

THEME 6: A CITY WITH AN ENRICHED COMMUNITY LIFE
CATEGORISATION OF COMMENTS AND PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED FOR CONSIDERATION

8th April 2018

The comments have unique codes as follows:

- EQ = electronic questionnaire response
- Q = paper questionnaire response
- EM = email response
- WC = web comment

However, no personal details have been provided.

The letters making comments relevant to this theme are coded as follows:

- L4: Campaign to Protect Rural England
- L8a: Durham City Cricket Club Response
- L8b: Durham City Cricket Club Development Plan 2017-2022
- L9b: Durham County Council Appendices ABC
- L10: Durham Miners Association
- L11: Durham Pointers
- L12b: Durham University
- L23: Nevilles Cross Community Association
- L27: The Empty Shop

The codes for categorising the comments are as follows:

- c1: outside the remit of the neighbourhood plan
 - c1a: outside the Plan area
 - c1b: planning issue that has to be dealt with by the Council or by other bodies not by a neighbourhood plan
 - c1c: not a planning issue
- c2: a generic style comment of praise, blame, opinion etc not requiring a response just an acknowledgement
- c3: suggesting changes to the policies
- c4: suggesting changes to the projects
- c5: suggesting changes to the other text of the Plan

Comments have also been given traffic light shading where appropriate:

Support for a policy, project, the theme, or the Plan

- Comment that is already addressed in a policy, project or the theme

Objection to a policy

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
COMMENTS ON THEME 6		
EQ03 Community facilities will only work if they are funded and organised professionally and used properly.	c1c Running of community organisations outside remit (not a planning issue)	No action
EQ05 Existing community facilities may not be economically viable but might warrant attempts to secure funding support / community takeover before being declared redundant	c5 Suggesting change to other text of Policy C4	Move under Policy C4 and consider changing other text
EQ13 Miners Hall land in North Road is only large enough for a small project. Key parts of DLI Museum could be shown in the Information Hub, while the remainder kept in their present locations. An art gallery should be a major project and include sufficient parking space to encourage visitors from other regions. Apart from the Bowes, no art gallery in the N-E can be considered a real success, though for varying reasons. MIMA could be a success, but suffers from poor transport links and almost no parking. There is the potential for Durham to produce something much better. Management should be independent of university and county council, though with close links. I am convinced it should prove possible to find a substantial benefactor if their name was linked to the gallery.	c1b Outside remit (for other bodies) except ... c4 comment about parking	Need to address parking issue under Policy C1 (but possibly explaining why it would be limited!). Consider relationship to Policies T1 and T2
EQ14 All of the above are so important. The removal of the tourist information centre was the most ridiculous move ever. If a city can not house such an important venue, there is something drastically wrong! We need more cultural venues and spaces in which to further "budding artists". Existing facilities must be protected at all costs.	c2 Support for Theme 6	Support noted
EQ15 There must be a policy of green lungs, community play space, fields and parks. Copied from theme 2b	c2. Need for community play space, fields and parks	Has this been adequately covered by Theme 6?
Q04 The amount of nurses and doctors decreasing due to cutbacks ?? dropping in staff. This also ?? students ?? Durham	c2 General comment	None, due to illegibility

<p>Q11 If its affordable [Theme6]. The other themes are more important right now.</p>	<p>c2 Qualified support for Theme 6</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Q13 First place which needs to be restored is the Tourist Information Office. A World Heritage city should enhance the World Heritage Site not detract from it. Visitors & residents could surely expect an art gallery or museum or both in the town centre. The DLI museum & arts centre was possibly removed for reasons which I will never understand. Restoring this, in its beautiful surroundings would give great pleasure to many, many people.</p>	<p>c2 Restore the Tourist Information Office. Addressed by Policy C2</p> <p>c2. Restore the DLI Museum and Art Gallery. Addressed to some extent by Policy C1</p> <p>c2. Need for art gallery/museum in the City centre. Addressed by Policy C1 and to some extent Project 14</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>Consider including art gallery/museum in Project 14 and relationship of this to Policy Implementation Project 3</p>
<p>Q13 Could the racecourse area incorporating the bowling green be developed as a park. Apart from Wharton Park, which is badly inaccessible, there are no play areas for children in the city. The old swimming baths could be converted into museum or display space & could provide toilet facilities which are missing from this part of the town. For visitors – this area could introduce them to the lovely walks around Durham – Maiden Castle, Houghall & Pelaw Woods all within striking distance of the city centre. Copied from Theme 2b</p>	<p>c2. Inclusion of Racecourse as a park</p> <p>c5. Consider inclusion of old swimming baths as a venue for Policy C1</p>	<p>Consider how to cover in Theme 6</p> <p>Consider changes to accompanying text for Policy C1</p>
<p>Q15 It is disgraceful that the Council closed down the DLI Museum & Art Gallery. A very good gallery has just opened in Bp. Auckland.</p>	<p>c2 General comment re DLI Museum</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Q18 I highly endorse the idea that community arts facilities contribute to the welfare of the population, and facilities for such need to be in the Plan.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C1</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>Q19 All obviously necessary. Accept neighbourhood plan suggestions, they are well thought out & written by people who know the city & care for it. I agree wholeheartedly with this neighbourhood plan, it's long overdue. I do hope there is no attempt to dilute this - the city is spoiled already & we need to keep what we have left. Ignore the plan & we lose the uniqueness of Durham which makes it so attractive to all.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Theme 6</p>	<p>Support noted</p>

<p>Q25 (1) Information Hub: This could be staffed by volunteers. (Info. Centre in Ludlow, Shropshire is run by volunteers.) (2)A museum / interpretation centre to highlight and interpret the fascinating history of the City – see note under Theme 2a.</p>	<p>c2 (1) Support for Policy C2 c5. Run Information hub by volunteers c2 Need for an interpretive centre. Addressed by Project 14</p>	<p>Support noted Consider changes to supporting text for Policy C2 No action</p>
<p>Q26 It is an absolute disgrace that such a world famous heritage site such as Durham does not have an information / tourist office open to the public. People may use the internet for information but there is no substitute for face-to-face enquiries.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C2</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>Q28 We need an Tourist Information Office. It is foolish in a city like this not to have one. That would encourage more information about what is available. Copied from theme 3 We need a viable Visitor Centre. We also need a large place than Alington House.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C2 c1c. Need for larger community facilities (not a planning issue, up to a developer to bring this forward)</p>	<p>Support noted No action</p>
<p>Q29 All facilities must be affordable, price can prevent many from taking up opportunities to socialise, improve health & general well being. What is on offer must be publicised, as many people not aware of existing opportunities. D.C.C. guided walks should be reduced in price pref. free!! Health benefits would be money well spent.</p>	<p>c1c Price of community facilities, DCC guided walks etc outside remit (not a planning issue) c2. Need for publicity of facilities addressed by Policy C2</p>	<p>No action. Possibly pass comment to Council No action</p>
<p>Q38 The argument that the former bowling green, near the former baths, cannot be a park because of the diminishing permanent population is spurious. It is a recreational green space on the riverbank – which is much used by people from around the City, and beyond, on a daily basis. It is in the lee of the Cathedral and W.H.S. with magnificent views across it from both sides of the riverbank. It is an ideal place to house some good quality play equipment, a green gym, a refreshment kiosk, maybe a sensory garden etc. etc. All over the country are such places which are protected from damage in imaginative ways, I quote this area as an example as it was so readily threatened not that long ago by inappropriate development when it should have been protected. I am sure this is true of other areas in and around our neighbourhood too. Copied to Theme 6</p>	<p>c2. Consider developing old bowling green as a park</p>	<p>Consider coverage in Theme 6</p>

<p>Q48 Surely the old cinema in North Road could be converted into something useful (but not for students) Copied from theme 2a</p>	<p>c1c Reuse of old cinema in North Road outside remit (not a planning issue).</p>	<p>No action. note repurposing of buildings covered in Theme 2a</p>
<p>Q57 School playing fields will NO longer be sold off for development? Is that a Vision and Objective for Durham? Durham city needs those open spaces. Copied to Theme 6 from Theme 2b</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding potential for school playing fields to be sold off.</p>	<p>Consider policy changes to protect school playing fields as open spaces. Consider relationship with Theme 2b policies.</p>
<p>Q68. Attachment [provided as a scanned pdf document] Access to Buildings. Making places and buildings accessible to all makes lie easier for everyone. You just have to look how many customers use the automatic doors at Marks and Spencers compared to those using the other doors. It helps the mother pushing the pram or someone with both hands full of shopping as well as the disabled. It is important with new builds and refurbishments for the plans to [be] checked by a qualified access consultant rather than an architect who thinks he knows. After the work is completed it is difficult and expensive to rectify mistakes. Copied from theme 4</p>	<p>c5 Promoting easier access</p>	<p>Consider adding to supporting text for policies C1 to C4, and relationship to Policies T1 and T2. Policies T1/T2 need to cover disabled access to buildings adequately and cross-reference from themes 3, 4 and 6.</p>
<p>EQ20 This theme cannot be accepted without recognition of and a policy to collaborate with Durham University (especially its colleges) which has won awards for its community outreach activities and student community action programme, and makes a huge contribution to the City through its multiplicity of cultural and sporting activities most of which are open to members of the local community, e.g. theatrical and operatic groups, orchestras, choirs, museums, regatta, the Lumière and illuminate festivals, public lectures, etc.</p>	<p>c1c Outside remit (not planning issue)</p>	<p>Although a policy to collaborate with Durham University is proposed, this cannot be expressed as a planning / land use policy. It may be a matter the Town Council could pursue. But, ensure that role of University in cultural life of city and as a stakeholder in the projects is covered.</p>
<p>EQ21 I strongly support the creation of an information hub. We need low cost meeting rooms for community groups. Visitors frequently ask where our art gallery is. It's expected in a city of our standing.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C2 c2. Need for an art gallery. Addressed by Policy C1</p>	<p>Support noted Possibly need to re-evaluate as Council is now proposing art gallery in former TIC. And University plans also</p>

Pre-submission consultation. Categorisation of Theme 6 comments, and planning issue or action identified for consideration

<p>EQ26 As the owner of a small holiday let property it is ridiculous that Peterlee has tourist hub and Durham City has not the figures use by the council to justify its closure was gross manipulation of statistics</p>	<p>c2 Need for a tourist hub. Addressed by Policy C2</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>EQ31 Slightly amending of the wording of the vision statements to provide consistency of wording with the overall vision would be helpful. For Theme 6: Durham City will have a proactively supported community life, including health and well-being, with an enriched artistic and cultural life for the benefit of residents and visitors alike. Residents will be supported and encouraged to be active citizens with a keen interest in their neighbourhood and how it develops.</p>	<p>c5 Suggested change to other text</p>	<p>To consider rewording vision statement along lines suggested.</p>
<p>EQ35 community facilities are a blessing and a gift provided with tax payers money from way back - sustainability of these including reopening of a purpose built DLI museum provision is a must (consider this when factoring in the DCC new build as part of the costings !!)</p>	<p>c2 Support for community facilities. Addressed by Policies C3 and C4 c1c. Reopening of DLI outside remit (for Council)</p>	<p>No action No action</p>
<p>EQ39 I have lived in Durham for some 40 years - currently in the City centre but also in a Durham city village some 7 miles from the World Heritage site. I well remember the community arts centre at Castle Chare, the facilities at the DLI... - lost to the local community. I strongly endorse policies C1, C3, C4, C5 - and the good sense embodied in C2 and C6 is to be cheered.</p>	<p>c2 Strong support for Policies C1, C3, C4, C5 c2. Support for Policies C2 and C6</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>EQ40 All these policies will make Durham an attractive place to live.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Theme 6</p>	<p>Support noted</p>

<p>EQ42 I fully agree with this section of the plan. The university, cathedral, gala, venues and not-for-profit organisers such as Empty Shop should be able (and encouraged) to upload event information to a TIC easily to make the most of such a facility and attractive/useful to the largest possible section of residents and visitors. It should be mirrored by an up-to-date website/app where the same information can be easily accessed from anywhere.</p> <p>I also welcome 4.116 whereby any new commercial development in the City should include an external, flexible space that can be used for the well-being of their employees, and for staging community events. Copied from theme 3</p>	<p>c2 Support for Theme 6</p> <p>c5. c4. Ideas for how to run TIC</p> <p>c1b Outside remit (for other bodies)</p>	<p>Support noted</p> <p>Consider changing supporting text for Policy C2 and Policy Implementation Project 4 Visit Durham has a website with what's on information at https://www.thisisdurham.com/whats-on</p> <p>No action</p>
<p>EQ43 A definition of community may be helpful in this section or more appropriate what constitutes a community facility.</p>	<p>c5 Suggesting change to other text</p>	<p>Consider</p>
<p>EQ46 Agree with all apart from the information hub - Is this really needed? Durham is so small!</p>	<p>c2 Support, c3 except for Policy C2</p>	<p>Consider with other comments on Policy C2</p>
<p>EQ52 Community arts facilities are important. An information hub would be positive improvement for tourism and local engagement. Community facilities and open spaces should be promoted and maintained. Public art and public facilities including seating and toilet facilities (including for disabled) are important. Copied from theme 1</p>	<p>c2 Support for policies C1 and C2</p> <p>c2. Promotion and maintenance outside remit (not a planning issue)</p> <p>c3,c4 Public seating.</p> <p>c2. Toilet facilities. Addressed by Project 14</p>	<p>Support noted</p> <p>No action</p> <p>Consider where public seating is covered in the plan, e.g. Theme 5, projects.</p> <p>No action</p>
<p>Q39 A personnet(?) visitor centre in the Centre Sustainability is a huge concern = massive work needed. Copied to Theme 1</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C2</p>	<p>Support noted</p>

<p>Q40 The Tourist Information Office is what people search out in a new place. An Art Gallery would be a welcome addition.</p>	<p>c2 Support for policies C1 and C2</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>Q42 E1: There should be no detriment to existing provision eg DLI museum closure. Copied from theme 3</p>	<p>c2 Support for existing facilities. Addressed by Policy C4</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Q47 Community Arts Centre needs to be within the City itself</p>	<p>c5 / c3 Suggesting change to other text</p>	<p>Consider under Policy C1. Or is this a proposed policy change?</p>
<p>Q48 We need an Art Gallery and a much bigger and more central heritage centre than Mary-le-Bow. Copied from theme 2a Development of the racecourse with a bowling green, putting green, crazy golf toilets & refreshments would be useful as would regeneration of the old swimming baths. Copied from theme 2b If the Council persist in the lunatic plan to move the bus station the vacated space could be used to a Community Centre to revitalize North Road. All developments must be easily accessible by public transport. Copied to Theme 5</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C1 c2. Need for a heritage centre. Addressed by Project 14. c1b Other comments outside remit (for various other bodies)</p>	<p>Support noted No action But consider coverage of bus station in Plan</p>
<p>Q54 I think the Information Centre should be brought back to the Market Place. It would be ideal if the DLI could return to its use as an Art Gallery and the surroundings maintained. It has a wonderful family space much appreciated by my grandchildren.</p>	<p>c2 / c3 Support for Policy C2 and possibly a change to the other text c1b Reopen DLI. Outside remit (for Council)</p>	<p>To consider if supporting text for Policy C2 needs to be this site-specific Support noted No action</p>
<p>Q60 Agree with the suggestion that DLI Museum should be brought into use again. Worried about artists and community facilities having their rents doubled (e.g. Fowler's Yard, Bearpark Community Assoc)</p>	<p>c1b Reopening DLI outside remit (for Council) c1c Outside remit (not planning issue)</p>	<p>Support noted No action</p>
<p>Q63 Para 4.230 could include Dunelm House, re-purposed. Para 4.251 last sentence: 'a requirement for' should be 'provision of'?</p>	<p>c5 Suggesting changes to other text</p>	<p>Consider changing supporting text under Policy C1 (Dunelm House) Consider changing supporting text under Policy C6 (para 4.251)</p>

<p>Q64 I consider it a disgrace that there is no information centre for tourists and that this service is provided by volunteers.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C2</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>Q69 Perhaps some of the existing buildings which contribute to Durham’s social problems might be considered as community facilities. The redundant premises (former Miners Hall) in North road might make a suitable performance and practice venue?</p>	<p>c5 Suggesting changes to other text</p>	<p>Policies C3 and C4 don’t have any supporting text as yet. Possible venues for Theme 6 policies</p>
<p>Q74 A tourist destination MUST have an Information / Welcome HUB A tourist destination MUST have arts facilities accessible via a community HUB / for performance / events / art exhibitions / talks / features / family friendly & WELCOMING Xmas festival should have SPARKLE & more MUSIC Facilities for an ageing population are there for us all - & demand will only grow. Copied from theme 5</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C2 c2 Support for Policy C1 c1b Outside remit (action for other body) c2 Need for facilities for older people. Addressed to some extent by Policy C6</p>	<p>Support noted Support noted No action No action</p>
<p>Q75 The County Council should support the refurbishment of the Redhills Miners Centre as an artistic hub to the memory of our mining heritage, art works and replacement of the DLI museum. This facility has more than enough space inside and outside to house such exhibits. Also development should be considered of the old baths building by the river into a community facility.</p>	<p>c1b Actions for DCC outside remit (action for Council) c5 Suggestions of venues for community facilities c1b Refurbishing old baths building outside remit (Action for University)</p>	<p>Both noted. Policy C3 would support these proposals if they were brought forward. Consider venues for Policy C1</p>
<p>Q78 No Tourist Information! A disgrace! “Pointers” and machines are NO substitute for informed people & face to face contact for visitors.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C2</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>EM15. Theme 6. A City with an enriched community life 4.6.2 Context /4.6.2.1 Cultural activities and facilities (text at time of consultation) 4.215 Durham City has a strong cultural identity. The City is rich with cultural activities such as the annual International Brass Festival, the Durham Miners' Gala, the Book Festival, Durham Streets Summer Festival, the Folk weekend and the biannual Lumiere light festival. In terms of infrastructure the City has one large, two small theatres and an open-air</p>	<p>This is quoting the text of the Plan.</p>	

<p>stage in Wharton Park. It has a cinema, (soon to be three), small gallery spaces in different locations across the City, and a small number of art and crafts courses in local community association buildings. Residents and visitors have access to some University facilities, such as The Oriental Museum, Palace Green Library, and The Wolfson Gallery. The Cathedral is used on a frequent basis throughout the year for cultural events and now offers the new Open Treasure Gallery as well as the World Heritage Site visitors centre.</p> <p><i>Comments</i></p> <p>4.215</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Durham Street Festival needs removing as the last one was in 2015 • Distinction is needed regarding commercial spaces and local community venues facilities – I recommend the following changes to the text. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I wish to add the TESTT space in North Rd – a temporary artist studio group and contemporary gallery which started March 2017 • I wish to add to this section the work of the County Durham Cultural Partnership (CDCEP) <p><i>Text should now read:</i></p> <p>Durham City has a strong cultural identity. The City is rich with cultural activities such as the annual International Brass Festival, the Durham Miners' Gala, the Book Festival, the Folk weekend and the biannual Lumiere light festival. In terms of infrastructure the City has one large, two small theatres and an open-air stage in Wharton Park. It has a cinema, (soon to be three), small commercial gallery spaces in different locations across the City, commercial arts and craft studios at Fowler's Yard and a small number of art and crafts courses and hireable event spaces in local community venues. TESTT Space, a temporary artist studio group and contemporary gallery, is situated above the soon-to-be demolished Durham Bus Station. Residents and visitors have access to some University facilities, such as The Oriental Museum, Palace Green Library, and The Wolfson Gallery. The Cathedral is used on a frequent basis throughout the year for cultural events and now offers the new Open Treasure Gallery as well as the World Heritage Site visitors centre.</p> <p>In order to improve cultural education for children and young people in County Durham, the County Durham Cultural Partnership (CDCEP) has</p>	<p>c5 Suggesting change to other text</p>	<p>Consider</p>
--	---	-----------------

<p>WC69 Comment on your post "Summary: Theme 6: A City with an Enriched Community Life" As a member of the Durham Pointers I think a central hub would be an excellent idea for visitors to our city. That's the lack of a tourist information office is still keenly felt and the pointers could complement the work of the hub.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C2</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>WC80 Comment on your post "Theme 6: A City With an Enriched Community Life" I fully support these policies.</p>	<p>c2 Support for policies C1 to C6</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>WC85 Comment on your post "Plan as pdf" Theme 3, Copied to Theme 6 Durham needs more toilet facilities in the centre, more seating that can be sat on i.e. wooden benches (and not stone blocks as per the market square, which are truly uncomfortable), including more seats along the river bank, and to encourage more shops to come into the city (lower rates?) instead of the numerous cafes. Also, the area outside the Gala Theatre should be redesigned, instead of 'windy city' we should have a beautiful area with pleasant seating etc.</p>	<p>c2. Toilet facilities addressed in Project 14 c2. Seating/ c1b Encouraging shops outside remit (for other bodies)</p>	<p>No action Consider coverage of seating in Plan, e.g. Theme 5 No action</p>
<p>WC104 Comment on your post "Policy G1" The SRA [Sidegate Residents Association] was fully supportive of all the Green policies. It suggested that fitness parks could be a good idea for using some green spaces. There is one in Wharton Park and there could be others. Copied to theme 6</p>	<p>c5. Need for fitness parks.</p>	<p>Consider covering in justification for policies to C3 to C5</p>

<p>WC114 and WC115 Comment on your post "Policy G2" Copied to Theme 6 We certainly recommend the use of the DLI Grounds once more, as a valuable public place, as well as a place of remembrance due to the ashes of Ex DLI Soldiers and families. We would welcome the use of the building to be used as an Art Gallery once again, but to also include the building back into a DLI Museum, which was originally why it was built. DCC will have us believe the building was not fit for purpose, we have the results of a survey they carried out in 2015 and it is. The amount of money that has been spent on displaying the few items from the Collection, the storage, the travelling exhibition is a disgrace and could have easily been spent on the original building. We are in a constant campaign and have had several meetings with DCC, to get justification for what has gone on between DCC, The Trustees of the Museum and now The University, to obtain a building where the whole collection is under ONE roof and not scattered around the County, and as the Museum still stands, it makes absolute sense, as well as solving a number of problems. We have met with Trustees, and Cllrs, ..., but unfortunately they do not see what the public is crying out for. This group seems to be wanting the same as our group, perhaps working together, we may convince the powers that be to listen to the public, instead of feeding us a load of rubbish. ON BEHALF OF THE FAITHFUL DURHAMS</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C1 c1b. Reopening DLI outside remit (for Council)</p>	<p>Support noted Consider inclusion as venue in Policy C1</p>
---	---	---

<p>WC125 Comment on your post "Summary: Theme 6: A City with an Enriched Community Life" It amazes me, and visitors alike, that a heritage city such as Durham City has no museum to illustrate its rich history from the period of early Christianity to the present day, including the period of the Norman Conquest, the 'Prince Bishops', the mining industry, ship building etc. The Durham County Council closed the Durham Light Infantry Museum, together with the 'City art gallery because it could not make a profit, or break even, with a footfall of 30,000 visitors per year. This needs an explanation when, down the road, at Richmond, North Yorkshire, the Green Howards military museum makes a profit with 17,000 visitors per year! Does the County Council have some secret plan for the land occupied by the DLI Museum building. The lack of a tourist information office in a heritage city beggars belief! Surely, there's more to culture and heritage than an ever increasing number of coffee bars and restaurants? Has anyone thought of using the former miners' hall at Redhills as the venue for a Durham Heritage Museum?</p>	<p>c2 Need for a heritage centre. Addressed by Project 14</p> <p>c2. Support for Policy C2</p> <p>c2. Miners Hall as a heritage Museum</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>Support noted</p> <p>Consider including Miners Hall as a venue under Theme 6</p>
<p>L4 CPRE supports proposals for the increase of leisure, cultural and other community facilities provided they are not (in the main) in the Green Belt.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policies C1 to C3</p>	<p>Support (with caveat) noted</p>
<p>L8a In respect of Theme 6 "A City with an Enriched Community Life" we consider that community sporting facilities should be included within the cultural and community realm. Durham City Cricket Club is at the forefront of coaching of young boys and girls. During summer 2017 we were the most successful club in the region in registering 75 children between ages 5 and 8 on a Sunday morning as part of the All Stars Programme. Add to that the 30 or so 9-11 year olds taking part in our Comets programme and we had 100 youngsters on the field. The importance of the club in making a real contribution to the local community should therefore be recognised in the Plan, for example at paragraph 4.6.2.1</p>	<p>c5 Proposed addition to supporting text about DCCC e.g. in para 4.6.2.1</p>	<p>Consider adding to the supporting text. Should we also consider Durham University in this respect, as evidenced in their planning application for Maiden Castle?</p> <p>Consider how sporting facilities covered in Theme 6</p>

<p>L9b The council has identified several instances where the DCNP approach deviates from and conflicts with that of the council's existing and evidence relating to emerging plans and strategies. Examples of this include: [...] g) Approach to tourism: which fails to adequately recognise the key challenges facing the visitor economy of Durham, and as such this is a missed opportunity for the DCNP to add value to the existing policy context for the area. Furthermore, the DCNP which advocates the provision of a visitor centre which is an approach which has proved unsuccessful in the past and conflicts with Visit Durham's existing approach. In light of the above the county council is concerned that the plan is deficient in this respect in the context of the requirement to meet the relevant Basic Condition relating to this matter. It is firmly urged that this situation is remedied as the plan prior to the plan advancing to Submission stage.</p>	<p>c2 Concern that the Plan fails to meet the relevant Basic Condition</p>	<p>Noted. This is not to minimise the significance of these comments, but they will be addressed as the detailed accounts in the Council's Appendix C are considered.</p>
<p>L10 The Durham Miners' Association (DMA) has recently announced an ambitious five-year plan to preserve the Miners' Hall at Redhills and bring it to the point where people can celebrate, practice and display the living heritage and culture of the North East. The DMA urges the Forum to support this project in any way possible. Redhills is an essential asset to be retained for the community of Durham city and the county as a whole. It has a vital role to play in creating much-needed performance and practice space for all forms of artists, musicians and actors. We are delighted that the draft plan recognises the importance of adapting existing buildings and facilities to open up new facilities for the community. We also welcome the recognition of the city's diverse heritage assets as integral to the character of the Neighbourhood. The city has a real need for such facilities and Redhills could provide this while safeguarding the heritage of the coalfield.</p>	<p>c2 Support, especially for Policy C1 c5 Addition of the Miners Hall as a venue for Policy C1</p>	<p>Support noted Consider addition to supporting text for Policies C1, plus addition as stakeholder to Policy Implementation Projects 3 and 4. Contact the Durham Miners Association for further discussions</p>

<p>L12b Referring to para 4.217: “it seems reasonable to infer that some expansion...” NPF should speak to medical practices and NHS Care Commissioning group and ascertain whether there is capacity in current practices to expand. Update growth forecast to 2016/17 figures. Referring to para 4.229: Durham Universities’ masterplan identifies the need for the provision of a significant venue for music and drama performance to raise the cultural profile of the University and City, allowing it to make a strong contribution to the arts nationwide. The facility would provide large scale performance and exhibitions spaces as well as facilities for music and drama practice and rehearsals. The University requests that the NPF includes a policy supporting this ambition.</p>	<p>c5 Suggests evidence rather than inferences needed c5 Suggesting figures be updated c3 There is no policy relating to the provision of new cultural facilities.</p>	<p>Need to check if evidence available Note have contacted practice and CCG Update figures Consider adding a new policy, or changing policies C1 and/or C3 to include this ambition.</p>
<p>L23 We acknowledge the good intentions behind this theme but must emphasis, as we have done earlier, that the Plan is asking for facilities previously taken from the City by the DCC and unlikely to be returned to the City in the foreseeable future. While we see this as a consequence of the failure by the DCC to address the City as a tourist destination or for residents use; declining numbers of the latter will also remove any justification for their re-instatement. Further we also note the use of many of the existing council and other facilities by the increasing student population alongside residents. We note in a recent University planning application for Maiden Castle sports facility that approval of the application would benefit the University and the wider community (DM/17/02697/FPA; para 109) and we would hope that this would mean a much greater reciprocal use of such facilities. [...] Overall, we feel that this theme should reflect a much more joined up, reciprocal and shared approach. We consider that the Plan should explicitly acknowledge the contribution other organisations should be making and to provide substantive provision that reflects how their rhetoric on community engagement and partnership is to be delivered in practice.</p>	<p>c2 Concern about achievability / necessity for Policies in Theme 6 c5 Suggestion for change to supporting text</p>	<p>Consider concerns Consider including these points But note the various projects in Appendix A and all the stakeholders identified in para A2</p>

<p>L27 On behalf of Empty Shop CIC I am pleased to place on record our support for the Neighbourhood Planning Forum's draft plan.</p> <p>We are supportive of the vast majority of the policies, the overall objectives and the thematic areas contained within the plan. As a Community Interest Company with a focus on regeneration through adaptive reuse we particularly welcome the commitment throughout to a rich community life that places heritage, culture and town-centre appropriate business at the heart of the neighbourhood.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Plan, particularly Theme 6</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>Policy C1: Community Arts Facilities</p>		
<p>Q24 C1: Policy?</p>	<p>c3 Query if Policy C1 is actually a policy</p>	<p>Consider wording of Policy C1</p>
<p>EQ25 Policy C1 needs to be expanded to include supporting existing arts and cultural venues/projects like testt, redhills and empty shop, but I know this is being worked on and I'm really excited to read the re-draft!</p>	<p>c5 Suggesting change to other text</p>	<p>Consider</p>
<p>EQ43. Re Policy C1. Whilst we wholeheartedly welcome the spirit of this proposal we feel further definition is required of what constitutes a 'community arts facility'. We would specifically welcome provision for supporting 'affordable and accessible' arts facilities in addition to community arts facilities.</p> <p>We would ask the forum to make a commitment to identifying appropriate spaces for community facilities - and possibly event establish partnerships through which these facilities could be identified and developed.</p>	<p>c5 Suggesting change to other text</p> <p>c1c Outside remit (not planning issue). For a project?</p>	<p>Consider</p> <p>Consider coverage in projects and any need for new project</p>
<p>Q48. C1 The old cinema in North Road should be a prime target</p>	<p>c5 Suggesting change to other text</p>	<p>Consider</p>
<p>Q69 Presumably the section on the DLI grounds will have to be rewritten. While the idea of a reprovided Arts facility is supported there also needs to be proposals for the reestablishment of a modern museum for the County Regiment in a more accessible location with adequate parking. Copied from theme 2b</p>	<p>c5. Reconsider inclusion of the DLI Museum building for a Policy C1 venue but c1b reopening outside remit (for Council)</p>	<p>Consider changes to supporting text for Policy C1</p>
<p>EM15. Policy C1: Community Arts Facilities (text at time of Consultation)</p>		

<p>Development proposals to create community arts facilities will be supported either on an appropriate site or through the conversion of an existing building. Any site should be well related to public transport, walking and cycling routes should be accessible.</p> <p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p>I have had some interesting and informative conversations about the title and description of this policy in terms of what is defined as a ‘community arts facility.’ It has been suggested that Fowler’s Yard etc. are private, commercial spaces which don’t fit into the overall title of Community Arts. I have been asked if commercial propositions equally benefit from this proposed policy?</p> <p>One online definition of Community Arts is that it ‘refers to artistic activity based in a community setting. Works from this genre can be of any media and is characterized by interaction or dialogue with the community. Often professional artists collaborate with people who may not otherwise normally actively engage in the arts.</p> <p>1. As this is a planning policy I think it should encompass facilities that could be used for ‘community arts’ as well as private and commercial facilities. I therefore think that the title of Policy C1 should be ‘Provision of Arts Facilities’</p> <p>2. The planning conditions for Policy C1 should be expanded in line with Policy C3 – Provision of New Community Facilities – i.e. not on Green Belt, well related to residential areas, not adversely affecting amenity of nearby occupiers, allows access to people with disabilities, not contributing to traffic hazards and is accessible to users of all modes of transport</p> <p>Context for Policy C1 (Text at time of consultation)</p> <p>4.230 The Forum is in the first stage of identifying sites or buildings that have potential for accommodating community arts facilities. This policy could include a single large building or a range of smaller facilities. Land and buildings are in short supply in the City Centre. Discussions have taken place as to whether a new build should be proposed or whether we use an empty existing building or buildings. The Forum believes a more sustainable option would be to renovate an existing empty building. Our preferred option therefore is the former DLI Museum and Art Gallery. Other possible options include the old Miners' Hall in North Road.</p>	<p>c3 Suggesting change to policies</p> <p>c3 Suggesting change to policies</p> <p>(This is the text of the Plan)</p>	<p>We should consider inviting the author of this comment to join us when we are considering the Communities policies.</p> <p>Consider</p> <p>Consider</p>
---	---	--

<p>4.231 The Forum is aware of the great sadness in the community when the DLI Museum closed and the DLI collection was moved to storage in Spennymoor, as well as having some exhibition space in Palace Green Library. The building was a valuable resource for the community and used by the young and older people, but the County Council has made it clear that the collection will not return to the building which will be considered for a range of alternative uses. Durham City Conservation Area Appraisal identified the DLI Museum as a non- designated heritage asset/building of local interest: While not possessing sufficient interest to be listed as of national importance, such buildings add to the general architectural richness and character of the area and it will be important that careful consideration is given to any development proposals that are likely to affect such building. (Durham County Council, 2016e, Character Area 2: Framwellgate p.36)</p> <p>4.232 The Neighbourhood Planning Forum is presently looking into the possibility of bringing the DLI building back to life as a community asset. This policy links with green infrastructure Policy G2 which includes the designation of the DLI grounds as a Local Green Space.</p> <p>4.233 The Forum is aware that the design of such facilities needs to be flexible to meet the needs of diverse audiences, changing patterns of use and demands of different art forms. There will be a need to ensure the proposal is deliverable and to establish arrangements for managing the facility over our Neighbourhood Plan period. Policy Implementation Project 3 in Chapter 5 indicates how this policy could be taken forward. <i>Comments on 4.230/ 4.231/ 4.232/ 4.233</i> These sections need changing.</p> <p>4.230 To date the Forum has not identified sites or buildings that have potential for accommodating community arts facilities. (need to change 'community arts facilities' to 'arts facilities') Policy C1 has been written to ensure that if other interested bodies come forward with a planning application the Policy will support it, subject to certain planning conditions The potential use of the DLI for example as an art gallery, came out of the first public consultation events at the Town Hall, but all attempts by the Forum to discover future uses for the DLI building from the County Council have fallen on stony ground. Not enough progress has been made in terms</p>	<p>Suggesting change to other text</p>	<p>Consider</p>
---	--	-----------------

<p>L9b The county council notes that the plan includes text which relates to specific site proposals which are not contained within a policy and that it is stated that the Forum is at the first stage of identifying buildings. If it is the intention to identify specific land for this use then this should have been included within a policy in this version of the plan for consultation. Alternatively, if it was not possible to identify a site at this stage a full scope of criteria for judging the suitability of a site should have been included within the policy. The council is concerned that the policy as drafted does neither. Furthermore, the county council considers that this policy would benefit from being reworded. The term 'and should be accessible' is superfluous as the policy is written at present as a development that relates well to the modes of transport referred to would by definition be accessible.</p>	<p>c3 Objection to wording of the policy</p>	<p>Consider the points made and the possible rewording of the Policy</p>
<p>L23 C1 and C2 require the involvement of the DCC.</p>	<p>c2 Involvement of DCC in Policies C1 and C2</p>	<p>Covered by discussion with Council</p>
<p>Policy C2: Information Hub</p>		
<p>EQ43. Re Policy C2. We would be sceptical of the efficiency or value of creating any sort of resource which solely exists as an information hub. Available space in the city centre is minimal and affordable space even more so. Also pertinent is the fact that an increasing majority of people plan their journeys and activities before leaving the house or carry a smart device with them - casting doubts on the longevity and necessity of any such resource. A hub which is integrated into an existing or new facility and which the use of could be monitored would be more appropriate. Most crucially a better quality and number of dedicated, free poster spaces would probably assist with clear lines of communication regarding activities and events.</p>	<p>c2 Concern c3 c5 Suggesting change to policy and supporting text</p>	<p>Concern noted Consider</p>
<p>Q33 C2: !! We residents all said that closing the Information Centre at Clayport was a very stupid move!! Get it re-opened as soon as possible. For a city like Durham not to have a Tourist Info Office is absolutely ridiculous.</p>	<p>c2 Strong support</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>Q48. C2 Bring back the Tourist Information Office ASAP</p>	<p>c2 Support</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>Q65 Policy C.2. The Information Hub would be exceedingly welcome.</p>	<p>c2 Support</p>	<p>Support noted</p>

<p>Q69 C2: ! It would be totally unacceptable to re-use the DLI Museum given the reasons set out for its closure – including asbestos problems. An alternative provision is needed urgently. As a DLI volunteer I am familiar with the Collection at Spennymoor and this has some benefits for researchers, but the Collection needs proper display, not the pathetic arrangement at Palace Green.</p>	<p>c2 Read as strong support for Policy C2 c5. Reconsider inclusion of the DLI Museum building for a Policy C1 venue c1c. Redisplay of DLI collection outside remit (not a planning issue)</p>	<p>Support noted Consider changes to supporting text for Policy C1 No action</p>
<p>Q76 C2 The return of the Tourist Information Centre is essential to the economy. This should include professional staff not just volunteers. Good to have community facilities available.</p>	<p>c2 Support</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>WC40 Comment on your post "Policy C2" POLICY C 2. I strongly support this Policy. It is a matter of local, national, and international embarrassment that somewhere as significant as Durham does not have a TIC.</p>	<p>c2 Support</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>WC123 Comment on your post "Policy C2" I support the principle of this policy. The information software should be accessible to all events and attractions providers so every organisation can easily add an event they organise with tags for easier searching. I would like the University to participate in it making the information about public lectures and events accessible. A the minute residents (or tourists) not working on the University has no way to learn about events open to public which University hold. Also as a separate policy I think that University should be encouraged or even obliged to have more public events/lectures/discussions and engage with the public more for the purpose of popularising science, encouraging democracy based on informed decision and serve as a place to express and exchange knowledge and opinions.</p>	<p>c5 Suggesting change to other text c1b Outside remit (for University) c1b Outside remit (for University)</p>	<p>Consider No action No action</p>
<p>WC148 Comment on your post "Policy C2" A TIC would be extremely useful for tourists visiting Durham.</p>	<p>c2 Support</p>	<p>Support noted</p>

<p>L9b It is considered that there needs to be more of a reference to Visit County Durham throughout this section acknowledging that they are the destination management organisation / official tourism body for Durham who is responsible for coordination of the tourism sector and they advise providers of attractions, services and events on how to set up information services.</p> <p>The county council is very concerned that this policy and supporting text has been drafted with insufficient understanding of the work of Visit County Durham. What is described below would be expensive to set up and very costly to maintain. This puts into question the deliverability of the proposal.</p> <p>It is also extremely concerning that the proposal for an information hub will replicate their function and also undo much of Visit Durham's coordination of the sector that has taken place over the last 11 years. This duplication of current work is likely to result in confusion and inconsistent messaging for visitors. If an information hub was to be set up then it should be one that is joint managed by Visit County Durham and a body that provides similar services to residents.</p> <p>The county council strongly opposes the branding 'Love Durham' as it has invested heavily in the place brand and an information hub would need to reflect this.</p> <p>The county council wishes to clarify that The Pointers are a voluntary run service, if they were to take a more active role in the provision of visitor information especially for areas outside of the city they would need to be professionally trained to do so - Visit County Durham have advised that they could support with this.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, if this policy is to be retained then the county council considers that this policy would benefit from being reworded. At present this policy fails to include an appropriate scope of criteria against which the acceptability of a proposal could be assessed. Furthermore the term 'and should be accessible' is superfluous as the policy is written at present as a development that relates well to the modes of transport referred to would by definition be accessible.</p>	<p>c3 Objection that this Policy cuts across the work of Visit County Durham.</p> <p>c5 Possible change to other text</p> <p>c5 Objection to brand</p> <p>c2. Clarification given about The Pointers</p> <p>c3 Objection to current wording</p>	<p>Consider wording of Policy, possibly with Visit County Durham.</p> <p>But see L11 below.</p> <p>Consider change</p> <p>Consider whether to drop this proposal.</p> <p>Possible change to other text</p> <p>Consider rewording. This policy had a lot of support from respondents.</p>
--	--	--

<p>L11 Durham Pointers' committee would like to endorse Policy C2 of Durham City Neighbourhood Plan: Information Hub</p> <p>Many visitors express their surprise that a cathedral city like Durham lacks an easily accessible central hub of information for visitors. We are very conscious that less well known, or attractions away from the centre, are not adequately promoted and we do our best to advise visitors and residents about events and attractions both within the city and across the County. In our experience, day or short stay visitors are rarely prepared to use the telephone service 'This is Durham'. Indeed this facility no longer operates at weekends.</p> <p>The proposed central hub offers the potential to provide a much needed central information point which could hold and disseminate information on local county attractions and community events. We believe any such provision should embrace all modern media methods for the distribution of information but should also be a place for face-to-face encounters. Our experience has demonstrated that the majority of older visitors to the city prefer personal contact. Remote access can also prove challenging for those with physical or learning disabilities.</p> <p>Additionally, if the Hub were located in the Town Hall with public access encouraged, the historic interior could be an added visitor attraction.</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C2 with reasons why existing arrangements are in their view not working</p>	<p>Support noted. Need to reconcile this with the Council's submission L9b above, if that is possible.</p>
<p>L23 C1 and C2 require the involvement of the DCC.</p>	<p>c2 Involvement of DCC in Policies C1 and C2</p>	<p>Covered by discussion with Council</p>
<p>Policy C3: Provision of New Community Facilities</p>		
<p>Q68 C3 How would you finance this with council funding cuts communal halls are being closed. With the large influx of students in many parts of the city has had a devastating effect on communities. It is difficult to assess how the Claypath, Nevilles Cross, The Gates and Old County Hospital will make this worse.</p>	<p>c5 Concern c1c. Affect of existing/currently being built PBSAs outside remit (not a planning issue)</p>	<p>Consider change to supporting text No action</p>

<p>Q76 C3 need to also mention point 8. Need good quality sustainable design that respects the distinctiveness of Durham.</p>	<p>c3 Suggesting change to policies</p>	<p>Consider (though it may be best addressed by Policy S2, or Policies H2 and H3)</p>
<p>WC41 Comment on your post "Policy C3" Policy C 3. I support this Policy.</p>	<p>c2 Support</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>L8b [extracts from 23 page document] It is essential that the clubhouse facilities are of a modern standard throughout to enable full use of the clubhouse in order to generate funds via social and fundraising events. A modern, usable clubhouse is crucial to the long-term sustainability of the Club. [...] Among the potential ground improvements that the Club will consider and investigate with an eye on 2029 and beyond are: • New clubhouse – either rebuilt on current site or new build in south-east corner of the ground</p>	<p>c5 Possible mention in supporting text re DCCC</p>	<p>Consider mention in supporting text.</p>
<p>L9b The county council strongly considers that the uses contained within this policy should be an exhaustive list otherwise it presents uncertainty over the scope of uses. It is suggested that reference is made to the appropriate Use Classes set out in the Use Classes Order. Criterion 1 this is not considered appropriate as it is a policy consideration in its own right which is already clearly dealt with in NPPF. Criterion 2 as worded could preclude a proposal that relates well to a residential area that is not currently served by local facilities. Criterion 3 the term ‘wherever possible’ weakens the application of this criterion. Criterion 6 reference to parking and servicing are important considerations which are absent from the policy.</p>	<p>c3 Objection to list of examples, an exhaustive list is recommended c3 Objection as duplicates NPPF c3 Objection to twin test c3 Objection as too weak c3 Objection to omissions</p>	<p>Consider revision along lines suggested. Consider: would moving to supporting text resolve this? Consider this constructive criticism Consider this constructive criticism Consider adding references to parking and servicing.</p>
<p>L12b Policy [...] states that development will not be permitted if it is in the green belt. This is not considered to be sound as the tests in the NPPF should be followed.</p>	<p>c3 Objection as duplicates NPPF</p>	<p>Consider: would moving to supporting text resolve this?</p>

<p>L23 Finally we recognise, as with the development of a community facility at Merryoaks for the community associations and residents in the CCP, NXCA and Merryoaks areas, that C3 is a sensible policy but one that requires collaboration with the University and the DCC</p>	<p>c2 Support with proviso of collaboration with DCC and University</p>	<p>Support noted Consider proviso in supporting text</p>
<p>Policy C4: Protection of an Existing Community Facility</p>		
<p>Q09 C4: !</p>	<p>c2 Read as strong support</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>Q76 C1 – need to also mention the need to maintain and contrive community facilities where possible. Possibly C4.</p>	<p>c2 This seems to be suggesting a change to the wording of C1 then realising it is addressed by C4.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>WC42 Comment on your post "Policy C4" POLICY C 4. Whilst I support this Policy, I suggest it be re-formatted as follows: 1.The facility is no longer financially viable, but an equivalent facility is available nearby to satisfy the needs of the local community, OR 2.There is no significant demand for the facility within that locality.</p>	<p>c2 Support c3 Suggesting change to policies</p>	<p>Support noted Consider</p>
<p>L9b The county council considers that in the interests of clarity the approach of cross referencing in this policy should be avoided. The scope of uses to which these policies relate should be aligned to the use Classes Order. Criterion 3 The county council considers that it is unclear as to whether criterion 3 is applicable to either scenario set out in criterion 1 and 2. The policy should be amended to provide the necessary clarity.</p>	<p>c3 Rewording suggested c3 Suggesting change to resolve ambiguity</p>	<p>Consider alternative approach suggested here Revise wording.</p>
<p>L23 We support C4-6 although we feel that it is important to note that health and related provision should not be used to subsidise, for example, what should more properly fall within the responsibility of the University.</p>	<p>c2 Support but proviso about responsibility of University</p>	<p>Support noted Consider including proviso in supporting text</p>
<p>Policy C5: Protection of Urban Open Spaces</p>		
<p>Q09 C5: !</p>	<p>c2 Read as strong support</p>	<p>Support noted</p>

Q43 All these facilities are needed but is C5 strictly necessary when it is already dealt with under Green Infrastructure?	c2 Concern about duplication	Commenter does not seem to have read supporting text 4.246 Need to consider changing policy or clarifying in supporting text. Cross ref to Theme 2b
Q52 C5: environment	c2 Unclear	No action required
Q53 C5: Vital to protect	c2 Support	Support noted
Q62 C5.1 – use of “or” between clauses again worrying.	c3 Concern	Consider change to policy
Q76. C51-4. Good quality materials, street furniture, lighting, landscaping. The space should respect the urban grain and townscape. C5.2 Who decides what is surplus to requirement. Concerned there may be some bias used here from University or Durham County Council.	c3 Suggesting change to policies c2 Question	Consider adding a new point 4 to C5.1 Answer question
WC43 Comment on your post "Policy C5" POLICY C 5. I support this Policy.	c2 Support	Support noted
WC44 Comment on your post "Policy C5" POLICY C 5.2. As currently drafted point 3 -the provision of equivalent or better quality space- appears to be a requirement, whether or not 1 or 2 can be demonstrated. Is this the intention, or am I just being thick?	c3 Concern	Need to clarify policy. Is it 1 OR (2 and 3), or (1 OR 2) AND 3, or something else?
L4 We do however note Policy C5 (loss of urban open spaces) which appears to be identical to Policy G1.3 (loss of green assets). Is there any real difference between these proposed Policies? Are both really needed?	c3 / c5 Concern about duplication	Need to consider changing policy or clarifying in supporting text. Cross ref to Theme 2b

<p>L9b The county council has noted that the threshold contained within this policy is inconsistent with that cited elsewhere in the draft plan. Furthermore the policy wording suggests that only criteria set out within that policy needs to be adhered to for a scheme to be acceptable. In the interests of clarity the policy should be reworded to replace the phrases 'will be supported if' with 'should'</p> <p>The policy intention at C5.1 is at odds with the title in that it relates to the provision of open space as opposed to protection of such space and is considered to overlap with Policy G1 which poses issues in the application of the policies in question.</p> <p>Criterion C5.1.3 it is an unreasonable requirement for developers to address existing short falls in provision. Such a requirement should only relate to the requirements of the scheme in question.</p>	<p>c3 Inconsistency pointed out</p> <p>c3 Objection to wording</p> <p>c3 Inconsistency pointed out</p> <p>c3 / c5 Overlap with policy G1 suggested</p> <p>c3 Objection to wording</p>	<p>Consider resolving inconsistency with policy G1.1 and elsewhere? Consider rewording: the current wording has a presumably unintended consequence.</p> <p>Need to resolve the protection / provision wording Urban open spaces can be hard, i.e. not green, but this distinction is not clear in our policies. Consider rewording. The intention of 5.1.3 was to let developers provide the space away from the site if it wasn't possible within.</p>
<p>L23 We support C4-6 although we feel that it is important to note that health and related provision should not be used to subsidise, for example, what should more properly fall within the responsibility of the University.</p>	<p>c2 Support with proviso about responsibility of University</p>	<p>Support noted Consider including proviso in supporting text</p>
Policy C6: Health Care and Social Care Facilities		
<p>Q09 C6: !</p>	<p>c2 Read as strong support</p>	<p>Support noted</p>
<p>Q18. C6. Access of disabled people to facilities needs ensuring as a priority Dentist facilities without such access need to be discovered factually rather than reliance on "anecdotal evidence".</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C6.5 c5 Suggests better evidence needed</p>	<p>Support noted Consider gathering more evidence (which would go in supporting text)</p>
<p>"C6: Can't comment – no information</p>	<p>c2 No reference given. No comment</p>	<p>No action possible</p>
<p>Q52 C6: environment</p>	<p>c2 No comment</p>	<p>No action possible</p>
<p>Q53 C6: not clear what is involved</p>	<p>c2 Comment lacks detail</p>	<p>No action possible</p>
<p>Q76 C6 good quality distinctive design picking up the character of Durham is still required despite this being a community building. Copied to Theme 2a</p>	<p>c2 Support for Policy C6.8</p>	<p>Support noted: any possible action will be under Theme 2a.</p>

<p>WC45 Comment on your post "Policy C6" POLICY C 6. I support this Policy and suggest that emphasis be given to the importance of adjoining car-parking space. I think the items listed 1 to 9 need to be reviewed/reformatted in finalising the draft. (See in particular point 6).</p>	<p>c3 Concern that Policy C6 does not mention car parking c3 Point 6 should not have been numbered: web version differs from the printed document.</p>	<p>Consider change to policy, and relationship with Policies T1, T2 Error in web version to be corrected</p>
<p>L9b The county council considers that as nursing homes and care homes have differing considerations to health centres and surgeries it would be more appropriate for them to be considered in another housing related policy. Criterion 1 this is not considered appropriate as it is a policy consideration in its own right which is already clearly dealt with in NPPF. Criterion 7 it is considered that levels of amenity and open space should be good, not 'satisfactory'. Criterion 4 & 8 could be refined into one criterion to avoid unnecessary repetition within the policy.</p>	<p>c3 Suggests splitting of the policy c3 Objection as covered by NPPF c3 Objection c3 Suggestion for rewording</p>	<p>Consider – but this was two policies originally which we merged due to repetition. Consider. Maybe move to supporting text? Consider this constructive criticism Consider.</p>
<p>L12b Policy [...] states that development will not be permitted if it is in the green belt. This is not considered to be sound as the tests in the NPPF should be followed.</p>	<p>c3 Objection as covered by NPPF</p>	<p>Consider: Maybe move to supporting text?</p>
<p>L23 We support C4-6 although we feel that it is important to note that health and related provision should not be used to subsidise, for example, what should more properly fall within the responsibility of the University. Under C6 we would wish for a specific discussion and policy recommendation on policing and security, particularly in relation to the policing of student conduct in private accommodation. This has been raised with the University and we feel that residents, who pay council tax which includes a policing precept, bear a disproportionate cost for policing such conduct. It could be argued that the very limited police presence in the City should not be disproportionately applied to a problem that should be either more effectively managed by the University or where the University makes a proportionate financial contribution to the cost of policing such conduct.</p>	<p>c2 Support with proviso about responsibility of University c1c This is not a planning matter</p>	<p>Support noted Consider adding proviso into supporting text This would be for another body to take forward</p>