan.

The Order lands and surroundings

6. The CPO relates to two parcels of land, one to the east of Darlington Station and the other to the west, with a total of 45 plots. The eastern parcel of land **includes land and buildings bounded by Adelaide Street and St John's Place**, Neasham Road, Garbutt Place and Princes Street; and land and buildings between the railway and west and south of Princes Street. The western parcel includes an access area adjacent to the railway station; buildings south of 95 Pensbury Street; Hogans public house; 1 Waverley Terrace and associated buildings; and part of the former cattle market. A full description is set out in the schedule to the CPO and is shown on the accompanying plan.
7. Darlington station is on the East Coast Main Line (ECML) and is one of the principal rail gateways for the Tees Valley and the wider South Durham and North Yorkshire area. It is located on the fringes of Darlington town centre.

The proposal for the Order lands

8. The Order lands would be redeveloped to form new gateways at the east and west of the station, in accordance with two planning permissions and a listed building consent approved recently⁴. The eastern parcel of land would involve demolition of existing buildings and erection of a new station building, with station concourse, a new multi-storey car park, a new transport interchange area, and public realm works. To the west, a number of existing buildings would be demolished (including two non-designated heritage assets), provision of new station access facilities (including works to a listed boundary wall), new or realigned highways, relocated bus stops, and public realm improvements.
9. These proposals form part of a larger scheme (the Scheme) that would also deliver operational improvements for the rail network and station including; two new bay platforms on the east side to accommodate existing and future local services; a further platform for southbound long-distance high-speed services; track re-design to ensure local services can operate independently from the ECML; diversion of local Bishop Auckland services to provide conflict-free use of existing Platform 4; and new accessible footbridge. The Scheme is intended to be completed before 2025, the 200th anniversary of the Stockton and Darlington Railway as **the world's first public railway**.

Reasons

10. The Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities Guidance on Compulsory purchase process and The Crichel Down Rules (2019) (the Guidance) refers to factors which may be considered in deciding whether to confirm a CPO, and I have used these as the structure for the majority of the

⁴ Gateway East: planning permission 21/00688/DC dated 29 September 2021 (SD10). Gateway West: planning permission 21/00691/DC dated 22 October 2021 (SD25) and listed building consent 21/00750/DCLB dated 22 October 2021 (SD33). A temporary car park was also granted planning permission 21/01244/DC dated 14 January 2022 (Inquiry Document 8) at the former cattle market.

remainder of this decision. I have also considered other matters raised by objectors, but the CPO process is not an opportunity to revisit the merits of the permissions and consent which have been granted for the Scheme.

Policy framework

11. The Guidance indicates that consideration should be given to whether the purpose for which the land is being acquired fits in with the adopted Local Plan for the area and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
12. The Order lands are within DBLP Policy TC6 (Town Centre Fringe)(TCF) which supports development and regeneration of the TCF area. The supporting TCF and Bank Top Station Masterplans together identify, firstly, that the western area of the station should include improvement of a key gateway into the town and, secondly, that the eastern side presents a major opportunity for comprehensive redevelopment to deliver a new station building, a major new public space, a new multi-storey car park, and drop-off facilities. No objections to this policy were received during examination of the draft plan.
13. The Scheme also benefits from support from regeneration and transport policies, originating with the Tees Valley Devolution Deal (2015) identifying Darlington Station as a key strategic transport scheme essential to facilitate growth. The Tees Valley Combined Authority (TVCA) Strategic Economic Plan (2016)(SEP) prioritises delivery of new platforms at Darlington Station. To this end, the TVCA Investment Plan (2019) allocated £25m to those improvements. Since then, a number of other policy documents have supported the proposal⁵, **with the most recent being the Department for Transport's Integrated Rail Plan for the North and Midlands (2021)**, which includes Darlington Station in a package of potential improvements to be developed further as part of the **Government's vision for rail investment in the north**.
14. In granting planning permissions and listed building consent, Darlington Borough Council (the Council) concluded that the proposal accorded with the then existing and emerging development plan and the Framework. No objections have been made to the contrary. Overall, the purpose for which the order is required complies with development plan policy and the Framework.

Wellbeing of the area

15. Section 226 of the 1990 Act and the Guidance together require consideration to be given to the extent to which the purpose of the CPO will contribute to the achievement of the promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental wellbeing in the area.
16. The Tees Valley currently experiences high levels of deprivation, with declining industrial economy, high unemployment, and accessibility barriers to work. The region contains several population centres within a small geographical area, with variable external links particularly by rail to east and west. The SEP identifies threats to the region from other sub-regional towns and cities becoming better connected, and from growth in road traffic which would have negative consequences in terms of congestion and the environment.

⁵ Network Rail East Coast Main Line Route Study (2018); Transport for the North Strategic Transport Plan (2019); and Network Rail Continuous Modular Strategic Planning (Church Fenton to Newcastle)(2020)

17. The passenger and freight networks that serve the Tees Valley are at or close to capacity, exacerbated by the track layout at Darlington station which requires local east-west services to cross the ECML. As a result, train operators are struggling to deliver contract commitments and, consequently, timetable changes were proposed to reduce ECML stops at Darlington and discontinue a service between York and Newcastle that started in 2018. Capacity analysis by Network Rail (NR) concluded that a potential solution would be to double track Darlington South Junction and install an eastern platform at Darlington so that local services would not interact with the ECML.
18. The updated Outline Business Case (OBC) for the Scheme identifies a number of quantifiable economic benefits including journey time benefits and associated user and non-user benefits; additional revenue benefits; reliability of rail service and associated reduction in rail delay payments; as well as acting as a catalyst for wider regeneration impacts. The OBC concludes that the benefits of the Scheme would amount to some £209.53m, against a cost of some £80.72m. This benefit to cost ratio indicates that, overall, significant economic benefits would be delivered by the Scheme.
19. The Scheme would also bring social and environmental wellbeing benefits to the area. Whereas existing access to the station from the east is via a stepped footbridge, accessibility improvements will open up the station to those with reduced mobility. On the western side, the redevelopment of the existing underpass, portico and public realm will increase inclusivity and perceived security, as well as improve permeability and connectivity of the station to the town centre and the Central Park enterprise zone.
20. Public realm works would improve the fabric of the urban environment around both sides of the station, as well as widen the settings for the listed buildings⁶ and re-establish the visual connection between them. Whilst some harm would be caused as a result of demolition of two non-designated heritage assets, in granting planning permission the Council concluded that this less than substantial harm was outweighed by the public benefits of the Scheme.
21. The Scheme would deliver improved rail capacity with faster, more frequent, and more reliable train services, as well as improved connectivity within the local region. Passengers would be better served by improved station facilities, with better drop-off and pick up areas, integrated bus and rail interchange, improved pedestrian crossing, and segregated vehicular and pedestrian areas. The Scheme would facilitate improved cycle and pedestrian routes with Parkgate via the improved footway, along the Neasham Road and to Central Park, and offer improved cycle parking facilities. An increase in car parking spaces will meet future demand and facilitate changing of transport modes. Together, these benefits would encourage increased use of public transport.
22. Overall, I conclude that the purpose for which the land would be acquired would, as an integral part of the overall Scheme, make a very significant contribution to the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of the area.

Achievement by other means

23. Consideration should be given to whether the purpose for which the AA is proposing to acquire the CPO lands could be achieved by any other means, as

⁶ Both the east and west sides of the Grade II* Bank Top Station, and the nearby **Grade II St John's Church**

set out in the Guidance. Given the identified need to improve capacity of the rail network and station facilities at this particular railway station, it is self-evident that there is no alternative location for the Scheme as a whole. Furthermore, in order to deliver the full package of anticipated benefits, the Scheme must be viewed as a whole.

24. Objections have been made on the necessity of inclusion of individual plots to the Scheme and I return to these concerns later. However, it will be seen below that I find acquisition of all of the individual plots would be necessary to deliver the purpose of the CPO, which could not therefore be achieved by other means.

Funding and viability

25. The Guidance states that consideration should be given to the potential financial viability of the CPO scheme. In particular the sources of funding for both acquiring the land and implementing the scheme need to be shown. The Guidance confirms that funding does not necessarily have to be fully in place at the current time, rather a general indication of funding intentions and third party commitments should be able to offer sufficient reassurance that there is a reasonable prospect of the scheme proceeding.
26. The funding position for the Scheme derives from two main sources, TVCA and the Department for Transport (DfT) working in partnership. In addition, the Council has demonstrated commitment to the Scheme through investment of some £3.5m of funding in promoting the CPO and acquiring property interests. Both TVCA and DfT have provided letters confirming the funding position.
27. TVCA confirm its strong support and continued funding commitment to the upgrade of Darlington station, which it identifies as a high priority. Funding of £25m is confirmed, having been approved by the TVCA Cabinet from the Integrated Transport Programme. To ensure the Scheme is delivered in the required timescales, TVCA have also proposed to make a further £8m available from the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement as a contingency.
28. Funding for the rail elements of the Scheme will be met by the DfT through the Rail Network Enhancements Pipeline budget. In June 2020, £8.7m was committed in order to progress design work on the project. The DfT confirm that it anticipates that further funding will be made available to deliver the Scheme, subject to business case, with the 2021 spending review anticipating a total spend of up to £79.5m on the project.
29. The Scheme is being progressed through an integrated design process by TVCA, the Council and NR along industry standard project stages. Acquisition, design, construction and other project costs have been reviewed throughout the development phases, and the OBC indicates that the scheme is financially viable. The sources and timing of funding for the scheme have been clearly explained by the AA, and there is a realistic prospect of the Order lands being brought into use for the purposes of the CPO within a reasonable timeframe.

Delivery and possible impediments

30. The Guidance states that the AA should show that the scheme underpinning the CPO is unlikely to be blocked by any physical or legal impediment. In terms of deliverability, the Council, TVCA and NR are highly experienced at delivering large and complicated infrastructure and building projects. The project delivery structure indicates that robust governance arrangements are in place, and the

integrated programme indicates completion by mid-2024 with new train services in operation by the end of that year.

31. Whilst the planning permissions and listed building consent that have already been granted contain a number of conditions, the AA is satisfied that these are capable of being discharged at the appropriate time and in the normal way. Indeed, the conditions are largely typical of developments of this scale, including those for potential physical impediments such as contaminated land and archaeological investigations. I see no reason why the conditions would present any significant impediment to delivery. The AA also confirmed that there are no planning obligation restrictions attached to the permissions.
32. Although a Decision to Deliver⁷ process is still to be undertaken, and a stopping up Order would need to be made by the Secretary of State, these matters have been planned for as part of the project programme. There is nothing before me to suggest that these matters are likely to block implementation. Once operational, the long-term viability of the Scheme would be secured through the statutory responsibilities of NR and LNER to manage rail infrastructure and the Council as highways authority to manage the new public realm.
33. None of these or any other matters indicate that the scheme underpinning the CPO is likely to be blocked by any physical or legal impediment to delivery.

Negotiations

34. The AA initially approached all owners, lessees and occupiers regarding the CPO in January 2020, and since then has taken a considerable number of steps to attempt to acquire all of the land and rights included in the Order by agreement⁸. That negotiations have largely been run in parallel with the CPO process is acknowledged in the Guidance as appropriate. Given the number and complexity of ownerships within the CPO land, the AA claim that even if all owners were willing to sell, it is unlikely that terms could be agreed within the programme timescales. Nonetheless, the extent and effectiveness of negotiations is evidenced by the AA's **acquisition of** many plots by voluntary agreement, and by the withdrawal of objections during the CPO process.

Objections

Objection no. 1, Plot 27, United Parking

35. The objection relates to benefits not being identified; lack of causal link between Scheme and benefits; no planning permission; funding and financial viability; and inadequate attempts to acquire the land by private treaty.
36. The economic, social and environmental benefits of the scheme are identified above, which I have found to be very significant. In terms of causal links, whilst not all of the benefits derive directly from the CPO lands, or this plot, the package of benefits as a whole could not be achieved without all of the Order lands. Each plot is integral to the overall Scheme and, to achieve the full range of intended benefits, the Scheme requires to be delivered as a whole.
37. Since the objection letter, the relevant planning permissions and listed building consent have been granted. A large proportion of the funding for the Scheme relies upon approval of full business case in the Decision to Deliver process,

⁷ The DfT Decision to Deliver process leads to a final decision on the investment.

⁸ As detailed in Section 4.3 of Richard Adamson POE and Appendix RTA2 (status of acquisitions)

which in turn requires the development land to be available. As such, full funding cannot be confirmed at this stage. Nonetheless, clear indications of the sources and timing of funding, and financial viability, have been given by the main funding bodies as set out above. This is consistent with the Guidance.

38. The AA have demonstrated that it has been in regular contact with United Parking since April 2021, indicating that a formal offer was made in May 2021. The AA state that the parties have not reached agreement on market value and alternate dispute resolution has been offered. However, market value is not within my jurisdiction in deciding whether or not to confirm the CPO.
39. Given this position, and the overall need for the CPO, this objection does not represent a reason for failing to confirm the CPO.

Objection no.2, Plot 12, Manminder Singh Dhatt and Narinder Kaur

40. The objection relates to there being no need to acquire the property and “targeting” of the objectors; loss of family home; impact upon livelihood; and impact of loss of business upon the community. The objection letter states that the matters raised represent just some of the objections, however no other specific concerns have been put forward either in writing or at the inquiry.
41. The AA refutes the claim of targeting of individuals. Indeed, the need is for the property itself, which is one of many, and which would be sited within the access area for the proposed interchange, as shown on the overlay drawing⁹. The location of the access is set by the separation distances to the pedestrian crossing and bus layby to the south and by visibility at the roundabout to the north, and could not be moved significantly. Even if that could be overcome, Plot 12 is a mid-terrace property and its retention could not be successfully integrated into the design strategy for the public realm. Whilst I have great sympathy for the position that the objectors find themselves in, the claim of victimisation is not borne out by the evidence.
42. Nonetheless, the proposal would result in loss of a home as well as the **objectors’** business premises and livelihood. Since the submission of the objection letter, the AA have offered to provide a potential relocation residence and have assisted in progressing a potential move to a nearby alternative retail premises with adjacent residential property¹⁰. This potential premises may be able to largely replicate the service that is currently offered to the local community. In any case, I note that there is no shortage of hot food takeaways in the locality and the new station building would also offer new retail facilities.
43. Given this position, and the overall need for the CPO, this objection does not represent a reason for failing to confirm the CPO.

Objection no.5, Plot 43, Paul Million and Adam Watson

44. The objection relates to lack of benefits and funding; inadequate justification for acquiring the plot; benefits being desirable not necessary; unclear links between rail and public realm benefits; alternative schemes could avoid acquisition of plot; and human rights. Objections relating to NR/LNER concerns and planning permission status are no longer pursued by the objectors.

⁹ Drawing number SGMSCP-FHT-Z0-SL-DR-H-00005 Rev P06 (Mr Colley Appx DC-SU06)

¹⁰ In evidence, Mr Adamson indicated this potential premises may be as close as some 100 yards from Plot 12.

45. My findings on the benefits of the western gateway are described above, as are the proposals for funding the Scheme. Although the western gateway did not receive planning permission until after the CPO had been made, the use of this plot is nonetheless necessary to achieve the approved highways layout.
46. That the proposed layout would resolve the existing substandard junction at Park Lane and Victoria Road is of importance, but this is not the main objective of the proposal. Rather, the design is based on a wider set of key objectives which include creating a modal interchange with high quality public realm that links and enhances the connection to the town centre and provides an enhanced user experience. Retaining this plot would create a pinch point in the new public realm that would limit attainment of these key objectives and whilst the objector suggests alternative solutions¹¹, these have disadvantages.
47. Firstly, the option for a turning bay in Pensbury Street has been included in the final Scheme, and there is no substantive evidence to suggest its inclusion on other options would enable retention of Plot 43. Secondly, relocation of the eastbound bus stop would not create sufficient highway width without acquiring NR land, which is and would continue to be used as a car park. This suggestion would in any case, along with the objector's third suggestion regarding the southbound bus stop, still require the car park entrance to be moved and would cause visibility problems at this bus stop. Moving this bus stop further south would also be restricted by the existing building at this point. Finally, providing the Waverley Terrace turning circle wholly within the cattle market would result in the loss of a number of protected urban trees.
48. I find the various individual suggestions made by the objector, even when taken together, are considerably less persuasive than the case made by the AA. Overall, the inclusion of Plot 43 within the proposed Scheme enables a **comprehensive and legible solution to the AA's objectives, by creating a new urban square** that would enhance the distinctiveness of the station entrance and create better accessibility and navigability between station and bus stops. Consequently, the acquisition of Plot 43 is not just beneficial, it is necessary to enable the Scheme as a whole and to achieve optimum benefits in terms of highway layout, public realm, and inter-connectivity of transport modes.
49. Whilst the objector questions the links between the transport benefits and the proposed western gateway, I have already found that the benefits package should be considered as a whole. The objector criticises the lack of detailed design for the public realm and the proposed tight radius at the Park Lane and Victoria Road junction which may require buses to wait for opposing traffic to clear before turning. However, that level of detail was sufficient to secure a grant of planning permission and the merits of this approved road layout are not within my remit in determining this CPO.
50. Even though the proposal would result in the loss of a residence and business premises, which would interfere with the rights of the objectors, it will be seen below that I am satisfied that the CPO is justified and proportionate.
51. Given this position, and the overall need for the CPO, this objection does not represent a reason for failing to confirm the CPO.

¹¹ As described on page 3 of the written evidence of Mr Snowball, based on AA options in Appx D of SD31

Objection no.7, Northern Powergrid (NPG)

52. This objection relates to the safeguarding of electricity apparatus. It has not been disputed that, since the objection letter, the AA have agreed an undertaking to protect NPG apparatus and any removals at its own cost. Given this position, and the overall need for the CPO, this objection does not represent a reason for failing to confirm the CPO.

Objection no.8, Plots 27 and 28, Dewton Ltd

53. The objection relates to; inadequate explanation for the CPO; insufficient justification of alternatives and continued use of plots; no demonstrated need for additional parking spaces; and lack of formal engagement in negotiations.
54. I have already found that the economic, social and environmental benefits of the scheme would be very significant. Both plots would form part of the land required for the MSCP and station building and are integral to the Scheme. Given the need for capacity improvements to the rail network at the station itself, along with improved connectivity with the east of the town, there is no feasible alternative to acquisition of both plots. Whilst the need for additional parking spaces is questioned, this level of provision has since been granted planning permission, the merits of which are not within my remit. Even so, those levels are based upon prescribed DfT methodology, robust demand calculations and growth forecasts. Since the objection letter, the AA have made formal offers and negotiations have subsequently continued. As noted above, negotiations running in parallel with the CPO process is accepted practice.
55. Given this position, and the overall need for the CPO, this objection does not represent a reason for failing to confirm the CPO.

Conclusion

56. The proposed Scheme is consistent with the local development plan and the Framework. The purpose for which the land would be acquired would, as an integral part of the overall Scheme, make a very significant contribution to the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of the area. The Scheme would deliver significant economic benefits for Darlington and the wider region; ensure faster, more frequent and reliable rail services; provide integrated rail and bus interchange facilities; improve inclusivity and security for station users; create greater permeability and connectivity between the station, the town centre and the east of Darlington; provide better facilities for cyclists; enhance the public realm and setting of heritage assets; increase car parking availability, and encourage modal shift.
57. The Scheme already benefits from relevant planning permissions and listed building consent. The sources and timing for funding for the proposal have been clearly set out, with ambitious but achievable timescales for delivery of the Scheme. There are no planning or other impediments, aside from land ownership, that would be likely to prevent the progress of the Scheme. Furthermore, without compulsory purchase, there is no realistic prospect of implementation of the Scheme and achievement of the benefits.
58. It is clear that the AA have made considerable efforts to acquire the Order lands by agreement, evidenced by voluntary agreements reached on many plots, as well as objections having been withdrawn during the CPO process.

Some outstanding objections, which are not sufficient to reject confirmation of the CPO, appear to have the potential for resolution even at this stage.

59. Nonetheless, having regard to the provisions of the Convention of Human Rights as incorporated into UK law by the Human Rights Act 1998, the CPO would clearly interfere with the rights of owners related to the protection of property. **The AA's legal submissions** conclude that there is no breach of these rights in considering and, if the submission and evidence put forward in support of the CPO are soundly based, confirming the CPO. In my view, the purpose for which the Order lands would be acquired, and the very significant benefits of the proposal as set out above, justify this proportionate interference with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected. The procedures for objection and confirmation of the CPO have ensured a fair and public hearing.
60. I have had due regard to the public sector equality duty contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations. There is nothing before me to indicate that acquisition of the Order property by the AA would conflict with this duty.
61. Overall, for the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised I conclude that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the CPO to be confirmed. I therefore confirm the Darlington Borough Council (Darlington Station Gateway) Compulsory Purchase Order 2021 subject to a minor modification relating to the colour of the Order map (paragraph 4 above).
62. The attention of the Acquiring Authority is drawn to s15 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981, as amended, about publication and service of notices now that the Order has been confirmed. Please inform the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State of the date on which notice of confirmation of the Order is first published in the press.

Patrick Hanna

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE ACQUIRING AUTHORITY

Richard Moules of Counsel, instructed by Darlington Borough Council

He called:

Jonathan Spruce MBA MEng CEng FICE FCIHT	Fore Consulting Ltd
Tom Bryant BA(Hons)	Head of Transport, TVCA
Ian Stewart BSc (Hons) PG Dip (T&CP)	Captial Programme Manager, DBC
Dominic Waugh BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Fairhurst
Graeme Dodd BA BArch ARB, RIBA SCA	Napper Architects
David Colley BEng MCIHT	Sanderson Associates
Richard Adamson BSc Land Man MRICS	Estates Officer, DBC

FOR THE OBJECTORS

No appearances

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

1. Letter of support, Transpennine Express, dated 23 December 2021
2. Letter of support, Tees Valley Mayor, dated 6 January 2022
3. Letter of support, Northern Trains Ltd, dated 5 January 2022
4. Letter of support, Darlington Association on Disability, dated 23 December 2021
5. Letter of support, Transport for the North, dated 17 January 2022
6. Annotated extract of Option 4, David Colley
7. Letter regarding funding, Department for Transport, dated 14 January 2022
8. Notice of Grant of Planning Permission ref 21/01244/DC for temporary car park at former farmers cattle market, Clifton Road, Darlington
9. AA Opening Statements (CPO & SUO)
10. AA List of Appearances
11. Appendices RTA1 & RTA2 to Richard Adamson Proof of Evidence
12. SD40 Equality Impact Assessment
13. AA Closing Statements (CPO & SUO)