

APPENDIX D: POPULATION, HOUSEHOLDS, HOUSING AND SITES

D1 POPULATION

D.1 The evidence for the social profile of Our Neighbourhood comes principally from the Super Output Areas of the April 2011 national census (Office for National Statistics, 2011), recording a total of 20,616 people living in Our Neighbourhood. 10,605 of these were boys or men, and 10,011 girls or women. Most of this discrepancy is accounted for by 514 male prisoners in Durham Jail. (The prison has a capacity of 1,017 but only 514 of them have been recorded in the census statistics.)

D.2 Over half (53%) of the residents were students, who numbered 10,916. Some of these are sixth-formers who had attained the age of 18, but the vast majority are at Durham University or New College. It should be noted that the University of Durham's own figures show 12,733 for the Census year, but this difference can be explained by the fact that not all students live within Our Neighbourhood. The area with the highest concentration of students (87%) is the South Road group of colleges. Here there are 4,494 persons comprising 3,924 students and 570 long-term residents.

D.3 The long-term (i.e. non-student) population of 9,700 has roughly the same age balance as for the rest of County Durham, except that 11% are aged 75 or over as opposed to 8% in the County as a whole. 33% of the long-term residents are retired (25% in the County), and only 3% are sick or with disabilities (7% in the County). These comparisons indicate that Our Neighbourhood will have a greater demand for elderly accommodation of varying degrees of shelter and care, for day centres and for domiciliary care services but less proportionate need than in the County as a whole for provision for school places, playgrounds and so on. The nature of retailing and other leisure activities will also be affected by the greater proportion of elderly people. As to whether the lower proportion with sickness and disability will offset the health care needs for a more elderly population is not clear. Only 15.7% of the population is non-White British, but this is not typical of County Durham which has just 3.4% non White British. The main minority ethnic groups in Our Neighbourhood are Chinese (2.7%); Indian (1.3%); and Other Asian (1.2%), reflecting the international nature of the University.

D.4 In terms of the level of economic activity of the residents of Our Neighbourhood, 32.5% of residents (including students) are recorded in the 2011 Census as being economically active as against 57.3% in County Durham as a whole. This contrast can be explained on the basis of the presence of students, and to a lesser extent by the higher proportion of retired people.

Durham City Neighbourhood Draft Plan for Public Consultation

Ward	Total persons 16-74 years old	Econ active full-time employees	Econ active part-time employees	Econ active self employed	Total econ active	% econ active
Elvet & Gilesgate	9,586	681	200	134	1,015	10.6%
Neville's Cross	7,995	2,118	634	490	3,242	40.6%
Durham South*	4,908	633	2,108	312	3,053	62.2%
Our Neighbourhood*	22,489	3,432	2,942	936	7,310	32.5%
County Durham	383,796	50,595	143,922	25,309	219,826	57.3%

* Durham South Ward extends to Shincliffe Village outside the area of Our Neighbourhood

D.5 The dominant occupations of the residents in Our Neighbourhood who are in employment are education (25.6%); health and social services (11.12%); and retail and wholesale (10.7%). These figures demonstrate the role of Durham City as a major centre for the whole County through being the location of County Hall, the University Hospital of North Durham and the University of Durham, though of course most of the people who work at these locations live outside Our Neighbourhood and indeed outside Durham City.

Ward	Total residents in employment	Retail and wholesale	Accom'n and food services	Professional and scientific services	Education services	Human health and social services
Elvet & Gilesgate	2,175	228	447	134	656	151
Neville's Cross	3,873	338	303	335	1,179	474
Durham South*	3,158	423	188	200	524	402
Our Neighbourhood*	9,206	989	938	669	2,359	10,27
Percentages	100.0%	10.7%	10.2%	7.3%	25.6%	11.2%
County Durham	227,894	33,261	12,257	8,789	23,836	31,923
Percentages	100.0%	14.6%	5.3%	3.9%	10.4%	14.0%

* Durham South Ward extends to Shincliffe Village outside the area of Our Neighbourhood

D.6 The residents of Our Neighbourhood also notably hold more qualifications than is the case across the County: some 37% hold Level 3 ('A' level equivalent) qualifications compared with 14% in County Durham.

Ward	Total persons over 16 years old	Number with Level 3	% with Level 3
Elvet & Gilesgate	9,958	5,645	59%
Neville's Cross	8,629	2,751	32%
Durham South*	5,543	598	11%
Our Neighbourhood*	24,130	8,994	37%
County Durham	425,258	57,957	14%

* Durham South Ward extends to Shincliffe Village outside the area of Our Neighbourhood

D.7 The health of the residents of Our Neighbourhood is above average: about 89% are in good or very good health, somewhat better than the figure of 76% for County Durham which reflects the long-standing damage to health and well-being caused in the traditional industries of County Durham beyond Durham City: coal-mining, railway engineering, ship-building and heavy engineering.

Ward	% with good or very good health
Elvet & Gilesgate	91%
Neville's Cross	90%
Durham South*	79%
Our Neighbourhood*	89%
County Durham	76%

* Durham South Ward extends to Shincliffe Village outside the area of Our Neighbourhood

D.8 The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2015 (Department for Communities and Local Government. OpenDataCommunities) reveals the legacy from those former industries: many communities of the County are amongst the 10% most deprived neighbourhoods in England. In contrast, Our Neighbourhood is in the 30% least deprived; indeed Neville's Cross is in the 10% least deprived. Put another way, out of a score of 100 for the least deprived places in England, Neville's Cross stands at 96.

Area	Deprivation rank (out of 32844, where 1 is the most deprived in England)	In decile cluster of least deprived neighbourhoods in England	Ranking out of 100
Claypath/The Sands	23,986	30%	73
Elvet East	11,502	40%	35
Elvet West	24,697	30%	75
Crossgate North	21,968	40%	66
Crossgate South	32,457	10%	99
North End	29,553	20%	90
Neville's Cross North	31,767	10%	97
Neville's Cross South	31,421	10%	96
Our Neighbourhood* (approximately)	26,000	30%	79

* Durham South Ward extends to Shincliffe Village outside the area of Our Neighbourhood.

D2 HOUSEHOLDS

D.9 At the time of the 2011 Census there were 20,616 people in 5,410 households in Our Neighbourhood, representing a crude overall household size in 2011 of 3.811. This displays the severely distorting effects of student households. The number of non-student households is estimated on the basis of the County average household size to be about 4,200.

D.10 The University's figures show that there were 12,733 students in the academic year 2011/12 and there are now 15,475 in 2016/17. These figures show that 9,123 of this number live outside of Colleges, nearly all in rented accommodation known as Houses in Multiple Occupation.

D.11 The area with the highest concentration of students (87%) is 030G - the Hill colleges and Houghall. Here there are 4,494 persons comprising 3,924 students and 570 long-term residents.

D12 Owner-occupation is 53% (as compared with 66% for County Durham as a whole); 8% is social housing (20% in County Durham); and private rental is 36% whereas for

County Durham it is just 12%. These comparisons indicate that housing tenure in Our Neighbourhood is distinctly shaped by student rentals.

D.13 If we aspire to a stable long-term population in Our Neighbourhood of 9,700 right through our Neighbourhood Plan period then, at national rates of household size decline, there would be about 4,400 households in 2033. This calculated increase of about 200 households therefore requires at least 200 more dwellings over the period in order for the resident population of Our Neighbourhood to be able to stay at 9,700.

D3 STUDENT ACCOMMODATION

D.14 The base-line figures for the numbers of University of Durham students - undergraduates and postgraduates, full-time and part-time - are for 2016/17 (in Table D1):

Table D1: Accommodation location and student numbers

Accommodation location	Home	Rented	College	Other	Total
Durham Campus					
Undergraduate	246	5,680	4,755	470	11,151
Postgraduate/distance	1,229	1,495	1,597	3	4,324
Total	1,475	7,175	6,352	473	15,475
Stockton Campus					
Undergraduate	256	1,049	967	63	2,335
Postgraduate/distance	16	48	52	1	117
Total	272	1,097	1,019	64	2,452
Both Campuses					
Undergraduate	502	6,729	5,722	533	13,486
Postgraduate/distance	1,245	1,543	1,649	4	4,441
Total	1,747	8,272	7,371	537	17,927*

**Note that 417 students in the School of Medicine, Pharmacy and Health have now transferred to Newcastle University, leaving the total for the University of Durham as 17,510*

Source: Durham University, Student Registry, Online Statistics, College Statistics, Accommodation (numbers surveyed in December 2016: Table 1.9 Term time accommodation)

D.15 Durham University (2016, 2017a) has published its Strategy and Estate Masterplan for the development of the University over the decade 2016/17 to 2026/27. The key points are to base the majority of the 2,500 students from the Stockton Queen's Campus in Durham City from 2018/19, joining the 15,500 students already in the City, and to increase

the student population to 21,500 by 2027. The Masterplan states that the University will have an additional 4,000 students, maximum, by 2026/27. It follows that the number to be accommodated in Durham City is planned to increase by about 6,000 by 2026/27. We calculate that this is an approximately 40% increase.

D.16 Further, the University aims to increase the proportion of students living in University accommodation from 42% now to between 50% and 55% in 2026/27. On that basis, there would need to be an increase in University accommodation from the present (2016/17) level of 6,352 beds in Durham to up to 11,825 beds in 2026/27 i.e. about +5,500 beds.

D.17 The University has planning permission for a new 1,000-bed College at Mount Oswald. It will therefore need to identify sites for up to a further 4,000 beds somewhere in Durham City.

D.18 There were, as of the base date of 2016/17, already built, under construction, approved or proposed PBSAs (purpose built student accommodation) in the wider Durham City for over 5,000 extra bed-spaces (Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum, Large student residences). Under current interpretations these do not count as 'living-in' University accommodation and thereby fail to contribute to the University's aim of up to 55% living-in. However, the University is considering entering into partnership arrangements such that at least some PBSAs could be classified as College-affiliated and thereby 'living-in'. In any case, some of the approved or proposed PBSAs are in unsatisfactory locations, and some of the existing PBSAs are not 100% occupied.

D.19 The University's aspiration for between 50% and 55% of its students to 'live in' means that up to 50% would 'live out'. In 2026/27 this would amount to 10,750 students 'living out'. At present a total of 9,123 live out, so the University's plans would imply that up to 1,600 or so additional bed spaces outside of University and University-affiliated accommodation will be needed. These may be provided in non-affiliated PBSAs but far more likely is that most would be in yet more homes being converted to houses in multiple occupation (HMOs). There is, however, an important issue on what students themselves prefer by way of accommodation. First year students must 'live in'. Thereafter, they can choose and the indications from the Geography Department survey (Durham University, Geography Department, 2015) of students' accommodation preferences are that most prefer to 'live-out'. If say 50% of the 6,400 extra students prefer HMOs (houses in multiple occupation) then (at about 5 students per HMO) about 640 existing family houses will be lost, causing the resident population to decline by about 1,400 people.

D4 OLDER PEOPLE ACCOMMODATION

D.20 Within the long-term resident population in Census year 2011 of 9,700 11% were aged 75 or over as opposed to 8% in the County as a whole. The population aged 80 and over is projected by the County Council to increase by 89% (Durham County Council (2016c) 'Issues and Options' document adopts the ONS 2012-based population

projections for County Durham as being the latest official projections available at the time the document was prepared (February 2016)).

D.21 The implications for residential accommodation are profound:

- Downsizing, whether voluntary or compulsory (the "bedroom tax"), creates a demand for more smaller dwellings of various kinds - for example, bungalows, apartments, and re-occupation of terraced housing. This in turn releases larger properties which, in Durham City, can be family homes.
- The increase in independent older people is creating a demand for good quality accommodation located conveniently for services.
- As independence declines, whether through physical or mental decline, more specialised accommodation is required. This can range from merely the presence on-site of a warden through to full nursing support.
- From Forum consultations with developers it is clear that there is a market opportunity in Durham City for good quality independent living accommodation.

D5 ACCOMMODATION FOR YOUNG PROFESSIONALS, SINGLETONS, COUPLES STARTING OUT

D.22 Although the Forum's public consultation (Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum, 2015) expressed a particular need for accommodation for these groups, there is a lack of evidence to substantiate the provision that should be made. It may be that some of the high specification PBSAs (purpose built student accommodation) will prove to be attractive to these groups, especially for those who wish to rent so as to remain mobile.

D.23 However, couples starting out are being priced out of the owner-occupier market and this has led to a pre-occupation with providing so-called 'starter homes' (defined as costing no more than 80% of prevailing local prices). In Durham City subsidised prices can only be achieved by either setting a percentage requirement within planning policies or by the use of land currently held in the public sector. Both remedies are used nationally.

D6 HOUSING SITES

D.24 The following analysis (Table D2) is drawn from Durham County Council's latest available SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) (2013 updated to 2014; Durham County Council, 2014a). When a more up-to-date SHLAA becomes available we will revise these details. It is noteworthy that, throughout Our Neighbourhood, there are student accommodation developments on land that would otherwise be suitable for 'normal' residential units e.g. County Hospital, Chapel Heights, Kepier Court, Berendsen's laundry.

Table D2: Housing sites in Durham County Council SHLAA 2014

Durham County Council's Deliverable SHLAA 2014 sites	Housing capacity In SHLAA 2014	Comments in SHLAA 2014
Sites under construction		
4/DU/79 Mount Oswald	291	Under construction
4/DU/128 Former Bus Depot, Waddington Street	19	Under construction
4/DU/40 Potters Bank	22	Under construction
4/DU/84 Former Dryburn Hospital site	27	Under construction
4/DU/44 Durham Johnston School Annexe	14	Under construction
Sub-Total	373	
Sites approved but not yet started		
4/DU/25 Durham Johnston School, Whinney Hill	77	Permitted, not started
4/DU/19 Police Headquarters	268	Permitted, not started
Sub-Total	345	
TOTAL	718	

Note: Some of these developments have now been completed

D.25 We contend that many of the brownfield sites classified in SHLAA 2014 as 'unachievable' within 5 years to 2019 should be included in the reckoning for the fourteen year period 2019 to 2033. We continue to challenge the Council's assertion in paragraph 4.202 of the withdrawn County Local Plan that a full assessment of brownfield sites has been undertaken within SHLAA 2013. The sites included and assessed in SHLAA 2013 were only those put forward by representatives of the County Council, the Home Builders' Federation, local land agents, planning consultants and a registered social landlord. There appears to have been no input from local community groups or residents' associations.

D.26 SHLAA 2013 accepted the rejection by house-builder representatives of many brownfield sites apparently without independent assessment of the reasons for rejection. Many of the rejected sites in Durham City are able to accommodate viable housing development schemes, if not within the five years 2014 to 2019 then in the subsequent fourteen years 2019 to 2033.

D.27 Our list of such longer-term achievable sites is as follows in Table D3:

Table D3: Longer-term achievable sites

Additional SHLAA 2013 housing sites within the built-up area of Durham City (with SHLAA 2013 rating in brackets)	SHLAA 2013 capacity (no. dwellings)	Our comments
4/DU/56 Kepier House (amber - unachievable)	35	In fact it received approval in June 2015 for 35 units
4/DU/131 Former Shell garage, A167 (green - not achievable)	8	Why not between years 6 and 20? Especially as it has now been cleared and is operating as a temporary car park
4/DU/129 Passport Office, Framwellgate Peth (amber - not achievable)	Up to 60	This site is now approved for a major development including a high-quality residential scheme for 440 units i.e. 380 more
TOTAL ADDITIONAL SITES	Up to 103	Plus 380 more i.e. up to 483

D.28 Adding these up to 483 dwellings on longer-term achievable sites to the total of 718 from Table D2 gives a total of sites for 1,201 dwellings within Our Neighbourhood.

D.29 There will, in addition, be 'windfall' sites (SHLAA 2014 calculates for the Central Durham Delivery Area an average of 23 per annum, so 437 over 19 years) and also the contribution from sites under 0.4 hectares (SHLAA 2014 estimates for Central Durham an average of 34 per annum, so 646 over 19 years). These together add 1,083 units in the Central Durham Delivery Area over the nineteen year period 2014-2033. Assuming that perhaps a quarter might be in Our Neighbourhood part of Central Durham, these two sources would together provide 270 dwellings over the period. Adding this to the 1,201 dwellings on identified sites summarised in paragraph 21, the total capacity is for 1,471 new dwellings in Our Neighbourhood by the year 2033.

D.30 If further houses become available for the long-term residents of Our Neighbourhood through the release of houses currently occupied by groups of students, this could amount to perhaps 500 over the period.

D.31 Even without the potential release of HMOs (houses in multiple occupation) and without the uncertain sites, we have sites for at least 1,000 new dwellings. This allows plenty of choice for developers. If all these sites are developed to accommodate long-term residents, we could see the resident population of Our Neighbourhood increase by as much as 2,000. This, however, does not balance against the University's plans to increase the student population by about 6,400 over the next 10 years and the consequent consumption of available development sites by PBSAs and conversion of homes to HMOs.

D7 THE CONSULTATIVE HOUSING WHITE PAPER, FEBRUARY 2017

D.32 The Government published a consultative Housing White Paper 'Fixing Our Broken Housing Market' (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2017a) in February 2017 setting out ideas for increasing the production of new housing. That consultation closed just before the General Election in June 2017 and a finalised version has not yet been produced. One of the initiatives in the White Paper is to introduce a standardised approach to assessing housing requirements. Consultations on the proposed standardised methodology were launched in September 2017 (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2017b), accompanied by the resulting rate of house-building for each local planning authority: 1,368 per annum in the case of County Durham. The County Durham Local Plan Issues and Options report of June 2016 envisaged rather higher annual rates for the 17 year period of the Plan up to the year 2033. A total of 23,256 additional dwellings would be required in County Durham under the Government's proposed standardised methodology, as compared with between 26,061 and 29,189 portrayed in 'Issues and Options'. At the time of writing (September 2017) Durham County Council's response to the proposed lower rate has not been determined.

D.33 Specific recognition is given in the September consultation on the proposed standardised methodology to the needs of neighbourhood plan preparation. Normally the local planning authority would provide a figure, derived from the relevant development plan. However, many development plans are out-of-date and of course do not use the proposed standardised methodology. The Government suggests that a simple pro-rata approach should be used: the population in the neighbourhood plan area as a proportion of the population of the whole local planning authority area, and this proportion applied to the total housing requirement. Our Neighbourhood's population is 4% of the County Durham total, so 4% of 23,256 i.e. 930 new dwellings would be required. However, this approach is inappropriate given that half the population in Our Neighbourhood are University students whose accommodation is in Colleges, PBSAs (purpose built student accommodation) and HMOs (houses in multiple occupancy). The 9,700 non-student population is 1.9% of the County Durham total, and this proportion represents a need for 442 new dwellings by the year 2033

D.34 In housing Policy D1 we identify land for 521 new dwellings, with a further 38 if particular issues can be resolved. This is more than sufficient to meet the requirement established under the Government's proposed approach.

THE REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE IS LEFT DELIBERATELY BLANK