

**Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum
Working Group Meeting, 3 January 2017, Miners' Hall**

Present: John Ashby, Sue Childs, Roger Cornwell (Chair), Adam Deathe, Ann Evans, David Hook, Peter Jackson, John Lowe, David Miller, Matthew Phillips, Kirsty Thomas, Ros Ward.

Apologies: Pippa Bell, Karen Elliott, Angela Tracy.

Roger welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the new year and expressed the hope that it would be the year of the plan!

1. Revisions made to Housing and Employment Sites

Roger explained that four of us (Roger, Sue, John A and John L) had met DCC officers (Carole Dillon, Nadia Wetherell and Claire Hattam) at County Hall on 14 December to discuss their concerns about the *Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report*. They had concerns that some of our proposed housing and employment sites would require more detailed assessment because of issues about flooding and landscape impacts. We agreed to drop the sites in question or reduce the number of houses. Roger had circulated a revised list of the sites prior to the meeting and this was **endorsed** by the working group. The changes are reflected in the latest version of our plan.

The reduction in the number of houses was not a cause for concern as we did not have a fixed target and in any case there were likely to be far more in the proposed Milburngate House development than we had forecast.

The DCC officers had been particularly helpful and had revised the *Report* and sent it to the statutory bodies before Christmas with a request that they should respond as soon as possible to help us to meet our public consultation deadline.

2. Revised Version of the Draft Plan

We **agreed** the following issues:

The major change was the introduction of a new chapter putting together a summary of the main Actions for Statutory, Community and Other Bodies. This was in order to ensure they were clearly distinct from the Planning Policies. This was agreed by the working group and it was also agreed to place it after rather than before the chapter on implementation and monitoring.

It was decided that Chapter 4 (Strategy and Plans) was unnecessary.

It was decided to amend the opening sentence of the paragraph introducing Map E2 to read: "The map shows the possible cycle network."

John A was asked to circulate the revised appendix on Housing.

John L was asked to circulate a revised table showing the alignment of our policies with the NPPF.

David M was asked to draft a paragraph about flood zones.

It was recognised that there are still issues to resolve about maps, particularly the definition of the City Centre. **Adam** was asked to circulate a map showing the BID area.

Sue will ensure that the maps are numbered sequentially.

Sue was once again thanked and congratulated for her sterling work in producing the document.

All were asked to let Sue have any final comments on the draft plan by **noon on Tuesday 10 January**. It was emphasised that it is important to check that all objectives are matched by policies and vice-versa. Also, indicators and targets are needed wherever possible and appropriate.

3. Arrangements for Public Consultation

Pippa had circulated a helpful draft leaflet. It was **agreed** that the leaflet should be like the previous one with our logo, two folds (giving six panels for text), and containing the vision for each theme. **Ann** was asked to collate comments on the draft and to let Pippa have them by **noon on 10 January**.

Ros will check the formal requirements for consulting neighbouring parishes. We need to ensure wide publicity for the consultation, including seeking comments from across the county because of the central significance of Durham City, perhaps using the *County News* distributed by DCC. Peter offered funding from the Chamber of Trade to pay for county-wide publicity. We should seek to contact students as well as long-term residents. It would be helpful to have articles in the *Northern Echo*, *Durham Times* and *Durham Advertiser*.

Response forms need to offer people the opportunity to say “Yes” or “No” or otherwise comment on each policy.

Ros will prepare a detailed action plan for the public consultation.

4. Dealing with the Outstanding Issues in the Draft Plan

This item concerns the passages highlighted in yellow. **Theme leaders** were asked to respond to Sue on these by **noon on Tuesday 10 January**.

5. Notes of Working Group Meeting 6 December 2016

The notes were agreed and **Sue** will post them on the website.

6. Actions arising from the Notes

Since there had been so many action points from the last meeting we went through them one by one. Most had been completed. Items of interest and those still outstanding are noted below.

Town Council Petition: John L had written to Colette Longbottom to point out the value of a town council in monitoring the Neighbourhood Plan. She had replied saying that our representations would be taken into account and that officers are currently drafting a report to go to council via an all-party working group in the new year to get the terms of reference for the review agreed.

National Building Standards: Advice from **Carole** is awaited.

SHLAA: This is still awaited due to the delay in the county plan.

Statement of Consultation and Community Engagement: Ros confirmed that this is not required for the consultation stage.

Map Copyright Issues: Roger reported that these have been resolved. **Roger** will send our wording about this to DCC.

Meeting with PhD Student: John L had written to him and it is now up to **Sue** and **Angela** to decide when to contact him.

Open Spaces Needs Assessment: This is still awaited due to the delay in the county plan.

Bus Station Proposals: David M asked what we were doing about the bus station proposals. Roger explained that we are awaiting the outcome of various FOI requests. This matter will be considered at our next meeting on 10 January.

7. Any Other Business

- **Whinney Hill Planning Application:** The submitted application is for 75 houses but we have taken DCC advice and suggested 48. We would be happy with more. They must be C3 to help to redress the imbalance in the local community. **Roger** will write to DCC to make these points.
- **24 The Avenue Planning Application:** This has been recommended for rejection by the case officer. **Roger** will speak at the hearing on behalf of the NPF.

8. Future Meetings

It was agreed to meet on Tuesdays 10, 17, 24 and 31 January, 9.00 – 10.00, at the Miners' Hall to deal with detailed preparations for the public consultation.

The next ordinary meeting will be on Tuesday 7 February, 10.00 – 1.00, at the Miners' Hall.