

Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum Working Group 2 October 2018, Miners' Hall

1. Welcome and apologies

Present: Sue Childs, Roger Cornwell (Chair), Ann Evans, John Lowe, David Miller, John Pacey, Matthew Phillips.

Apologies: John Ashby, Pippa Bell, Peter Jackson, Angela Tracy.

2. Progress with re-writing of Themes

- **Theme 1:** John L presented the additional policy S2 about masterplans. Detailed discussion followed and an amended version is included at the end of these notes. It was also **agreed** that a small amendment should be made to policy E1 to ensure consistency with S2. The suggested wording for this is also included at the end of these notes.
- **Theme 2a:** Ann had circulated a revised black version and Sue is working on the red and green version. It was **agreed** to change the wording in H1.3 from “within the World Heritage Site” to “throughout Our Neighbourhood”. This was to widen the protection of views. The revised Theme 2b was then **agreed**. It was noted that H2.2 and one of the Projects also dealt with the importance of views.
- **Theme 2b:** Sue will meet Carole Dillon on 9 October to discuss this.
- **Theme 3:** We are awaiting a response from Carole.
- **Theme 4:** Sue reported that she and John A had a useful meeting with Carole on 28 September and they are revising the Theme accordingly.
- **Theme 5:** We are awaiting a response from Carole. Matthew reported that he had received a map of the CPZ and a list of streets indicating which ones were controlled by payment and which ones were for residents only. **Matthew** will ask Carole for feedback provided by Dave Wafer.
- **Theme 6:** Sue will discuss this with Carole on 9 October.

4. Progress with re-writing Part B

Chapter 5: David had circulated a revised version. It was **agreed** to include this in Part A, to retain paragraphs 5.1 – 5.4, to take out references to the Projects, and to simplify 5.6.

All theme convenors should check the list of Projects and send any comments to David this week for future discussion. New Projects can still be added.

5. Standing item: Timetables for Neighbourhood Plan and County Local Plan

It was **agreed** that owing to the issue of the boundary discrepancies, we would have to wait until after the Parish Council meeting on 25 October to decide whether the Forum should submit the Plan to DCC or do it via the Parish Council. This meant we also postponed the idea of calling a special Forum meeting early in November. Meanwhile, we should ensure that at the regular Forum meeting on 16 October we were in a position to present all the Themes to the Forum and explain where we were up to in terms of all the documentation.

This means that on 9 October we have to consider exactly how we prepare the following:

- Consultation Statement

- Basic Conditions Statement
- Delivery Plan

6. Consultation Statement

John L had circulated a first draft of the list of contents. This was broadly welcomed and a number of improvements were suggested. **John L** will present a revised version at the next meeting. John P had volunteered to assist with this.

7. Issue about planning authorities removing comments from their websites

This issue had been referred to us from NORA but we **agreed** it was not something we needed to consider as DCC's practice did not give cause for concern.

8. Any other business

- Sue reported that she would be speaking on behalf of the Forum at a public meeting on 18 October organised by All Churches Together to discuss town / university relations. She would be outlining our vision for Our Neighbourhood.
- John P raised an issue about Quarry Heads Lane where the lane has to accommodate pedestrians (it is a designated right of way) and an increasing number of vehicles. **Matthew** will add it to the pedestrian map and also suggest that it could be designated as a Quiet Lane or Home Zone.

9. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on Tuesday 9 October following the 9.00 am Forum meeting at the Miners' Hall.

Policy S2: The Requirement for Master Plans

A master plan for all large sites will be required where new development would have a major impact on adjacent areas or would be intrusive in views of the World Heritage site or the surrounding landscape of Our Neighbourhood. The master plan will have to be developed through a process of public consultation and approved by the planning authority and put in the public domain. It must set out the overall layout and style of the proposed development, including the main uses to which the site will be put. The master plan will be taken into account as a material planning consideration when applications and variations are being considered.

Justification (for policy S2)

The importance of the preparation of a master plan for large sites was emphasised during the public consultation (Q43). Bearing in mind the historic character of Our Neighbourhood, it is appropriate that a separate policy on master plans should be included. Large sites require master plans that will ensure avoidance of standard solutions, respect local surroundings, and create the highest quality of design. Master plans will ensure that buildings and spaces are of the right type and in the right place. They will reduce the risk of inappropriate or piecemeal development and protect views to and from the World Heritage Site and its setting. Durham County Council’s *Durham City Masterplan Update* (October 2016) refers to the Milburngate House site and states that the Council “will work through the planning process to ensure a high quality and sensitive scheme is developed on this exceptional site within view of the World Heritage Site” (p.8). This is precisely the sort of site where this policy would be appropriate.



Policy E1: Larger Employment Sites

Employment will be created at the two largest available sites on X hectares of non-Green Belt land at Aykley Heads (including Durham County Council’s County Hall site), and on Y hectares of non-Green Belt land at the Durham Science Park at Mountjoy where full compliance will be required with high sustainability standards set out in master plans for these prime locations. **The master plans must meet the requirements of Policy S2, with the additional requirements specified below for these employment sites.**