

Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum Working Group Meeting, 9 January 2018, Miners' Hall

1. Welcome and apologies

Present: John Ashby, Pippa Bell, Sue Childs, Roger Cornwell (Chair), Alan Doig, Peter Jackson, Jonathan Lovell, John Lowe, David Miller, Ros Ward.

Apologies: Ann Evans, Matthew Phillips.

2. Notes of 20 December

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

- Item 5: Roger reported that he had submitted the objections to the planning applications for Hawthorn Terrace.
- Item 6: John A reported that he had drafted, and Roger had sent, the objection to the revised planning application from the university for Maiden Castle with the new dimensions. He had also sent it to Jane Robinson. A recent FoI request had revealed great concern among senior university staff about the mindset of some sports teams; this somewhat undermined the case for the expansion at Maiden Castle and **John A** would submit a supplementary objection accordingly.
- Item 8: Roger confirmed that all financial documentation had been completed and signed off.

3. Date of Full Forum Meeting

John L explained that he had reflected on his suggestion that the future work of preparing the plan should be undertaken by the full Forum rather than a working group. Despite the fact that this suggestion had been endorsed at the last meeting with the effect that today's meeting should have been a meeting of the full Forum, he had decided not to call a Forum meeting to give time for further reflection on the decision. He gave three reasons for this:

- He didn't think we were in a good state of mind at the last meeting: it was a strange mixture of shell-shock from DCC's response to the draft plan and being demob happy at the prospect of our Christmas lunch.
- We had not thought through the practicalities of involving all Forum members in the heavy traffic of emails required to progress the plan.
- And as a matter of principle such a decision should have been taken by the Forum rather than the working group.

John apologised for the upset this had caused but hoped the group would understand the benefit of reconsidering its decision.

It was **agreed** that the officers would call a meeting of the Forum at 6.00 on Friday 19 January in

the Miners' Hall. **John A** would invite the MP. **Sue** would invite Forum members plus Carole Dillon and Matthew Wright.

4. Should the Working Group Continue?

The group then moved on to discuss whether it should continue and, if so, how it should relate to the wider Forum membership, particularly regarding communications.

Sue pointed out that new Data Protection legislation would shortly require us to obtain explicit permission from anyone on our email lists. This would be an opportunity to refresh the lists that currently comprise: working group participants, full Forum members, and others who have expressed an interest in being kept informed of developments. Carole Dillon and Matthew Wright will be included in mailings to Forum members.

It was judged that in practice not all Forum members would wish to show the level of engagement required if the plan is to be revised within a reasonable timescale (by May?). Weekly meetings will be required. It was **agreed** to recommend to the Forum that the plan should be taken forward by a working group that would meet weekly, 9.00 – 11.00 or 12.00 at the Miners' Hall. All members of the Forum would be invited to participate in the group and the first half-hour of each meeting would be a Forum meeting to ensure the correct steer for the group's work. All members of the Forum would be free to stay and participate as they wished after that half hour. There would also be a monthly meeting of the Forum at 6.00 on a Friday to review progress. Agendas and notes of working group meetings would continue to be published on our website with an email alert to Forum members that they had been posted.

John A and **David** will draft a briefing note for the Forum meeting on 19 January. This will be approved at the meeting of the working group on 16 January.

5. Consultation Responses and how to deal with them

Sue has produced and distributed a numerical analysis of the questionnaire responses. She is currently organising comments by theme / policy, plus general overall comments. **Sue** will circulate an amended version of the protocol we discussed at the last meeting.

When analysing comments and considering how to amend the draft plan we need to take account of the following factors:

- The need to meet the Basic Conditions (See Great Aycliffe examiner's report)
- The need for an evidence base for policies, including public opinion
- The need to clarify the treatment of “projects” in Chapter 5 and Appendix A
- The possibility of conflict with strategic policies in the Local Plan
- The need to work with DCC to improve the neighbourhood plan and the SEA. **John L** will invite Carole Dillon to our meeting on 16 January to discuss the modality of this.

At that meeting we shall begin our analysis of the comments by looking at those that are general or outwith the scope of the plan. All will be involved in the analysis with a sub-group doing the SEA.

We shall thank those who responded by using the press and our website. Pippa has prepared a press release that we hope will appear in the *Durham Times* on 12 January.

Sue was heartily thanked for her tremendous efforts in dealing with the responses.

9. Date of next meeting of the Working Group

Tuesday 16 January, 10.00 – 12.00, at the Miners' Hall.