

**MINUTES OF NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING FORUM MEETING  
ON THURSDAY 23 MAY 2013**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
Present	Roberta Blackman-Woods MP (RBW) Nick Rippin (NR) Gordon Cessford (GC) Margaret Dineley (MD) Jonathan Elmer (JE) Ann Evans (AE) Kirsty Thomas (KT) Mike Costello (MC) Roger Cornwell (RC) Ruth Chambers (RC) Teresa Hogg (TH) Malcolm Smith (MS)
1. Apologies	Ian Forrester, Sue Childs, Laura Watson, Alan Hayton, Norma Hayton, David Hook, Frank Newton, Johnson Dent, Malgorzata Bialek
2. Previous Minutes	All present were given copies of the previous minutes to read.
3. Matters Arising from Previous Minutes	It was raised that NR was to invite council officers to the meeting. This was not done. RBW explained that there was still some work to be done before we could access any assistance from Durham County Council. All present then agreed the minutes as correct.
4. Constitution	<p>RBW explained that the amendments that were put forward for the constitution had been taken on board, and work had been done to include these. A copy of the up-to-date constitution was handed out for people to take away and study.</p> <p>Upon reading the constitution, MD decided that she did not meet the criteria, and left the meeting.</p> <p>AE raised the issue of whether Clause 3 should be changed to bullet points regarding the criteria of members. RBW thought it was quite clear on the current format. Discussions were then had around Clause 6, and the inclusion of subsection 6.2 that states the Vice Chair will be from a different geographical area than the Chair. NR explained that he thought this was required in any Neighbourhood Planning Forum (NPF) constitution. RBW said NR would confirm this.</p> <p>RBW suggested that this may be the case to stop particular interest groups taking over an NPF for their own reasons. AE suggested that it wasn't an issue for Durham. RBW agreed that it may not be much of an issue for Durham, but may be for others areas, hence its inclusion.</p> <p>RBW asked all present to take the constitution away and read it, as this is something that is important to get right.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS: NR to confirm if Clause 6.2 needs to state 'from another geographical area'</b></p>
5. Support for Forum and Engagement	<p>NR informed the Forum that through the website <a href="http://www.locality.org">www.locality.org</a> there was a facility for an NPF to access assistance – financial and otherwise.</p> <p>It was discussed that the Forum would need funding, and that support would need to be found in this area. RBW pointed out that the consultation on the Neighbourhood Area, and the local</p>

	<p>referendum on the Neighbourhood Plan would be funded by the local authority.</p>
6. Officer Positions	<p>Discussions were had around the appointment of officer positions for the Forum. JE explained he was interested in the position of Engagement Officer, but was worried about the workload, and the need to build connections with communities. RBW explained that the Forum was born out of the Balanced and Sustainable Communities Forum, which had already build connections, so the support was in place. It was then agreed:</p> <p>RC will take on the role of Vice Chair  TH will take on the role of Treasurer  AE will take on the role of Secretary, with KT supporting as assistant. The constitution will be amended to show this role in Clause 6.</p> <p>It was suggested by RC that a member not present may be interested in the position of Chair, and this will be followed up before the next meeting.</p> <p><b>ACTION: NR to confirm intentions of member not present</b></p>
7. Designation of Neighbourhood Area Process	<p>Discussions were had around the boundaries of the Neighbourhood Area. Maps provide by RC were examined, and it was agreed that the unparished areas of Belmont would not be included in the Neighbourhood Area, as this is very much part of the Belmont community. It was felt by those present that it would be best to contact Belmont Parish Council to inform them of the intentions of the Forum, and to clarify their intentions. It was also agreed that the boundary would include the college areas out to Shincliffe Parish Boundary.</p> <p>RC committed to producing a new map that would outline the potential Neighbourhood Area, and clearly delineate the electoral divisions.</p> <p><b>ACTIONS: RC to produce new map.  RBW to contact Belmont Parish Council</b></p>
8. Submission of documents	<p>RBW stated that the applications for designation of a Neighbourhood Area, and a Neighbourhood Planning Forum were underway. This is not complete however, and more work needs to be done on this.</p> <p>RBW pointed out that any NPF would be superseded should a town council for Durham come into effect. It was agreed that the applications should be written in such a way as to recognise this, and welcome the formation of a Town Council. Discussions were had around the likelihood of this occurring. RBW explained that she thought it likely. Roberta also pointed out that it would be valuable to have the Forum, Area and Plan working before the County Durham Plan was scrutinized, as any Neighbourhood Plan</p>

	developed by the Forum would sit alongside the County Durham Plan.
9. Date, place and time of next meeting	The next meeting was agreed. <b>27<sup>th</sup> June, 12.30pm, Miners' Hall, Redhills, Durham</b>
10. Any Other Business	<b>RBW asked that members bring their diaries along with them for the next meeting so activities and actions can be planned.</b>