

DURHAM CITY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING FORUM
THE PUBLIC'S VIEWS
RESULTS OF SURVEY OF PRIORITIES
Sue Childs, John Ashby and Ruth Chambers
11/10//2015

Contents

	Page no:
INTRODUCTION	3
A QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY	3
A1. Response Rate	3
A2. Respondent Characteristics	3
A3. Summary of Answers to 'What is Good About Durham City'	4
A4. Summary of Answers to 'What is Bad About Durham City'	4
A5. Summary of Answers to 'What Needs to Change'	5
A6 Categorised Responses to 'What Needs to Change'	5
A6.1. Governance	6
A6.1.1. Forum	6
A6.1.2. City Council	6
A6.1.3. County Council and Planning	7
A6.2. Housing	10
A6.2.1. Housing	10
A6.2.2. Student Accommodation, Students and University	12
A6.3. Community	16
A6.3.1. Balanced Communities	16
A6.3.2. Beggars and Buskers	17
A6.3.3. Community, Leisure, and Cultural Facilities	17
A6.3.4. Drink and Behaviour	17
A6.4. Economy	18
A6.4.1. Entertainment Facilities	18
A6.4.2. Shops and Businesses	18
A6.4.3. Tourism	20
A6.5. Infrastructure	21
A6.5.1. Cycling	21
A6.5.2. Infrastructural Facilities	22
A6.5.3. Litter, Cleanliness and Pollution	22
A6.5.4. Parking	23
A6.5.5. Pavements and Pedestrians	23
A6.5.6. Public Transport	24
A6.5.7. Roads and Motor Transport	25
A6.5.8. Taxis	26
A6.6. Heritage	26

A6.7.	Environment	28
A6.8.	Named Areas	29
B	OPEN MEETINGS	36
B.1	Attendance	36
B.2	Summary of Feedback on 'What is Good About Durham City'	36
B.3	Summary of Feedback on 'What is Bad About Durham City'	36
B.4	Categorisation of Feedback on 'What Needs to Change'	37
B4.1.	Governance	37
B4.2.	Housing	37
B4.2.1.	Homes	37
B4.2.2.	Students	38
B4.3.	Communities	38
B4.3.1.	Community Facilities	38
B4.4.	Economy	38
B4.4.1.	Businesses	38
B4.4.2.	Claypath	38
B4.4.3.	Entertainment	39
B4.4.4.	Milburngate House	39
B4.4.5.	North Rd	39
B4.4.6.	Roads	39
B4.4.7.	Shops	39
B4.4.8.	Taxis	39
B4.4.8.	Tourism	39
B4.5.	Infrastructure	40
B4.5.1	Cars	40
B4.5.2	Cycling	40
B4.5.3	Parking	40
B4.5.4	Public Transport	40
B4.5.5	Railway	40
B4.5.6	Other	40
B4.6	Heritage	40
B4.6.1	Heritage	40
B4.6.2	Design	41
B4.6.3	Green Spaces	41
B4.6.4	Parks	41
B4.6.5	River	41
B4.7	Environment	41
B4.7.1	Buskers	41
B4.7.2	Streetscene	41
B4.7.3	Other	41

INTRODUCTION

The Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum carried out a survey in June/July 2015 to discover the planning priorities of local people. The survey comprised a questionnaire and open meetings. These were advertised via a leaflet drop to every household in the Forum area, and to businesses in the City centre. A press release was also published in the local paper and leaflets put up around the City Centre and in the University.

People were asked to respond to a number of open questions:

- What is good about Durham City?
- What is bad about Durham City?
- What needs to change?

An open meeting was held in Durham City Town Hall on 29th June, 7.00 to 9.00 pm. A follow-up meeting was held on 8th July, 7.00 to 9.00pm, as more people turned up on the 29th than could be accommodated on the premises. People at the meeting were organised into groups to discuss planning questions with a facilitator and note taker for each group. At the end of the group discussions, a summary of the comments was fed back to the whole meeting.

The questionnaire was provided in a paper version (as part of the leaflet) and online. Questionnaires could be returned in a number of ways: by post, by deposit in boxes in the Market or the Public Library in the City centre, as an email attachment, or via the online route.

A. QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

A1. RESPONSE RATE

Paper questionnaire responses posted = 30
 Paper questionnaire responses left in boxes = 41
 Electronic survey questionnaire responses = 82
 Questionnaire responses emailed = 5
 Paper questionnaires handed in at open meetings = 4
 Total responses = 162

A2. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Status	No:	%:
Live in City Centre	131	81
Permanent resident	129	80
HE/FE student	0	0
Work in City Centre	41	25
Run a business in City Centre	11	7

Postcode Sector	Status	No:	%:
DH1		7	4
DH1 1		20	12
DH1 3		25	15
DH1 4		85	52
DH1 5		6	4
DH7 6	Run a business	1	
DH7 8	Work	1	
DH8 7	Work	1	

DH9 7	Not specified	1	
NE38 0	Work	1	
NE38 8	Work	1	
Not specified		11	7

A3. SUMMARY OF ANSWERS TO 'WHAT IS GOOD ABOUT DURHAM CITY CENTRE'

The most frequent comments are listed in descending order of popularity, i.e. most popular are at top – the ones starred are particularly recurrent.

- ****World Heritage Site, cathedral, castle, Palace Green
- ***Riverbank setting and riverside walks
- **University and students (adds to city vibrancy and economy), attractive environment of colleges, and public facilities (e.g. Botanical Garden, Library, Oriental Museum), lectures and exhibitions
- **Public transport and road transport links
- **Woodland 'wedges' which bring greenspace into city
- **Historic City (e.g. its Mayor and Bodyguard, Crook Hall, churches, mining heritage)
- *Shops, coffee shops, pubs and restaurants
- *Lively, vibrant, multi-cultural, with friendly people and strong community feeling
- *Compact size
- Market place and indoor market
- Variety of historic and period properties (not just on peninsula)
- Attractive streetscapes / beautiful architecture
- Leisure and cultural facilities (e.g. Gala cinema and theatre, Freeman's Quay, public library, DLI Museum and Art Gallery)
- Large number of pedestrianised areas in city
- Council flower displays and tree plantings
- Park & ride, and car parking
- Close to beautiful countryside, and nearby towns
- Parks and nature areas (e.g. Flass Vale, Wharton Park, Aykley Heads, Browney Valley, Baxter's Wood)
- High profile festivals (e.g. Lumiere, Book Festival, Brass, Miner's Gala, sporting events)
- Schools

A4. SUMMARY OF ANSWERS TO 'WHAT IS BAD ABOUT DURHAM CITY CENTRE'

The most frequent comments are listed in descending order of popularity, i.e. most popular are at top – the ones starred are particularly recurrent.

- ***Excessive student housing (much poorly maintained and unsympathetically altered)
- **North Road (tawdry and dirty, run down, ASB focus, charity shops, poor introduction to City for visitors)
- **Poor retail offer (of both small, independent traders and big names), empty shops
- **Pedestrian experience (e.g. poor maintenance of pavements, dirty, lack of curbs, lack of street lighting, hills, traffic and pollution, overhanging vegetation, cluttering with rubbish bins, bill boards, tables and chairs, not suitable for disabled or people with pushchairs, material (cobblestones), more bridges and crossing points of river and A690)
- **Planning decisions (inappropriate, unsuitable for a World Heritage Site, ignoring residents' views, poor implementation of control, lack of cohesion / gulf between University and Council, vested interests)
- **Traffic congestion
- **Night-time economy (too geared to drinking, encouraging anti-social behaviour)
- *Littering (including riverbanks)

Market Place (poor redevelopment)
Parking (lack of spaces, location, cost, park & ride needs improvement)
Poor design of new, modern build developments (e.g. Prince Bishops, Gates, 60s and 70s developments)
Millennium Place (bleak, unwelcoming, underutilised, lack of greenery)
Loss of / lack of open and green spaces and threat to green belt
Student behaviour
Lack of tourist information centre
Lack of housing for local residents/unbalanced community
Road system and traffic management
Poor appearance/maintenance of premises and streetscape
Lack of City Council

A5. SUMMARY OF ANSWERS TO 'WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE'

The most frequent comments are listed in descending order of popularity, i.e. most popular are at top – the ones starred are particularly recurrent.

***Redress the huge imbalance towards student accommodation, and the various problems this causes

**Change the County Council's approach to making planning decisions: take on board the views of local residents

**Increase the diversity of retail outlets (both big names and small independent/speciality shops); reduce business rates/rents

*Provide more housing (e.g. affordable housing; housing for families, older people and young professionals)

*Preserve and protect the City's heritage

*Protect green spaces/green belt and the environment

*Improve traffic management and provide a better road system

*Upgrade North Road

*Improve the provision for pedestrians

Promote and support tourism (e.g. reopen the Tourist Information Office)

Deal with littering and clean the streets

Tackle the drinking culture leading to anti-social behaviour

Provide more entertainment facilities (e.g. a multiplex cinema)

Set up a Durham City Council

Provide more community, leisure, and cultural facilities

Improve the Riverside

Develop balanced communities

Tackle parking issues (e.g. extend the Park & Ride facilities)

Improve public transport

Improve the Market Place

Improve infrastructural facilities

Improve the Bus Station

Improve cycling facilities

A6. CATEGORISED RESPONSES TO 'WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE'

Responses are listed under topic areas, and sub-headings within topics where appropriate. Additionally, named areas and associated comments are listed. As there were many comments about the Council and planning in general these have also been listed. Comments relevant to more than one subject have been duplicated under the different subjects. Items comprise the original words of the respondents, and all responses are given even if repetitious. All issues have been included though some are outside the remit of the Forum. The number of **respondents** making comments under each category has been

given. It should be noted that some respondents have made more than one comment under a category.

A6.1. GOVERNANCE

A6.1.1. Forum

5 respondents

- It's probably too late! Your opening example refers to more building - homes, shops and offices - is this all your 'Planning' is about, to build even more?
- The establishment of a stronger Local Voice, i.e. a Town Council and/or the Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum whose 'Voices' must be considered seriously by Durham County Council when making decisions that affect the local community. The Forum in turn must be resolute and business like at all times.
- The potential Town Council and/or the Forum must facilitate and go out of its way to seek and encourage maximum consultation, participation and engagement by the Local Community in order that the Community will have complete faith in the Town Council/Forum in raising and delivering the issues of concern to the Local Community on its behalf.
- Your request for residents' views highlights homes offices and shops. This is a worrying list of a NPF's priorities. I would have hoped for something a bit more imaginative than that. I don't believe we have to get bigger to get better. The last forty one years that I have lived here perfectly illustrate that.
- There seems to be a lot of "groups" (for want of a better word) that try to promote Durham...Durham BID, Totally Locally Durham, Durham City Chamber of Trade, Visit County Durham and now there's yourselves. Will you (and any others that I may have missed!) be working together for the good of Durham City?

A6.1.2. City Council

16 respondents (10%)

- The establishment of a stronger Local Voice, i.e. a Town Council and/or the Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum whose 'Voices' must be considered seriously by Durham County Council when making decisions that affect the local community. The Forum in turn must be resolute and business like at all times.
- The potential Town Council and/or the Forum must facilitate and go out of its way to seek and encourage maximum consultation, participation and engagement by the Local Community in order that the Community will have complete faith in the Town Council/Forum in raising and delivering the issues of concern to the Local Community on its behalf.
- Instead of a county authority it would probably be better for a world heritage site to be governed by a city authority
- Durham City needs a council
- We need a return to a City Council responsible to the citizens of Durham
- Town Council needed
- Town Council?
- Absence of a City Council. The County Council seems to be uninterested in the City
- having a town council would (or at any rate should) help, as long as the County Council was obliged to take some notice of it.
- City urgently needs its own town council with its own planning influence not one controlled by out of town councillors who seem to see development as the only way forward but will destroy with inappropriate development what has become a world heritage site built up over 1000 years. we are already at times grinding nearly to a halt, we have lived here since and will die in the city so mine is a plea not for me but

for generations still to come, it is so easy to destroy you cannot make an old city into something it is not. However as usual I do not suppose anyone in County Hall will listen

- We need our own town council - desperately
- Desperate need for a town/parish council to promote our views as equally legitimate to others in County Durham.
- Durham needs a Town Council to represent the views of local people. Durham County Council should not feel that Durham is theirs to mutilate. Developers should not feel that Durham is theirs for the taking. The views of the Inspector who rejected parts of the County Plan should be respected.
- The City needs a democratically elected representative body, charged with the oversight of the development of the City.
- Durham needs its City Council back, but all the councillors should be independent and party politics kept out altogether.
- but having a town council would (or at any rate should) help, as long as the County Council was obliged to take some notice of it.

A6.1.3. County Council and Planning

54 respondents (33%)

- [change] the Council's attitude
- Planning decisions seem to be taken despite wishes of residents, e.g. Market Place
- The Planning Department. The City needs a Chief Planning Officer who cares about the residents and who has some experience in design of both buildings and towns. He/she might also regulate traffic and taxis
- More weight needs to be given to resident's views & future planning of the city
- Attention should be paid to views of permanent, all year round, residents
- Listen to the people when they say No to yet more University buildings and new housing on green field sites. Leave some grass and trees for our children and grandchildren
- Let local people guide building based on city need & not the developers financial interests.
- Being helpful to Council tax payers
- asking & listening to the opinion of those who live in the city
- The mediocre elected officials and officers of the council have done little to improve the city over the last 3 yrs
- Planners simply hide behind government legislation and the planning committee seems only interested in income from business rates and trying to keep developers happy
- We need an elected mayor like London & Middlesbrough, someone who has the appetite to fight for the city
- The County Council has too many councillors live outside the City they seem to ignore anything people say to enhance the City
- Planning regulations to reflect the views of the people who permanently live in the city (& not just business interests)
- The county council's attitude to town planning in Durham City. Having only one councillor who represents Durham City on the Planning Committee is remiss. More local input from people who live in & love Durham should be considered as they understand the situation.
- Decisions on planning applications should be made by those representing the city
- Rectify bad council
- Rectify: Councillors including Henig grossly overpaid
- Rectify: Failure to take heed of residents needs
- Local views actually listened to by planners & less dependence on outside experts & forums, e.g. Market Place fiasco. "City Vision"
- Planning regulations need to be stricter
- Residents need to feel they are listened to

- The Planning Committee
- planning decisions taken by unsympathetic County Council,
- The priority seems not to preserve its unique assets, but to pursue short term improvements, dependent on money from bidders bent on business profit. Successive building schemes and roads have obscured the map of the City. Frequently, visitors are lost because the layout is not clear. There is no vision of overall development, but a piecemeal planning. What has happened to public promises for the Necklace of paths around the river? What has happened to Millennium Square, intended to be a cultural centre and fast becoming the Mecca of the Night Time Economy? Why bother to create housing like Highgate which was promoted as a Buy to Let opportunity and thereby create a student area of multiple occupation? The City has been taken over by student lets and accommodation blocks and eroded the residential streets. Are there enough families left to attend our schools and maintain gardens? A small City cannot afford for its population to be skewed in favour of students who are by nature temporary residents with no long term stake on the community. There needs to be housing policies to offset the above trend. There needs to be housing policies to offset the above trend. The emphasis should be on preservation and not on ever more commercial attractions. Care should be taken to balance the needs of a full range of people. Public assets, not private profit should guide decisions on alterations.
- DURHAM COUNTY COUNCIL MUST WORK WITH RESIDENTS ON A NEW LOCAL PLAN and not impose the existing flawed Plan.
- Frankly, the Planning Officer is not acting in the interests of the City or its residents, and the Planning Committee, from my personal observations, is supine, unaware, and ineffective.
- The County Council needs to radically modify its attitude to Durham City. It is not nor ever will be the metropolis of the North and therefore the emphasis on jobs and housing should be directed to the severely deprived areas such as the old mining communities that are spread around the area and from with the population seem reluctant to move. The DCC needs to listen to the people of Durham who live in the city and care for it, they don't because they only represent a tiny minority of voters!
- There needs to be a cohesive long-term plan for the City to take in to account the needs of permanent residents.
- Updates on where planning schemes have got to. We've heard about the Gates being pulled down, the top of North Road being altered and the old Shire Hall building being converted then it all goes quiet. This gives the impression to residents that nothing is happening but it may be behind the scenes.
- Inappropriate planning that is based on pandering to developers and unrealistic growth expectations rather than local needs.
- Planning decisions which are taken at the county level and ignore the views of the city residents.
- Poor city governance is the root problem. It is as if no one really represents the city as a whole and that county planners do not understand the economic forces acting on it.
- Key players - the university, the city and citizens - need to find more creative ways to work together. At the moment, the property market is shaping the city and that is not in anyone's interests. The city needs its own council and for that council to be run on democratic lines in ways that nurture civil society and vibrant communities.
- Planning decisions need to be made with a reference to the immediate surrounding area and what has been approved before. City people should make city decisions! Consultation with city dwellers, visitors, workers -- and listen to them!!
- Planners to take more account of residents' views
- The council needs to not only start actively listening to the views of residents it also needs to act on voices of those who are not developers. More affordable housing and a coherent city strategy. I agree with the points made in Harold Stephens report.

- Lack of a sensitive planning policy and proper strategy for potential developments sites and initiatives. DCC always seems to put 'business' before the interests of residents and visitors and seems intent on destroying the green views from the city centre mentioned above.
- More generally, the city needs a council that understands its unique needs and the ways in which it can best contribute to the economy (and national and international profile) of County Durham and the wider region.
- Scrap the County Council magazine and put the information in the Durham Times.
- I must include the attitude of our Council - their determination to do what they want to do and not to listen to the public voice (They hold consultations but take no notice of what others say.
- The council needs to listen to residents and reflect their wish for a sustainable development plan appropriate that capitalises in a sensitive way on the city's unique attributes.
- Even at this late hour elected bodies and those in positions of influence should listen more to informed and experienced residents. I came to Durham in 1974 and I found it a far more attractive city then than I do now. Let us have people representing us who are more aware of the city's particular problems. To have major decisions foisted on the city by those who have little first hand experience of the city is shameful.
- More consultation with actual residents in the city. Decisions taken by people actually affected by them - in other words residents, or their representatives - it used to happen! Contentious decisions explained by those who take them. More immediately - the Durham County Plan re-thought to reflect, and treat sensitively, the particular circumstances of the City and its infrastructure
- Acceptance that the Plan was deeply flawed and bringing in the likes of Sir John Hall who does not live here won't change this.
- We need a Council which has an interest in the area and the people, instead of councillors who are elected in a different part of the County playing politics to the detriment of the City.
- The Council need to make sure that any plans they put forward actually have some chance of being passed and that they have the money to make proposed changes. There's been so many different plans put forward in the years that we've been trading here and none of them have happened!
- Fresh ideas from the council.
- Planning decisions for the city are taken by councillors who do not live here. They do not take account of what the local councillor says. Eg. recent decision to demolish Dryburn Hall, a grade 2 listed building. Originally set down for delegated powers until Cllr. Holland intervened and had it heard at a meeting. Design and Conservation seemed to have no input or interest.
- The PLANNING authorities must start LISTENING to the local residents and the many associations that have had to be formed to address all these planning issues. Almost every week there is an article in the local paper about yet another application being registered for more student flats.
- The Planning culture which ignores the wishes of people living and working in Durham. The behaviour of Planning committees and who simply obey the party line and vote according to secretly pre determined actions. The arrogant attitude of Planning officials who again ignore the public. The fact that Planning officials are often out-manoeuvred by Planning Consultants employed by developers.
- The County Plan as it affects Durham City
- There needs to be more respect from the City Council towards both the historical and architectural heritage and the views of the people who live here.
- planning decisions taken by unsympathetic County Council,

- Durham City needs a plan for its future maintenance and development - a plan which will enhance its strengths as a working city in a coherent joined up way rather than piecemeal as at present.
- Planning needs to be co-ordinated, e.g. Gala Cinema wants 3 screens, Gates development 4-6 screens. Where is the sense in that?
- Aside from much more stringent rules about where student accommodation can be built and the capacity for these purpose built blocks I also think there is a real issue with planning conditions not being complied with and no one taking any action. For example, the Village at the Viaduct still does not have the management plan in place that the planning permission required despite being open for nearly a year. No one has done anything about it! Similarly, they often breached planning permission requirements by working on Sundays during the building process and although this was reported to the council (and a holding reply being received) we have never received a substantive reply as to what was done about this and whether or not a fine was imposed, for example.

A6.2. HOUSING

A6.2.1. Housing

34 respondents (21%)

- What is needed is affordable houses for families
- Listen to the people when they say No to yet more University buildings and new housing on green field sites. Leave some grass and trees for our children and grandchildren
- Priority should be given to housing (affordable) e.g. if new bus station is built, the old site should be for residents not shops (which we already have too many of - hence empty units).
- Housing priorities this town is not a campus
- More mixed family homes
- More provision of retirement accommodation by encouraging building applications. Milburngate & Claypath would be great locations with good access to City shops & amenities
- Townspeople need houses in the city
- Any new housing needs to be for normal families - not for student renting
- County Hospital site should be mixed housing in landscaped gardens
- More family homes - bungalows
- Provision of housing for all groups in the community, but particularly for older people
- Not enough housing here and elsewhere for low income and moderate income earners.
- Sort the students out. It's not just 'not allowing purpose built blocks'. Some terraced housing needs to be returned to family ownership, but that is going to be hard. Purpose built student blocks (sensitively placed and designed) might help. But only with assistance to owners of terraced properties to convert them back to family ownership.
- Encourage / make it easier for developers to convert retail units away from the City Centre, into residential properties.
- The County Council needs to radically modify its attitude to Durham City. It is not nor ever will be the metropolis of the North and therefore the emphasis on jobs and housing should be directed to the severely deprived areas such as the old mining communities that are spread around the area and from which the population seem reluctant to move.
- Planners appear to have an adhoc approach of looking at larger scale planning applications, particularly in recent years with the disproportionate number of applications for large scale student accommodation, whilst the needs of local residents, particularly younger people is ignored.
- There is a housing crisis
- More affordable housing
- HMO licences should be much more difficult to obtain.

- tighter planning control on conversion to HMOs;
- No purpose built student accommodation blocks in the city centre, give those spaces to residential housing ...
- Reversal of studentification of local housing to attract permanent, council-tax-paying residents.
- Affordable Housing: There needs to be more affordable housing built and of a greater variety within Durham City.
- I would like to see an affordable element included with purpose built student accommodation. Not all University students can afford £120+ a week for a 50 week let. Allowing developers to charge 100% market rent on 100% of the bedrooms means it is very unlikely that a traditional residential scheme, which would have to incorporate an Affordable Housing element at 80% rent/market value, will be able to offer a better financial return. Enforcing an affordable element on PBSA would benefit students in receipt of a maintenance grant and level the playing field between PBSA & traditional residential development.
- Lack of housing: For high quality developments relax height restrictions in certain locations. There isn't enough brownfield land for everyone to live in a two storey detached house. An acceptable compromise would be to allow larger developments of mid-rise height providing a mix of studio, 1-4 bedroom flats/maisonettes.
- Develop public/private housing suitable for older residents eg lower Claypath devt site is ideal flat walk into the market place.
- Private landlords should be legally urged to make properties more environmentally sustainable, eg double-glazing, fully insulated etc.
- Improved housing for families
- No more student accommodation in the City, house builders should be encouraged to build affordable family housing.
- More incentive for young families to move into the city. At the moment many are priced out. Bring in young professionals and the cash will follow.
- A broader range of different types of residential accommodation in some areas eg Viaduct
- More affordable houses/flats are needed especially for families
- The council needs to protect the city from being overrun by landlords and Estate agents who are trying to make a lot of money from student tenants. If accommodation is not protected, it will be increasingly difficult for families to buy homes near the city centre and it will be virtually impossible to rent.
- The centre used to have a mix of families and student living in harmony, today and for the foreseeable future it is dominated by students living in multiple occupancy accommodation. This balance must be reinstated otherwise the centre of Durham will die. The issue appears to be one of lack of a proper planning framework with decision being made by local representatives and not by so called representatives that live 15 - 20 miles away.
- HOUSING: The city should be encouraging developers to build more private housing for young executives and young couples starting on the property ladder - NOT SOCIAL HOUSING!
- More family homes for PERMENANT residents.
- The ratio of residents and students in any given street desperately needs to be looked at as a matter of urgency.
- We need to look for ways to return houses to family occupation, reversing any changes which have been made to adapt them for multiple occupancy. Perhaps the council could set up or partner a Housing Association with this aim.
- The City Centre has a number of under occupied premises, particularly 1st/2nd floors which could be converted in to accommodation for 1/2 people. this would help to revitalise the City, stop urban sprawl, reduce the number of commutes, help reduce

crime by having eye and ears in City after hours. Most Cities in Europe have people living above the shops so why not Durham. This would also reduce the cost of rent for ground floor accommodation and would attract more independent shops, which might improve the shopping experience.

- Bring in policies that use the large increase in purpose built private student accommodation to encourage a return of the older housing to family occupation.

A6.2.2. Student Accommodation, Students and University

78 respondents (48%)

- Designated student housing zones - not allowed in residential areas
- Over "studentification" of Areas that should be for permanent residents
- Too many student housing developments independent of University
- Houses that are lived in for only half the year.
- Yet more student accommodation proposed by private developers, even though the University says it isn't needed
- Failure of University to develop a proper policy, & take responsibility for student accommodation
- University needs to hold more responsibility & discuss with council & businesses developing student accommodation
- No further expansion of "student accommodation" as it is NOT needed. Plenty already
- Work with University
- Listen to the people when they say No to yet more University buildings and new housing on green field sites. Leave some grass and trees for our children and grandchildren
- Move student property to outside of city - commutable but free up houses for a more balanced residential mix.
- A good look at the effect of student houses being built - More control over new developments
- Too much student housing to the detriment of local inhabitants.
- there needs to be a balance between housing for students & local residents. There is too much of an imbalance currently
- Housing priorities this town is not a campus
- less student hostels (proposed)
- Rectify: Too many students during term
- Rectify: Too empty during Univ holidays
- The university's attitudes to student accommodation and its failure to take any responsibility for its impact on the city
- Serious consultation and resultant sensible plan for student residencies taking into account projected student numbers
- A clamp on more & more student accommn
- A limit to the numbers of students accepted by the university
- Any new housing needs to be for normal families - not for student renting
- Someone who listens to the University Vice Chancellor who has stated numbers of students will not increase by more than 500 in the next few years
- Some curb on growth of University & numbers of students in non-college accommodation
- Turning every available space or property into student accommodation or dwelling
- Student behaviour near the river
- Too many areas suddenly having student blocks built - Not needed
- No more students houses - litter problem in summer
- Purpose built student accommodation blocks built
- restrictions needed on amount of student accommodation in rented privately-owned houses

- students live in purpose built / converted blocks NOT ordinary houses
- student [night] life
- Stop catering for so many students (pubs etc.)
- Stop more building for students there are local needs
- University in response to government pressure and constraints has expanded student numbers without being able to house the additional students, so that too many have to find accommodation in the city and parts of the city have too many students living in them (but there seems no need for the private halls of residence which are now being proposed),
- Why bother to create housing like Highgate which was promoted as a Buy to Let opportunity and thereby create a student area of multiple occupation? The City has been taken over by student lets and accommodation blocks and eroded the residential streets. Are there enough families left to attend our schools and maintain gardens ? A small City cannot afford for its population to be skewed in favour of students who are by nature temporary residents with no long term stake on the community.
- Student housing
- Desperate need for a revised County Plan which prioritises family areas in the city by managing HMOs and PBSAs ...
- Implement regulations limiting number of HMOs in each street.
- Prevent development of large student accommodation blocks in and near the city centre.
- Create a fund for converting HMOs back to ordinary houses.
- Please liaise with the Centre for Social Justice at Durham University to draw on the skills to develop a map of Durham city centre showing which housing is HMOs (in one colour) and which are not (shown in another colour) to show the scale of studentification and the need for change.
- [Student bad, anti-social behaviour] There needs to be constant monitoring of these problems, not just wishful thinking.
- We need to have a robust policy to control student accommodation.
- Provision of student housing is essential to Durham and deserves a city-wide plan that includes all stakeholders.
- sort the students out. It's not just 'not allowing purpose built blocks'. some terraced housing needs to be returned to family ownership, but that is going to be hard. Purpose built student blocks (sensitively placed and designed) might help. But only with assistance to owners of terraced properties to convert them back to family ownership.
- First and foremost a better balance between permanent resident's homes and student housing in this small town. NO MORE STUDENT HOUSING - Enough!
- The County Council must take strident measures to reverse 'studentification' and bring local residents back to the city centre. The two communities can live happily, side by side, with the residents in homes that were built for them ,and the students in purpose-built accommodation that is built for their very specific needs.
- Much has been said about "studentification" but it continues to be just words. The situation is effectively out of control and has reached crisis point. However commendable localism is in principle, there need to be fundamental changes at a more macro level including the immediate removal of ludicrous subsidies available to buy to let landlords, otherwise developments like Mount Oswald and the inevitable mushrooming of HMO's (and letting agencies!!) will continue inexorably.
- Student accommodation needs to be retained to one area, out of the city.
- The student accommodation situation is out of control. I look to both the University and the Council for allowing this to happen. The University is outsourcing the risk of providing suitable accommodation, and the Council is looking to maximise return from developers. The resulting free for all is their fault. Shame on them both.
- The city has become a student campus for 7 months and deserted for the remainder

- An overall plan for the city centre, e.g. how many student houses are needed, what type of shops etc.
- Planners appear to have an adhoc approach of looking at larger scale planning applications, particularly in recent years with the disproportionate number of applications for large scale student accommodation, whilst the needs of local residents, particularly younger people is ignored.
- An end to new student accommodation - we need families and people who will live here all year - it's a ghost town at Christmas and Easter.
- Student housing. They need to reside outside the city so their messy houses and some poor behaviour are out of public and tourist sight.
- We need more permanent residents (and families in particular) in the city centre, not more and more student accommodation. Aside from the transitory nature of student residents and the lack of a real community landlords seem unwilling to spend any money on the upkeep of student houses and the gardens with the result that large parts of the city centre look very shabby indeed. Such a shame when the buildings themselves are often attractive. I have in mind streets like Waddington Street when I say this - the student houses look terrible.
- Key players - the university, the city and citizens - need to find more creative ways to work together. At the moment, the property market is shaping the city and that is not in anyone's interests. The city needs its own council and for that council to be run on democratic lines in ways that nurture civil society and vibrant communities.
- The rash of student housing is a real threat to the city's future.
- Discourage student accommodation in centre.
- Very large proportion of houses occupied by students (and for only 60% of the year). Prospect of large purpose-built student accommodation right in the city centre rather than some way out.
- I moved to a city with a University, I now live in a University campus. I am not anti-student, but Durham is too small for the number of students now living here. Tighter planning control on conversion to HMOs; purpose-built student accommodation is the lesser evil. NB although the university isn't at present expanding student numbers significantly, it may well be forced to in within a few years
- a proactive partnership between city and university, rather than just intermittent reaction to specific issues
- No purpose built student accommodation blocks in the city centre, give those spaces to residential housing, green space, perhaps interesting attractions such as a Durham version of Jorvik - life in the old days.
- As a former university student I have nothing against the student population but there are simply far too many living in the centre for such a small town. It works in other big cities like Manchester, Newcastle etc because they have the size. Student housing should be moved outside the city centre and the university should use student fees to provide free university bus services. Also they don't respect the city. They live 10 mins away from me and there is rubbish everywhere. I've frequently seen rats. I cannot think of another city in the country where housing has been totally taken over by the student population and there is such a claustrophobic atmosphere.
- Reversal of studentification of local housing to attract permanent, council-tax-paying residents.
- I would like to see an affordable element included with purpose built student accommodation. Not all University students can afford £120+ a week for a 50 week let. Allowing developers to charge 100% market rent on 100% of the bedrooms means it is very unlikely that a traditional residential scheme, which would have to incorporate an Affordable Housing element at 80% rent/market value, will be able to offer a better financial return. Enforcing an affordable element on PBSA would benefit students in

receipt of a maintenance grant and level the playing field between PBSA & traditional residential development.

- Attitudes, University and City need to work together for our shared city. Outreach required from those on the peninsula who are seen as isolated from everyday concerns of city residents.
- No more student accommodation in the City, house builders should be encouraged to build affordable family housing.
- The University and County Council need to communicate more effectively eg on planning issues
- University needs to be brought under control. It is taking over and regards the city as its campus.
- Students need to be told to grow up and stop drinking so much or they will be sent home. Police should enforce licensing laws - eg: Klute serving drinks to drunken students.
- and refuse planning permission for large residential student housing
- The council needs to protect the city from being overrun by landlords and Estate agents who are trying to make a lot of money from student tenants. If accommodation is not protected, it will be increasingly difficult for families to buy homes near the city centre and it will be virtually impossible to rent.
- The centre used to have a mix of families and student living in harmony, today and for the foreseeable future it is dominated by students living in multiple occupancy accommodation. This balance must be reinstated otherwise the centre of Durham will die. The issue appears to be one of lack of a proper planning framework with decision being made by local representatives and not by so called representatives that live 15 - 20 miles away.
- STUDENTS: - Planning authorities must stop ignoring the views of local residents who do not want to live in the middle of a huge Uni campus. They must stop all these greedy developers ruining our lovely city. and enforce a policy that only planning applications that enhance the city are passed..... Not ones that allow magnificent Edwardian buildings being knocked down to make way for student flats. The developers don't care - they don't live here.... I wonder how many of the planning people live in
- Almost every week there is an article in the local paper about yet another application being registered for more student flats.
- The ratio of residents and students in any given street desperately needs to be looked at as a matter of urgency.
- Dirty and neglected student accommodation
- There needs to be more regulation regarding landlords and student housing ASAP! This is an urgent issue which has destroyed the local communities which used to exist in the centre. If there are no permanent communities, the area will not be loved and cared for.
- University in response to government pressure and constraints has expanded student numbers without being able to house the additional students, so that too many have to find accommodation in the city and parts of the city have too many students living in them (but there seems no need for the private halls of residence which are now being proposed),
- Policies made or reviewed for: Student housing.
- The university must take more responsibility for housing its students. It boasts of being a collegiate university, and should act like one. More students should be accommodated in colleges, and PBSAs should be brought within the college system, with the level of surveillance and pastoral care that implies.
- The council needs to stop approving planning applications piecemeal, and begin to plan for how much student accommodation is needed, and where. HMOs are not residential properties, they are a business, and should be treated as such.
- It is too late for the Council to use an Article 4 Direction to ensure balanced communities; their stated aim that no area should be more than 10% student houses cannot be met by

preventing further conversions. We need to look for ways to return houses to family occupation, reversing any changes which have been made to adapt them for multiple occupancy. Perhaps the council could set up or partner a Housing Association with this aim.

- Univ property along Bailey etc in poor state of repair - looks awful
- I think that there is presently too much negativity about student landlords and proposed developments for student accommodation based on whether or not more accommodation is needed. Ultimately, all student accommodation built in the city centre will get filled as student houses further afield become harder to let and revert to local resident occupation - that is the economics of supply and demand - students prefer to live in the city centre. So instead, it would be better to work with developers to encourage quality developments that fit with the rest of the community. Fortunately, most student landlords take good care of their properties - Neville Street is a good example where the stone built student homes are very well restored and maintained, but the commercial properties at the lower end are an eyesore
- There needs to be a policy on large scale student hostels
- Less absentee landlord student properties

A6.3. COMMUNITY

A6.3.1. Balanced Communities

14 respondents (7%)

- Imbalanced communities (why was this allowed to happen?)
- Move student property to outside of city... free up houses for a more balanced residential mix.
- there needs to be a balance between housing for students & local residents. There is too much of an imbalance currently
- Why bother to create housing like Highgate which was promoted as a Buy to Let opportunity and thereby create a student area of multiple occupation? The City has been taken over by student lets and accommodation blocks and eroded the residential streets. Are there enough families left to attend our schools and maintain gardens ? A small City cannot afford for its population to be skewed in favour of students who are by nature temporary residents with no long term stake on the community.
- The social ecology of the city
- First and foremost a better balance between permanent resident's homes and student housing in this small town.
- The County Council must take strident measures to reverse 'studentification' and bring local residents back to the city centre. The two communities can live happily, side by side, with the residents in homes that were built for them ,and the students in purpose-built accommodation that is built for their very specific needs.
- An end to new student accommodation - we need families and people who will live here all year - it's a ghost town at Christmas and Easter.
- We need more permanent residents (and families in particular) in the city centre, not more and more student accommodation ...
- The city needs families and key workers and balanced communities.
- The centre used to have a mix of families and student living in harmony, today and for the foreseeable future it is dominated by students living in multiple occupancy accommodation. This balance must be reinstated otherwise the centre of Durham will die. The issue appears to be one of lack of a proper planning framework with decision being made by local representatives and not by so called representatives that live 15 - 20 miles away.

- Discussions between the residential population, DCC and developers, in order to try to re-balance this historic city. Any future developments need to take account of the younger generation, disabled and elderly, in terms of accommodation and activities.
- There needs to be more regulation regarding landlords and student housing ASAP! This is an urgent issue which has destroyed the local communities which used to exist in the centre. If there are no permanent communities, the area will not be loved and cared for.
- We need to come to terms with the fact that this is a University city and the city caters for the university by providing accommodation, places to eat/drink etc for its student population. Secondly it is a tourist attraction. Last comes residents.

A6.3.2. Beggars and Buskers

4 respondents

- Amount of beggars & buskers
- too many buskers and "chuggers" on and around Framwellgate Bridge,
- Ban amplifiers, not buskers, just amplifiers. (Special events excepted of course).
- too many buskers and ""chuggers"" on and around Framwellgate Bridge,

A6.3.3. Community, Leisure, and Cultural Facilities

13 respondents (8%)

- Community facilities at Neville's Cross and other areas of large development
- Provision of community, leisure & sporting facilities, e.g. meeting rooms, art rooms, parks & playgrounds, sports centre & sports grounds
- Provision of more cultural facilities - art is particularly poorly provided for
- The cultural balance
- [millennium square] development of adjacent space for arts exhibition etc
- more involvement from library in cultural events.
- facility to provide outdoor seating for cultural events eg chamber music concerts in millennium square.
- there needs to be a big improvement in sport and recreational facilities in more accessible locations than Freeman's Quay - a ridiculous locational choice and typical of a total absence of joined up thinking in planning terms.
- Rethink city centre, shopping is clearly done for...internet and high rents. More art, cinema, theatre, leisure areas done up nice so folk like to come and meet up. Think of what was done to Newcastle riverside
- More cultural & sport events within the city
- The art gallery needs to be moved to the city centre. It is such a shame that a city with the cultural heritage of Durham does not have a city centre art gallery.
- A community centre for the Neville Cross/Merryoaks area (and some retail provision)
- The dearth of public open space, with suitable areas for children, games etc is a disgrace.
- There is a lack of affordable public space in Durham where different groups that make up civil society can meet. The town hall should be available free of charge to all legitimate civic groups that need meeting space. We have to encourage a vibrant public sphere in which good ideas for the wellbeing of Durham citizens and the city as a whole can emerge.
- We have been struck by the lack of play facilities in Durham for children. I know that Wharton Park is being re-done, but more needs to be invested in other parks. In particular the play ground by the river close to the statue of the cow should be refurbished to accommodate the many families who live here as well as those who visit. The old swimming baths could be re-furbished into a nice cafe- there would be great business in that location due to the amount of people who walk by there every day.

A6.3.4. Drink and Behaviour

17 respondents (10%)

- [change] the drink laws
- Rectify: Rowdiness at nights (called night economy)
- Drunken behaviour punished
- Idea that City is a "great night out" for yobs, regardless of how much money it brings in
- Student behaviour near the river
- The drunkenness & bawdiness (weekends)
- late-night drunkenness (a non-University as well as a University problem),
- [Student bad, anti-social behaviour] There needs to be constant monitoring of these problems, not just wishful thinking.
- Tighter control of drunkenness and antisocial behaviour from people coming in to Durham from outside on Friday and Saturday afternoons/evening.
- Drinking culture should be discouraged in City Centre.
- The boozing culture...
- Too much emphasis placed on alcohol consumption as part of the 'night-time economy' and a lack of other amenities (except restaurants).
- [Students] Also they don't respect the city.
- A reduction in drinking establishments which make parts of the City no go areas late at night.
- Students need to be told to grow up and stop drinking so much or they will be sent home. Police should enforce licensing laws - eg: Klute serving drinks to drunken students.
- The drinking culture in Millennium Square particularly by students
- late-night drunkenness (a non-University as well as a University problem),

A6.4. ECONOMY

A6.4.1. Entertainment Facilities

17 respondents (10%)

- Durham needs a multiplex cinema at the very least
- A ten-pin bowling alley and an ice rink (both long gone) should be re-established to provide a meeting place and entertainment for youngsters
- Lack of good leisure facilities for young people - the loss of facilities like the bowling alley by the river seems sadly typical (as does the failure to have a proper replacement for the North Rd Cinema)
- need cinema
- Number of fast food outlets, pubs, clubs and opening hours should be restricted
- Would be nice if we had ... a better cinema
- restrictions needed on bars/nightclubs/take-away food premises
- Stop catering for so many students (pubs etc.)
- Cinema
- Rethink city centre, shopping is clearly done for...internet and high rents. More art, cinema, theatre, leisure areas done up nice so folk like to come and meet up. Think of what was done to Newcastle riverside
- no cinema.....
- Quality of commercial environment more cinemas
- More attractive shopping and restaurants to attract tourists and day trippers, rather than cheap takeaways for students.
- Rebuild the ice rink that existed in the city until only a few years ago
- Refurbish the old Robins cinema. It could be an attraction like the Tyneside cinema in Newcastle
- Planning needs to be co-ordinated, e.g. Gala Cinema wants 3 screens, Gates development 4-6 screens. Where is the sense in that?

- Enlarge Gala theatre to attract larger companies at present many people travelling to Sunderland & Newcastle this City deserves a better theatre

A6.4.2. Shops and Businesses

47 respondents (29%)

- More diverse / specialist shops in City centre
- More independent, non-charity shops
- Priority should be given to housing (affordable) e.g. if new bus station is built, the old site should be for residents not shops (which we already have too many of - hence empty units).
- Not making shop rents too expensive. We don't want anymore charity shops!
- supporting local businesses needs to be a priority NOT developers
- Attract small businesses and independent shops
- Attract new high tech industry
- Make Durham a 'growth pole' for surrounding villages/towns employment opportunities
- Attract more tourists to boost pubs & restaurants
- Better range of individual specialist shops
- Are business rents/rates too high?
- Empty shops in suitable area should be returned to housing, e.g. North Rd / Claypath
- Lower rents for shop owners to encourage a greater mix
- Investigation to encourage more private interesting shops rather than multinationals
- Would be nice if we still had a Waitrose
- Choice of shops
- Better variety in shops (clothes) to encourage people into town
- choice of shops
- More shops
- different shops
- Better shops, e.g. House of Fraser, Debenhams
- We need Primark
- Shop rates for new businesses
- Better retail
- Not enough decent jobs with an adequate salary.
- Increasing poverty (look at rise of foodbanks).
- Increasing polarisation between haves and have-nots.
- Reduced choice and freedom eg forcing people to do their transactions on-line whether or not this is convenient..
- Encourage / make it easier for developers to convert retail units away from the City Centre, into residential properties. It would be better if retailers were in the recognised shopping areas such as North Road, The Gates, Silver Street, Saddler Street etc, where appropriate parking and public transport (and shoppers!) are available.
- The problem is that very few people who live in the Durham area shop in (or even visit) the City. Most permanent residents with transport leave the City to shop.
- An overall plan for the city centre, e.g. how many student houses are needed, what type of shops etc.
- The County Council needs to radically modify its attitude to Durham City. It is not nor ever will be the metropolis of the North and therefore the emphasis on jobs and housing should be directed to the severely deprived areas such as the old mining communities that are spread around the area and from with the population seem reluctant to move.
- Rethink city centre, shopping is clearly done for...internet and high rents. More art, cinema, theatre, leisure areas done up nice so folk like to come and meet up. Think of what was done to Newcastle riverside
- Lower rents for city centre buildings.

- Complete rethink of business rates to attract traders.
- Much tighter controls on rented properties
- Encouragement towards independent retailers to populate the retail space
- Encourage independent shops to return to the city centre.
- Attract 'magnet' shops (it is a shame that greedy owners pushed Waitrose out of the city).
- We need a better range of shops, perhaps small and independent with cheaper costs making this feasible
- Plus smaller specialist shops should be encouraged - like York but not "gift shops".
- empty shops
- Dominance of national chain shops over local independent shops (in contrast to some other historic cities).
- More generally, the city needs a council that understands its unique needs and the ways in which it can best contribute to the economy (and national and international profile) of County Durham and the wider region.
- Business rates need to be reduced and the BID scrapped.
- Can I suggest review of shop rents to reduce them so that independent shops have the chance. This would add shopping interest. It would be good to have more of a mix of many different retailers, look at York for example.
- More independent retail outlets
- Regenerate North Road area, put some money in to attract some reasonable shops.
- Quality of commercial environment -- better
- Small business such as craft shops should be encouraged on to North Road, York is a good example we need good shops to encourage more visitors.
- More attractive shopping and restaurants to attract tourists and day trippers, rather than cheap takeaways for students.
- Reduction in rent and rates and/or incentives for businesses, so as more independent traders can establish themselves in the city, and get the empty shops filled. This would give Durham a more individual feel rather than just the usual shops you find on a High Street anywhere.
- CLAY PATH: Similar to North Road, the council need to investing re generation and introduce incentives to get small independent retailers to open up in the city.
- RETAIL: Incentives for small independent retailers need to be introduced. Small Independent retailers would bring more visitors as the city gained a reputation of specialist one off type boutiques or retailers , instead of just having the same High Street shops as every other town in the UK
- Lack of individual shops
- These streets are underused with some units/ buildings empty. A more creative approach is needed to encourage creative and pop up independent businesses into these areas. A good example of this is Brixton Market in London.
- Policies made or reviewed for: Shop rates for new businesses.
- No amount of Prince Bishops shopping streets will enable Durham to rival the Metro Centre as a retail destination: but it could accommodate the mix of galleries, small shops and cafés that draws visitors to Corbridge.

A6.4.3. Tourism

23 respondents (14%)

- There is a massive potential to increase tourism but it needs initial investment. The city is an excellent tourist destination but there is little to keep people here once they arrive. Initial investment would quickly have an impact & then attract better shops, tourist-gear businesses as well as the already massive coffee shop sector!
- Attract more tourists to boost pubs & restaurants

- A Tourist Information Office in the centre
- We should have the Tourist Information Centre right back as it was, where it was
- Promotion of tourism - it's more than just the castle & cathedral, all the other heritage & history in the city centre, plus links to the wider Co. Durham
- no tourist information office,
- restoration of tourist info centre in millennium square.
- Tourists stop off to see the Cathedral, have a coffee, use the toilet and get out ASAP. And who can blame them.
- Bring back Tourist Info as place for general local info (not just for tourists).
- We need a central point like a Tourist Information Office to which all those who are holding an event can leave leaflets and information.
- Make better use of Millennium square - as a tourist focal point. Though would that work with all the pubs nearby?
- North Road *attracts less desirable elements. poor first impression for visitors eg Bus Station. too busy with uses and taxis
- no Tourist Information Centre to promote tourism and Special Events Open new TIC perhaps in the Town Hall as it is more central.
- More help and encouragement for tourists to visit
- No proper Tourist Information Office.
- The city (and county) needs to have more attractions that will entice tourists to stay for more than half a day.
- No purpose built student accommodation blocks in the city centre, give those spaces to perhaps interesting attractions such as a Durham version of Jorvik - life in the old days.
- Better information about what's on in the city - info is available but not from a single source thereby making finding out what's going on inconsistent and difficult
- Need a good tourist info office
- More attractive shopping and restaurants to attract tourists and day trippers, rather than cheap takeaways for students.
- More events that bring the whole of the City together and not just the market or Cathedral area. So include North Road, Claypath, The Gates etc.
- NORTH ROAD: the council must put some investment into regenerating North Rd if Durham wants to attract the right level of visitors/tourists. If it doesn't less and less will want to come and the city will spiral even deeper.
- Restore the Tourist Information Office
- no tourist information office,
- Durham needs development which recognises its strengths and is sensitive to its nature. It is a small city, and care must be taken not to overdevelop it in a way or to an extent which is harmful to its potential as a tourist destination. Resources should be put into the maintenance which will make it a more attractive place to be, and to an information centre which can persuade visitors to extend their stay in Durham.
- Look at transition towns and the slow food movement for innovative ideas to bring the City vitality and raise its profile to the wider world. It is not attracting the visitor numbers other Cities attract and yet has all the right ingredients. It is sadly known in the coach trade as 'the loo stop' between York & Edinburgh!!

A6.5. INFRASTRUCTURE

A6.5.1. Cycling

8 respondents (5%)

- Build bicycle lanes
- Safe cycle path provision

- Durham is not an easy city to cycle round - some of the bigger roads are quite forbidding and this combined with the topography does reduce take-up. There are lots of potential short cuts through the city which whilst not marked up are used illegally by cyclists . Cyclists routinely could done South Street and then turn onto Framwellgate Bridge/ North Road , They cycle down Crossgate and the wrong way up North Road. My proposal is not to criminalise them but to legitimise this - much in the way that cyclists can come down Redhills Lane against the one way traffic. This makes motorists aware of the possibility of cyclists. There are also areas where no one is sure what the rules are - Can you cycle from Lambton walk to Prebends Bridge? Up or Down Silver Street? These things could be made clearer and regardless of the rules people do it as it is the shortest and safest route.
- Better cycling parking provision in the centre itself e.g. near the market place. More attention to the road surface especially near cycle lanes e.g. the upwards / southbound portion of Sutton St (A690) where there is a narrow cycle lane and a *sunken* drain cover on a bend which traffic often gets close to anyway. The bus lane on North Road and near the bus station itself, the road surface is in poor condition for cyclists.
- Improved facilities for cyclists. Durham is hilly, so make use of the flat land we have: For example, a cycleway linking Newton Hall with the train station, following the railway track. This would greatly improve access to the station. Open up the river bank for cyclists, e.g. past the boat sheds, etc, to allow cycles to pass from south to north or north to south unhindered by busy road traffic.
- More cycle paths - maybe widen and resurface the path on Southfield way.
- a roads/traffic plan that significantly reduces traffic through the centre, whether through a W/E bypass or congestion charging; this will also help reduce air pollution and encourage cycling
- Transport: The City needs to move away from the car being the dominant form of transport. Currently the LTP & CDP say they put walking, cycling & public transport first but in practice, the car dominates the city, its planning & spending.
- Cycling should be supported by removal of on-street parking & the provision of segregated cycling infrastructure on the major routes into the city. Rat runs should be closed to cars but left open to cyclists to create filtered permeability.

A6.5.2. Infrastructural Facilities

9 respondents (5%)

- No pedestrian street lighting on Gilesgate Bank (but we pay for it in our Council-tax!)
- More toilets
- The sewage works needs to be decommissioned and moved.
- Public toilets somewhere central (Market Place?) accessible for people who have pushchairs but no radar key! (Library toilets not available before 9.30am, market toilets need radar key...)
- disabled access could be improved, also for the elderly
- No cable TV & internet provision.
- The police station in New Elvet should become fully functioning again.
- The path from St John's Church to Clay Lane, and all of Clay Lane down to Quarryheads Lane should have street lighting to encourage safe walking in the evenings and early mornings
- [sewage works] Water quality in the area is very poor and we suffer several times a day from foul water discharges into the river. Concentrations of noxious gases (SO₂, NO₂ and other toxic gases) emanating from the works are also increasing. Insects are also breeding more heavily due to the previous expansion of the works and future expansion will make all of the above problems worse.

A6.5.3. Litter, Cleanliness and Pollution

20 respondents (12%)

- Littering
- More dog poo bins
- Grass mowing and litter picking are not synchronised
- Excessive street littering
- Rectify: Too congested and polluted
- Rectify: Dirty City Centre
- Rectify: Filthy pavements
- Cleanliness of city centre - visitors must be appalled by the filth
- litter problem in summer [students houses]
- Fast food outlets taking responsibility for waste packaging
- More litter clearance.
- Cleanliness ... of North Road
- Stronger management of landlords and tenants on property waste disposal particularly when terms end!
- We need ... better cleansing arrangements so the city is cleaner and free of rubbish
- [Students] Also they don't respect the city. They live 10 mins away from me and there is rubbish everywhere. I've frequently seen rats.
- More cleaning and upkeep of the City streets.
- More effective enforcement of noise pollution regulations
- How litter is allowed to build up
- Dirty and neglected student accommodation
- Policies made or reviewed for: Fast food outlets taking responsibility for waste packaging

A6.5.4. Parking

14 respondents (7%)

- Build parking garages and eliminate street parking to decrease congestion
- Parking for those working in the congestion zone
- Illegal parking outside of restaurants on the Bailey.
- park & ride service
- P&R open longer (later) - more reliable
- residents parking in CROSSGATE MOOR as most time if I come home at day time if school is on I can't park my car so end putting my car in some one else's street
- More Park and Rides
- Park & Ride facilities should be provided at Stonebridge on the west & Shincliffe on the south supported by additional city bound bus lanes
- Cycling should be supported by removal of on-street parking ...
- Quality of commercial environment longer hours for P&R
- A new Park & Ride near the A1/Bowburn interchange would be a welcome addition
- can we have a park and ride scheme on the west of the city (Langley moor end), please?
- I do not know what the current rules are on changing gardens into parking areas, but would like to see this 'banned'.
- In the conservation area, require the complete removal of front boundary walls for off street parking to require planning consent and prevent unauthorised footpath crossings
- Free parking on a Sunday?

A6.5.5. Pavements and Pedestrians

25 respondents (15%)

- Paving/Roads in town/market
- For one who fractured his femur on the ice on a pavement, pavement would be better deiced in winter, church street head

- Greater clarity about the respective spaces for vehicles and pedestrians on Sadler St
- Rectify: Filthy pavements
- Pavements need repairing
- As a matter of urgency access to the market square from the bus stop on the bridge to be improved - hazards are loose flags, cobbles, no maintenance. This is used by hundreds of people A DAY, many with walking sticks
- Clean & repair the pavements in the pedestrian areas
- Pedestrianise southern (shops) North Rd
- Rail on Halifax premises to help people (elderly) in winter
- The pavements needs repairs
- Improved pedestrian facilities - better & more paths & footpaths, non-slip surfaces, well maintained, provision of seats (ergonomically designed with back support and arm rests) at intervals along the paths, provision of hand rails on steep slopes, gritting in the winter time
- What has happened to public promises for the Necklace of paths around the river?
- Maintenance of pavements
- More attention to paving e.g. from the train station down, the steps are in poor condition and the paving loose. It takes many weeks for these problems to be resolved when the paving actually comes away.
- Pedestrian crossings on Gilesgate Green and elsewhere to help people walk safely with the ever increasing traffic.
- Finally, taking a visionary approach in terms of the development of the riverside paths and walkway areas of the city, a totally under-developed resource.
- Wider flat non-cobbled areas of Fram Bridge and Silver Street.
- Market square and Saddler St * many people don't realise where the road is as all the surfaces look the same. would be better if they were essentially traffic free
- No where to drop people off
- Regenerate North Road area Remove buses and pedestrianise the street.
- Policies made or reviewed for: Maintenance of pavements.
- The path from St John's Church to Clay Lane, and all of Clay Lane down to Quarryheads Lane should have street lighting to encourage safe walking in the evenings and early mornings
- Gritting of residential streets when we have snow especially in areas where there is a high number of elderly residents. It should not be beyond the wit of the Council to organise volunteers such as students, local farmers and those engaged in unpaid Work to undertake this vital task.
- Over hanging shrubbery from gardens are restricting pavement access (particularly noticed Fieldhouse Lane - opposite St Leonard's school) but also in Springfield Park meaning pedestrians walking in road at some point and if pushing pram / buggy making it potentially dangerous.
- Pedestrianise North Road

A6.5.6. Public Transport

14 respondents (7%)

- Too many (big) empty buses on "bus lanes" causing congestion for other traffic
- inadequate train service to Newcastle early morning and from Newcastle late evening.
- There is a focus on taking buses to the city centre rather than to major areas of employment - esp. County Hall/Aykley Heads area. Encouraging bus commuting (e.g. with dedicated work buses) could remove most of the congestion in that area.
- provide /arrange 'bus service up to cathedral on Sundays ref service times
- Realistic plans to help all motorists, who represent almost everyone. Cars are necessary. Buses are not always 'right'. Respecting the real difficulties people have getting to work

and shops, etc.. Not taking a moral high-ground about Public Transport in the face of real issues people face on a day to day basis. Balance is what is required.

- "The evening train service from Newcastle is very poor and means most people have to drive to use the evening amenities (eg Sage, Theatre Royal, cinemas, restaurants) there.
- There is no fast, direct, luggage-friendly public transport to Newcastle Airport which causes considerable extra expense in taxis or long-stay car parks for air travellers.
- Quite slow rail services to everywhere except stations on the east coast line.
- tight emissions regulations for all public transport vehicles serving the centre (if New York can do it, why not Durham?)
- Transport: The City needs to move away from the car being the dominant form of transport. Currently the LTP & CDP say they put walking, cycling & public transport first but in practice, the car dominates the city, its planning & spending.
- The new bus station should be co-located to the train station to form a transport hub
- inadequate train service to Newcastle early morning and from Newcastle late evening.
- Transport into the City could be improved by providing a bus to follow a circular route to and from the Centre of the City morning to late evening
- The provision of bus services to the train station isn't good
- Acceptance that bus services are a social service and not just an economic problem.
- Bring back the Leamside line with a station at Belmont park and ride and connect it to Tyneside Metro
- Park & Ride facilities should be provided at Stonebridge on the west & Shincliffe on the south supported by additional city bound bus lanes

A6.5.7. Roads and Motor Transport

29 respondents (18%)

- Establish a circulation tax for cars that enter the city centre and urban perimeter
- Paving/Roads in town/market
- The entry/exit roads into the City. I know there is little room for manoeuvre or any alternative routes
- The City needs a Chief Planning Officer ... He/she might also regulate traffic and taxis
- Greater clarity about the respective spaces for vehicles and pedestrians on Sadler St
- Cars need to be 'slowed down' on Hallgarth St and Church St. Consider making these roads 'one-way'. H. t - out of town; Church St - into town.
- Sadler St should be a pedestrian area. Access by car should be from the back. Or at least make it a 10 mph limit
- By pass
- traffic that is not coming to Durham should be able to bypass it, even if it means more roads
- The northern bypass to take traffic from Newton hall to the Belmont/Carrville interchange needs building now
- Non-resident car exclusion zones around schools. Paid by driver parking out of town like in town.
- 20 mph speed limit on all residential streets.
- Less motor traffic
- lower speed limits
- A northern bypass between Belmont and Newton Hall should have been built years ago
- Realistic plans to help all motorists, who represent almost everyone. Cars are necessary. Buses are not always 'right'. Respecting the real difficulties people have getting to work and shops, etc. Not taking a moral high-ground about Public Transport in the face of real issues people face on a day to day basis. Balance is what is required.
- Wider flat non-cobbled areas of Fram Bridge and Silver Street.
- The city should have an east/west bypass built.

- There is a housing crisis and a serious traffic problem.
- 3. Improve road traffic management. The cross-city traffic should never have been routed through the centre (Milburngate bridge and Leazes Road were designed in the 1930s and built much later with little modification).
- We need ... better traffic management
- Market square and Saddler St * many people don't realise where the road is as all the surfaces look the same. would be better if they were essentially traffic free
- a roads/traffic plan that significantly reduces traffic through the centre, whether through a W/E bypass or congestion charging; this will also help reduce air pollution and encourage cycling
- Park & Ride facilities should be provided at Stonebridge on the west & Shincliffe on the south supported by additional city bound bus lanes to get [?]
- Cycling should be supported by removal of on-street parking & the provision of segregated cycling infrastructure on the major routes into the city. Rat runs should be closed to cars but left open to cyclists to create filtered permeability.
- Nowhere to drop people off
- Constant road works.
- The traffic in the market square on a morning and evening. The heavy lorries delivering morning and evening causing much damage to street furniture
- The traffic in Saddler street
- A north Durham by-pass is needed.
- examine traffic flow on A 691 and others to reduce cross city transit traffic e.g. by finding diversionary routes up Quarry Head lane and Potters Bank for example
- resurface roads in Nevilles Cross to reduce road noise which is considerable (and others)
- Bite the bullet and build a northern by pass from Carrville to Pity Me. The city centre is far too overloaded with traffic and the system is very fragile. A breakdown on Milburngate Bridge causes chaos. And when the bridge is restricted this summer it will cause huge problems. We need another bridge. Everybody from Newton Hall who works in Sunderland or east of the A1 has to drive south into the city, over Milburngate Bridge then north again. A census could easily be carried out on the bridge, using the ANPR cameras. Sample 10% by post, asking for start and end postcodes. This will provide the information needed.
- Gritting of residential streets when we have snow especially in areas where there is a high number of elderly residents. It should not be beyond the wit of the Council to organise volunteers such as students, local farmers and those engaged in unpaid Work to undertake this vital task.
- Traffic is Very heavy through the city because of the bottleneck of Milburngate Bridge, Durham needs a bypass route from the Arnison centre (A167) to the A1M junction 62 at Carrville. This will also improve the diversion routes around the A1M for planned roadworks and unplanned emergency closures.
- Access to a Crossing point outside Salutation pub junction is inadequate. Traffic use the bus lane only at that point making it even more dangerous than necessary.
- Barrington Close onto the main road needs a grit bin as traffic skid on the incline and more dangerously still as they exit onto the main road , it's treacherous!
- Less traffic

A6.5.8. Taxis

7 respondents

- The City needs a Chief Planning Officer ... He/she might also regulate traffic and taxis
- A safer taxi rank
- Taxis removed from North Road

- A cull in the number of taxis on the slip roads
- North Road ... too busy with uses and taxis
- Inadequate arrangements for taxis on weekend evenings.
- Taxi's everywhere

A6.6. HERITAGE

35 respondents (22%)

- North Road and all derelict premises need to be smartened up
- The City needs a Chief Planning Officer ... who has some experience in design of both buildings and towns.
- New buildings need to fit in.
- North Rd redevelopment - employ world leading architects. Lord Foster/Rodgers or Adam Architects or Quinlon Terry. See redevelopment of Richmond (surrey) riverside
- Landlords need to be penalised for inappropriate "renovations" i.e. sash window removal etc.
- Clean up disused buildings (eyesores)
- All new developments to be PASSIVI HAUS in environmental rigour, not just lame building regs. Compliant
- More pride in the city by visitors and residents
- Put Durham back how it was
- Any new buildings need to be built to compliment the city and its heritage. (the Highgate development fits in perfectly) it's an historic site, that's why people come to visit. That historic site is not just the cathedral and the castle and a few streets around, it's the whole city. It's not the place for 'bold new' architecture, do that somewhere else.
- too late to do anything about appearance of Prince Bishops development but to try and learn from mistakes and not put up more eyesores which block the fabulous views.
- Encourage owners/developers to preserve/restore historic and period properties. Welcome the redevelopment of 'eyesore' properties into quality properties more suited to an historic city.
- No more businesses and student lets who don't care about the fronts of their shops and houses.
- Those visiting, or thinking of visiting, our County would probably say that Durham City is our only real gem. The County Council must spend whatever is needed to maintain and improve this world-status 'attraction' - simple as that.
- When planning permission is granted, plans should be sympathetic to the City.
- In new build, particularly waterfront property, have the imagination to create buildings as the University does.
- [student] landlords seem unwilling to spend any money on the upkeep of student houses and the gardens with the result that large parts of the city centre look very shabby indeed. Such a shame when the building themselves are often attractive. I have in mind streets like Waddington Street when I say this - the student houses look terrible.
- Planning decisions need to be made with a reference to the immediate surrounding area and what has been approved before.
- Perhaps make more of our mining heritage - the University might think they are all there is to Durham but the city is the centre of a mining area - we shouldn't forget that or lose the connection.
- The council needs to listen to residents and reflect their wish for a sustainable development plan appropriate that capitalises in a sensitive way on the city's unique attributes.
- Rather, what should be preserved, e.g. green spaces and old buildings.

- Eg. recent decision to demolish Dryburn Hall, a grade 2 listed building. Originally set down for delegated powers until Cllr. Holland intervened and had it heard at a meeting. Design and Conservation seemed to have no input or interest.
- Historic market place needs to be respected. Having a smelly burger vans and donought vans does not feel conducive to Durham historic past.
- They must stop all these greedy developers ruining our lovely city. and enforce a policy that only planning applications that enhance the city are passed..... Not ones that allow magnificent Edwardian buildings being knocked down to make way for student flats.
- There needs to be more respect from the City Council towards both the historical and architectural heritage and the views of the people who live here.
- Durham needs development which recognises its strengths and is sensitive to its nature. It is a small city, and care must be taken not to overdevelop it in a way or to an extent which is harmful to its potential as a tourist destination. Resources should be put into the maintenance which will make it a more attractive place to be, and to an information centre which can persuade visitors to extend their stay in Durham.
- More sympathetic building design should be encouraged to avoid clashes with the historic appearance of the City.
- Univ property along Bailey etc in poor state of repair - looks awful
- Some attempt to avoid potential dereliction of sites like old swimming baths, Neville's Cross college, Old Shire Hall, Hospital. Better students than dereliction. Why not marketed as flats for singletons!
- Durham has the potential and space to be as good a York, another beautiful historic City nearby which seems to have everything right.
- The development of Sheraton Park is a disgrace. The old New College building was to be for "luxury flats". Now we hear it is for student accommodation. It is obvious to anyone who looks at the buildings that they are being allowed to deteriorate to the point at which demolition will be proffered as the only option.
- Mount Oswald is irretrievable. But let us seek to overthrow the proposed scheme for Huf Houses: what have they got to do with Durham? On what grounds is the Planning Officer allowing this even to be considered? And what of the plans for the old golf clubhouse: is this to go the same way as New College?
- Neglect of Durham as a fine city; eg, compare with York or smaller centres like Hexham, Barnard Castle
- NEW BUILDINGS: Any planning applications to build or convert an existing building must be sympathetic and fit in with surrounding buildings. There should be no more eye sores like the monitors new DURHAM JOHNSON School. How awful to live across from that! Give it 20 years or so and it will be another 60s type issue.
- Iconic buildings, e.g. COUNTY HOSPITAL should have designated development plan to avoid situation that has arisen occurring again
- Improve facades of 60s & 70s developments

A6.7. ENVIRONMENT

30 respondents (19%)

- Update park
- Constant infilling of green and open spaces by developers
- Listen to the people when they say No to yet more University buildings and new housing on green field sites. Leave some grass and trees for our children and grandchildren
- We should have more greenery in City - not build on every available inch of land
- Council's Greenery Department uses poison to excess, all over Durham to kill weeds
- No protection of trees in conservation area.: nearly all trees on private ground on Gilesgate Bank (North Side) were recently cut down.
- Grass mowing and litter picking are not synchronised.
- Make riverside into a park/open space

- Fireworks have a detrimental effect on our wildlife - do we need so many in the autumn term?
- Protect green spaces
- Create a park somewhere (not just Wharton Park)
- Provision of green spaces & nature routes/trails throughout the city
- Desperate need for a revised County Plan which ... protects our stunning Green Belt to keep Durham city small.
- less housing on the green spaces next to the city. It's small size is a key feature.
- find places to plant trees
- There must be no rampant development of the Green Belt. Period.
- Cleanliness and appeal of North Road maybe large planters with some trees could be a step forward
- Green policies applied to all planning
- Lack of a sensitive planning policy and proper strategy for potential developments sites and initiatives. DCC always seems to put 'business' before the interests of residents and visitors and seems intent on destroying the green views from the city centre mentioned above.
- No purpose built student accommodation blocks in the city centre, give those spaces to ... green space ...
- Improve Walkergate - make it greener and more pleasing to the eye.
- Private landlords should be legally urged to make properties more environmentally sustainable, eg double-glazing, fully insulated etc.
- Rather, what should be preserved, e.g. green spaces and old buildings.
- Trees need pruning regularly
- Lack of Council commitment to PRIORITISE decarbonisation
- HERBICIDE USE: The current and growing widespread use of toxic systemic herbicides should be stopped. Research has shown that widespread use of sprayed herbicides is dangerous to the health of those doing the spraying - these sprays have been found to be carcinogenic when used often by workers - See RCS issues, etc.. We know sprays that kill plants are much more toxic than we thought previously. Look at what is happening to bees. Here in Durham we are part of the very big picture. Again, Health and Safety legislation is being used to manipulate policies, including cutting costs to the Council. Strimming is the safer option. New technology is needed to look at ways to prevent stones being thrown from trimmers. There are plastic shields available. Poisoning areas is a terrible crime. Saturating tree roots and grass areas in systemic herbicides looks terrible, causes soil erosion, and endangers the environment and public health. It should be stopped. Urgently!
- The dearth of public open space, with suitable areas for children, games etc is a disgrace.
- Protect all green areas and add more. Why not be brave and provide more allotments for example
- Over hanging shrubbery from gardens are restricting pavement access (particularly noticed Fieldhouse Lane - opposite St Leonard's school) but also in Springfield Park meaning pedestrians walking in road at some point and if pushing pram / buggy making it potentially dangerous.
- Resurrect the necklace park project to enhance the visitor experience
- Council to work with university (e.g. geog. Dept.) to develop a sustainable plan
- Rectify: Too congested and polluted
- Rectify: Overcrowded
- Policy on County Hall & use of its land

A6.8. NAMED AREAS

Bailey

2 respondents

- Illegal parking outside of restaurants on the Bailey.
- Univ property along Bailey etc in poor state of repair - looks awful

Baths Bridge

1 respondent

- development around Baths Bridge must be restricted

Bus Station

9 respondents (5%)

- if new bus station is built, the old site should be for residents not shops (which we already have too many of - hence empty units).
- New bus station
- The bus station - are we really going to get a new one?
- What doesn't need to change, IMO, is the bus station and other bus locations - I think they're fine. The proposed e-build would only serve developers and pushers of urban infill
- poor first impression for visitors eg Bus Station
- New Bus Station and concourse
- Improvements to bus station
- The new bus station should be co-located to the train station to form a transport hub
- The bus station and North Road need a complete sensible update.
- The proposed bus station development is totally unsuitable. The current location is fine; the building and roads need to be refurbished, reengineered or replaced, but the access by both passengers and buses works fine. To remove the roundabout under the viaduct - which works, even in the so-called rush hour, and replace it with traffic lights and new buildings would be crass.

Church St

1 respondent

- Cars need to be 'slowed down' on Hallgarth St and Church St. Consider making these roads 'one-way'. H. t - out of town; Church St - into town.

Claypath

7 respondents

- More provision of retirement accommodation by encouraging building applications. Milburngate & Claypath would be great locations with good access to City shops & amenities
- Empty shops in suitable area should be returned to housing, e.g. North Rd / Claypath
- Link between Market Place & Claypath: I heard previously a suggestion that the airspace above the A690 between Clayport Library & St Nich's and between the Prince Bishop 's Shopping Centre & shops at bottom of Claypath could be let to a developer to create large retail space linking the Market Place & Claypath. I think this would be a brilliant idea, provide some large floorplate retail in the City Centre
- Develop public/private housing suitable for older residents eg lower Claypath devt site is ideal flat walk into the market place.
- Claypath
- CLAY PATH: Similar to North Road, the council need to investing re generation and introduce incentives to get small independent retailers to open up in the city.
- resolution of awful traffic / parking / access issues in lower Claypath

County Hall

1 respondent

- Policy on County Hall & use of its land

County Hospital

3 respondents

- The old county hospital could be converted into over 55 apartments as it is central and convenient.
- County Hospital site should be mixed housing in landscaped gardens
- Some attempt to avoid potential dereliction of sites like old swimming baths, Neville's Cross college, Old Shire Hall, Hospital. Better students than dereliction. Why not marketed as flats for singletons!

Crossgate

1 respondent

- residents parking in CROSSGATE MOOR as most time if I come home at day time if school is on I can't park my car so end putting my car in some one else's street

DLI Museum

1 respondent

- The DLI Museum was a modernist gem - there aren't that many. It should be restored to what it was, without the plasticky Toytown exterior. Mind, the new café is an improvement

Elvet

3 respondents

- Updates on where planning schemes have got to. We've heard about the Gates being pulled down, the top of North Road being altered and the old Shire Hall building being converted then it all goes quiet. This gives the impression to residents that nothing is happening but it may be behind the scenes.
- The police station in New Elvet should become fully functioning again.
- Some attempt to avoid potential dereliction of sites like old swimming baths, Neville's Cross college, Old Shire Hall, Hospital. Better students than dereliction. Why not marketed as flats for singletons!

Framwellgate Bridge

2 respondents

- too many buskers and ""chuggers"" on and around Framwellgate Bridge
- Wider flat non-cobbled areas of Fram Bridge and Silver Street.

Gates Shopping Centre

5 respondents

- Update Gates Shopping Centre
- Modernise North Road & Gates - it's the min route in from bus station / railway station
- The Gates shopping centre has poor choice
- Updates on where planning schemes have got to. We've heard about the Gates being pulled down, the top of North Road being altered and the old Shire Hall building being converted then it all goes quiet. This gives the impression to residents that nothing is happening but it may be behind the scenes.
- The Gates should be totally revamped to make the most of its position looking towards the castle and cathedral.

Gilesgate Bank

1 respondent

- No pedestrian street lighting on Gilesgate Bank (but we pay for it in our Council-tax!)
- No protection of trees in conservation area.: nearly all trees on private ground on Gilesgate Bank (North Side) were recently cut down.

Hallgarth St

1 respondent

- Cars need to be 'slowed down' on Hallgarth St and Church St. Consider making these roads 'one-way'. H. t - out of town; Church St - into town.

Kingsgate Bridge

1 respondent

- Kingsgate bridge needs the weeds on its edges killing as it is one of the entrances into the peninsular.

Leazes Rd

1 respondent

- Improve road traffic management. The cross-city traffic should never have been routed through the centre (Milburngate bridge and Leazes Road were designed in the 1930s and built much later with little modification).

Market Place

11 respondents (7%)

- Seats in Market Place which resemble tombs should be replaced by wooden seats with back rests
- Market Place made not better but worse by its latest revamping,
- The traffic in the market square on a morning and evening. The heavy lorries delivering morning and evening causing much damage to street furniture
- Historic market place needs to be respected. Having a smelly burger vans and donut vans does not feel conducive to Durham historic past.
- Link between Market Place & Claypath: I heard previously a suggestion that the airspace above the A690 between Clayport Library & St Nich's and between the Prince Bishop 's Shopping Centre & shops at bottom of Claypath could be let to a developer to create large retail space linking the Market Place & Claypath. I think this would be a brilliant idea, provide some large floorplate retail in the City Centre
- Market square and Saddler St * many people don't realise where the road is as all the surfaces look the same. would be better if they were essentially traffic free
- A proper maintenance budget to protect the investment in the market square refurb.
- Public toilets somewhere central (Market Place?) accessible for people who have pushchairs but no radar key! (Library toilets not available before 9.30am, market toilets need radar key...)
- Better cycling parking provision in the centre itself e.g. near the market place.
- Local views actually listened to by planners & less dependence on outside experts & forums, e.g. Market Place fiasco. "City Vision"
- Town Hall is not being used to its best potential, i.e. coffee mornings, social events and entertainment
- As a matter of urgency access to the market square from the bus stop on the bridge to be improved - hazards are loose flags, cobbles, no maintenance. This is used by hundreds of people A DAY, many with walking sticks
- Paving/Roads in town/market
- Planning decisions seem to be taken despite wishes of residents, e.g. Market Place

Milburngate

7 respondents

- More provision of retirement accommodation by encouraging building applications. Milburngate & Claypath would be great locations with good access to City shops & amenities
- redevelopment of Milburngate area (esp the steps down to river).
- World class vision for the redevelopment of the Milburngate House site with more ambition than what has been achieved at Walkergate.
- The passport office should be flattened.
- Improve road traffic management. The cross-city traffic should never have been routed through the centre (Milburngate bridge and Leazes Road were designed in the 1930s and built much later with little modification).
- Improve the North road area and redevelop the Milburngate shopping centre, or better still demolish the whole area and redevelop to build a multitude of buildings that mirror the old buildings in Durham and open up the riverside and approach to North road.

- Traffic is Very heavy through the city because of the bottleneck of Milburngate bridge,

Millennium Square

7 respondents

- The drinking culture in Millennium Square particularly by students
- Improve Millennium Square - keep The Journey there
- Make better use of Millennium square - as a tourist focal point. Though would that work with all the pubs nearby?
- Rescue the Lawson Cuthbert carrying monks from Millennium Square ASAP.
- restoration of tourist info centre in millennium square.
- [Millennium square] development of adjacent space for arts exhibition etc
- facility to provide outdoor seating for cultural events eg chamber music concerts in millennium square.
- What has happened to Millennium Square, intended. to be a cultural centre and fast becoming the Mecca of the Night Time Economy?
- Millennium Square, suggest it is roofed similar to an arcade to create a "winter garden", offering art and craft studios, open plan coffee shop and eating area.
- Sculpture in Millennium Square (The Journey) should be resited to nearer the Cathedral where it would be much more appreciated by local and visitors, rather than be abused and mistreated in Millennium Square

Neville's Cross, Merryoaks and Mount Oswald

7 respondents

- Community facilities at Neville's Cross and other areas of large development
- Much has been said about "studentification" but it continues to be just words. The situation is effectively out of control and has reached crisis point. However commendable localism is in principle, there need to be fundamental changes at a more macro level including the immediate removal of ludicrous subsidies available to buy to let landlords, otherwise developments like Mount Oswald and the inevitable mushrooming of HMO's (and letting agencies!!) will continue inexorably.
- The path from St John's Church to Clay Lane, and all of Clay Lane down to Quarryheads Lane should have street lighting to encourage safe walking in the evenings and early mornings
- Some attempt to avoid potential dereliction of sites like old swimming baths, Neville's Cross college, Old Shire Hall, Hospital. Better students than dereliction. Why not marketed as flats for singletons!
- resurface roads in Nevilles Cross to reduce road noise which is considerable (and others)
- A community centre for the Neville Cross/Merryoaks area (and some retail provision)
- The development of Sheraton Park is a disgrace. The old New College building was to be for "luxury flats". Now we hear it is for student accommodation. It is obvious to anyone who looks at the buildings that they are being allowed to deteriorate to the point at which demolition will be proffered as the only option.
- Mount Oswald is irretrievable. But let us seek to overthrow the proposed scheme for Huf Houses: what have they got to do with Durham? On what grounds is the Planning Officer allowing this even to be considered? And what of the plans for the old golf clubhouse: is this to go the same way as New College?

North Rd

27 respondents (17%)

- North Road facelift
- North Road and all derelict premises need to be smartened up
- Upgrade North Rd

- North Rd redevelopment - employ world leading architects. Lord Foster/Rodgers or Adam Architects or Quinlon Terry. See redevelopment of Richmond (surrey) riverside
- Vast improvements to North Road
- North Road needs changing especially the top part
- Taxis removed from North Road
- Empty shops in suitable area should be returned to housing, e.g. North Rd / Claypath
- Pedestrianise southern (shops) North Rd
- Modernise North Road & Gates - it's the main route in from bus station / railway station
- North Road to be made more appealing
- The bus lane on North Road and near the bus station itself, the road surface is in poor condition for cyclists.
- Improve North Road.
- NORTH ROAD
- Updates on where planning schemes have got to. We've heard about the Gates being pulled down, the top of North Road being altered and the old Shire Hall building being converted then it all goes quiet. This gives the impression to residents that nothing is happening but it may be behind the scenes.
- Cleanliness and appeal of North Road maybe large planters with some trees could be a step forward
- North road is desperately in need of a refurbish in-line with the good parts of the city, i.e. silver street, Sadler street.
- North Road *attracts less desirable elements. poor first impression for visitors eg Bus Station. too busy with uses and taxis
- New Bus Station and concourse also make North Road traffic free.
- North Road
- North Rd
- Regenerate North Road area, put some money in to attract some reasonable shops. Remove buses and pedestrianise the street.
- North Road
- Small business such as craft shops should be encouraged on to North Road, York is a good example we need good shops to encourage more visitors.
- The bus station and North Road need a complete sensible update.
- Improve the North road area and redevelop the Milburngate shopping centre, or better still demolish the whole area and redevelop to build a multitude of buildings that mirror the old buildings in Durham and open up the riverside and approach to North road.
- Improve North Road
- NORTH ROAD: the council must put some investment into regenerating North Rd if Durham wants to attract the right level of visitors/tourists. If it doesn't less and less will want to come and the city will spiral even deeper.
- Pedestrianise North Road

Prince Bishops

3 respondents

- too late to do anything about appearance of prince bishops development but to try and learn from mistakes and not put up more eyesores which block the fabulous views.
- Link between Market Place & Claypath: I heard previously a suggestion that the airspace above the A690 between Clayport Library & St Nich's and between the Prince Bishop 's Shopping Centre & shops at bottom of Claypath could be let to a developer to create large retail space linking the Market Place & Claypath. I think this would be a brilliant idea, provide some large floorplate retail in the City Centre

- No amount of Prince Bishops shopping streets will enable Durham to rival the Metro Centre as a retail destination: but it could accommodate the mix of galleries, small shops and cafés that draws visitors to Corbridge.

River and Riverside

13 respondents (8%)

- Get landslide sorted beside river Pelaw Woods
- Make riverside into a park/open space
- Student behaviour near the river
- The river banks need barriers fitted too much talk about it but nothing done
- Open up the river bank for cyclists, e.g. past the boat sheds, etc, to allow cycles to pass from south to north or north to south unhindered by busy road traffic.
- redevelopment of Milburngate area (esp the steps down to river).
- Better lighting and fences around river where danger of falling in water or more likely of falling down very steep banks.
- Finally, taking a visionary approach in terms of the development of the riverside paths and walkway areas of the city, a totally under-developed resource.
- River Wear / Racecourse needs to be energized. it is not a place to go. lack of family amenity & engagement
- The riverside footpaths need to be upgraded & extended. The 'missing link' between Elvet Bridge & Prebends Bridge on the eastern bank of the river, should be completed through partnership with landowners.
- Development of the riverbanks
- See redevelopment of Richmond (surrey) Riverside
- Council should reopen blocked riverside footpath promptly
- Get the footpath along the riverbank sorted out. Health and safety issues should not be allowed to be misused to the extent seen in this city, as an excuse for not getting things sorted out. The river has rivulets cutting down the bank and always will. One land slip should not cause the sort of delaying in opening footpaths back up that we see on our Riverbank - a very important part of this historic town.

Sadler St

5 respondents

- Greater clarity about the respective spaces for vehicles and pedestrians on Sadler St
- Sadler St should be a pedestrian area. Access by car should be from the back. Or at least make it a 10 mph limit
- North road is desperately in need of a refurbish in-line with the good parts of the city, i.e. silver street, Sadler street.
- Market square and Saddler St * many people don't realise where the road is as all the surfaces look the same. would be better if they were essentially traffic free
- The traffic in Saddler street

Silver St

2 respondents

- Wider flat non-cobbled areas of Fram Bridge and Silver Street.
- North road is desperately in need of a refurbish in-line with the good parts of the city, i.e. silver street, Sadler street.

Viaduct

1 respondent

- A broader range of different types of residential accommodation in some areas eg Viaduct

Waddington St

1 respondent

- [student] landlords seem unwilling to spend any money on the upkeep of student houses and the gardens with the result that large parts of the city centre look very shabby indeed. Such a shame when the buildings themselves are often attractive. I have in mind streets like Waddington Street when I say this - the student houses look terrible.

Walkergate

2 respondents

- Improve Walkergate - make it greener and more pleasing to the eye.
- World class vision for the redevelopment of the Milburngate House site with more ambition than what has been achieved at Walkergate.

B. OPEN MEETINGS

B.1 ATTENDANCE

100 people attended the first open meeting; 12 people the second open meeting; giving a total of 112. In addition facilitators, notetakers and other helpers were present at these meetings.

B2. SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK ON 'WHAT IS GOOD ABOUT DURHAM CITY'

- Cathedral and World Heritage site
- Heritage and conservation area
- Architecture from Georgian to modern
- Unique character and beauty
- Beautiful views from train
- Small walkable city
- Riverside
- Wildlife, e.g. trees
- Parks
- Green spaces, green fingers
- University
- Community feel and community events
- Schools
- Cultural facilities
- Festivals and exhibitions
- Tourism (e.g. the Durham Pointers)
- Park & Ride
- Infrastructure
- Good access to the countryside
- Well connected

B3. SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK ON 'WHAT IS BAD ABOUT DURHAM CITY'

- Planning Committee not representative of the City; planning applications are developer-led; no voice for local people
- No Town Council or city planning department
- Unbalanced community
- Dominance of student housing, and resulting impact on shops and services
- Lack of housing: affordable; starter homes; for the elderly
- Too hard on the University

- Character being eroded; no historic knowledge; loss of City's collective memory; mining heritage not sufficiently valued
- Neglected, run-down streets, e.g. North Road, Claypath
- Loss of good, older buildings and attractions
- Cheap, unsympathetic new buildings
- Threat to green belt and to wildlife, e.g. trees
- Green belt strangling City
- Litter
- Bus station
- Traffic congestion and pollution
- More roads will encourage more traffic
- Lack of parking; Park & Ride services need extending
- Poor cycling facilities
- Poor facilities for pedestrians
- Lack of water/sewage infrastructure
- Businesses struggling; no opportunities for start up businesses
- Rates and rents are too high
- Poor offer for tourists
- Poor signage of streets and locations
- Anti-social results of the 'evening/night-time economy'
- Poor facilities for children and for teenagers
- Lack of community facilities
- Lack of cultural facilities

B4. CATEGORISATION OF FEEDBACK ON 'WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE'

B4.1. GOVERNANCE

- Council should coordinate with the University.
- Existing planning laws should be enforced.
- Should learn from other University cities.
- Landlords should pay Council Tax or Business Rates.
- Firmer rules and controls on developers.
- 106 Agreements should be enforced.
- Planning decisions should be by local people.
- Local planning committee.
- Town Council.
- The Neighbourhood Planning Forum should have a public hub/drop-in place.
- Control licences.
- Bigger role for the University in the town.
- Link planning with University strategy.

B4.2. HOUSING

B4.2.1. Homes

- Houses should be homes not investments.
- Need more varied mix of accommodation - affordable; special needs; elderly; range of household sizes;
- Need powers to prevent houses becoming HMOs.
- Need policy and support for converting HMOs back to family homes/permanent residents.
- Use brownfield sites for housing.

- Work with housing associations.
- Reclaim the Viaduct area for families.

B4.2.2. Students

- Areas for students to live should be identified and the other areas protected.
- Adopt an Article 4 Direction immediately.
- University should build a new College.
- Student housing should be provided only by the University.
- Covenants should be placed to prevent homes becoming student lets.
- Ban students' cars.
- PBSAs in right context are ok - must demonstrate need.
- Diversity is required.

B4.3. COMMUNITIES

B4.3.1. Community Facilities

- Public should have better access to University facilities e.g. Maiden Castle sports complex.
- Improve signage eg Freemans Quay swimming pool.
- Should be special rates for community groups use of the Town Hall.
- Combine services e.g. GPs with library.
- Develop a cultural and artistic centre.
- Millennium Place should be a cultural centre.
- Walk-in health centre needed.
- There's no health centre for Nevilles Cross.
- More public toilets.
- A new vision for community involvement and amenities.
- Need to know what the different communities want – real consultation.
- Sharing of University facilities with young people in the resident population.
- Use of Civic spaces at the weekends for events, especially for young people.
- Local community facilities – doctors/ cafes/ meeting spaces
- Children's play areas.
- More use of Millennium Place.

B4.4. ECONOMY

B4.4.1. Businesses

- Grow Durham.
- Transformation to a different, more mixed economy.
- Focus on 'high-tech' jobs linked with University.
- Opportunities for 'business incubators' – worked well in Cambridge.
- Opportunities for start up businesses – Milburngate development?
- Opportunities for small independent shops and galleries – an issue relating to high rentals.
- Support for small cafes within communities to support young families/ older people.
- Foster an artists' quarter.
- Rents and rates.
- Live after five.
- Licensing by the local authority.
- Encourage small businesses.
- Lower rents.

- Green energy deal for city centre.
- Link arts and economy.
- Evening economy.
- Quality antique shops.
- Upmarket shops.
- More interesting shops.

B4.4.2. Claypath

- Re-connect Claypath to the Market Place.

B4.4.3. Entertainment

- Need a museum for the city.
- Need art gallery.
- Need an ice rink.
- Need facilities for youngsters e.g. skatepark.
- Need a cinema.
- A live music venue is needed.
- More public spaces with a café culture that expands into the evening.
- A bowling green and café.

B4.4.4. Milburngate House

- Milburngate House site should become mixed housing with good design and good links to city centre plus a skatepark.

B4.4.5. North Rd

- North Road needs wash and brush up.
- North Rd needs regeneration, as the gateway into town from the station.
- Development in North Road must be integrated as a part of the Gates development.

B4.4.6. Roads

- Restrict road traffic onto the Peninsula.
- Toll on Milburngate Bridge.

B4.4.7. Shops

- Department store.
- Independent shops.
- Need shops that fit in with Durham.
- Anchor store for The Gates.

B4.4.8. Taxis

- Remove taxis.

B4.4.8. Tourism

- Need Tourist Information Centre.
- A better offer for tourists coming to the City – a more integrated approach.
- More festivals.
- Small buses to Auckland Castle, Beamish etc.
- Volunteer TIC [Tourist Information Centre].
- More tourism.
- More bed and breakfasts.
- Destination city.
- Develop longer-stay tourism.

- Tourists stay overnight.
- Walks to Finchale.
- Signage to Finchale, Beaufort etc.

B4.5. INFRASTRUCTURE

B4.5.1 Cars

- Ban cars from centre.

B4.5.2 Cycling

- Cycle route over Belmont viaduct.
- Cycle paths
- Cycle stands.

B4.5.3 Parking

- School gates policy.
- Need more parking space in new developments.
- Reconcile street car parking with quality of environment.
- County Hall pay for parking.

B4.5.4 Public Transport

- Park and ride on west side of city.
- Extend stops of Cathedral bus.
- Sustainable travel.
- More park & ride.
- Consult on bus routes.
- Make buses fares cheaper.
- Uniform bus fares.
- Electric buses.
- Circular route for buses.
- Evening bus services.
- Bus station needs more capacity but location is fine.

B4.5.5 Railway

- Walking routes to/from the railway station.

B4.5.6 Other

- More footpaths.
- Linking route back from the Gates to the Market Place.
- Improved wheelchair accessibility e.g. Walkergate.
- More pedestrianisation.
- Design for renewable energy.

B4.6 HERITAGE

B4.6.1 Heritage

- Information on archaeology sites.
- Heritage trails.
- Cherish Flass Vale.
- Protect what we have.
- More heritage including Labour movement.
- Miners' Hall into museum.

- List Oldfields.
- Use old swimming baths.

B4.6.2 Design

- Control heights of new buildings.
- High quality new buildings in context.
- Preserve 'sense of place'.

B4.6.3 Green Spaces

- Millennium Place needs 'greening'.
- Protect green spaces.
- Maintain green areas.
- Preserve the Green Belt.

B4.6.4 Parks

- Better signage eg Wharton Park.

B4.6.5 River

- Extend river walks.

B4.7 ENVIRONMENT

B4.7.1 Buskers

- Enforce against buskers.

B4.7.2 Streetscene

- Better street cleaning and maintenance.
- Restrict alcohol and takeaways.
- Make takeaways responsible for their pavements.
- Improve vennels
- Maintain floorscape.
- Stop using tarmac to repair floorscape.

B4.7.3 Other

- Pelaw Woods land-slip needs repairing.
- Remove A690 through the middle of the city.