

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

**1. Welcome and apologies**

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

**Apologies:** Pippa Bell, Angela Tracy.

**2. Notes of working group meeting on 2 October 2018**

John Pacey pointed out that in Item 8 it should read “Quiet Lane or Home Zone” rather than “Quiet Zone”. The notes were then agreed and **Sue** will post them on the website

**3. Progress with re-writing of Themes**

- **Theme 1:** It was **agreed** that, rather than try to define “large” sites in policy S2, the justification text should identify likely sites but also indicate that others could be added. **John L** would add these details and send the full Theme to **John A** to send to AECOM.
- **Theme 2a:** This has been sent to AECOM.
- **Theme 2b:** **Sue** will meet Carole Dillon on 9 October to discuss this.
- **Theme 3:** We are awaiting a response from Carole. The addition about master plans to policy E1, consequent upon the introduction of policy S2, was **agreed**.
- **Theme 4:** John A reported that AECOM had significantly reduced the number of dwellings on some sites. It was **agreed** that we could justify our original numbers and that we should include them. DCC has not laid down a set number that we have to achieve. It was also **agreed** to exclude the Framwell House site as it now had planning permission for offices.
- **Theme 5:** **Matthew** will ask Carole for feedback provided by Dave Wafer and Peter Olivere.
- **Theme 6:** **Sue** will discuss this with Carole on 9 October.

**4. Progress with re-writing Chapter 5 and Part B**

**Chapter 5:** **David** has revised this following last week’s discussion and will send it to **John A** to send to AECOM.

**Projects:** David had circulated a revised list. It was **agreed** that too much prescriptive detail was given for some projects. The intention was simply to give a brief indication of the core idea of each project, mainly to give a steer to the Parish Council. The red/green version of the text would include the response codes so that further details could be tracked down. **David** will present a revised version next week. It will form a single chapter with the text about the Creative City.

**5. Discrepancy between Forum and Parish Boundaries**

It was **agreed** that this is a matter that needs resolving by the Parish and County Councils. **John L** will send to the Interim Clerk of the PC the letter drafted by Roger informing the PC of the situation and asking them to discuss it.

**6. Standing item: Timetables for Neighbourhood Plan and County Local Plan**

It was **agreed** that realistically the date for completing the Themes had to be put back to mid-

October and that would be our deadline irrespective of whether we have feedback from DCC on all the Themes.

**John A** will contact Ros to clarify what needs doing in terms of consulting the statutory bodies during October. Doubts were expressed whether this was really necessary. **John A** will also contact AECOM for information about their timescale for completing the Sustainability Appraisal.

## 7. Consultation Statement

John L presented a revised version of the 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. **Roger** will draft the Background section dealing with the original idea of developing a neighbourhood plan and establishing the Forum. **All theme convenors** are asked to draft the summary, using the Tattenhall table model, of the issues and concerns raised during all the different stages of the plan's development and how we have responded to them.

## 8. Basic Conditions Statement

John L had distributed the official guidance notes about this. One of the conditions we have to satisfy is to demonstrate "general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan". In our case since there is not yet a County Plan this means the saved policies of the City of Durham plan (2004, revised 2007 and assessed for compliance with the NPPF in 2015)

**All theme convenors** are asked to check whether any of those policies should be considered as strategic using the guidance given in paragraph 076 of the notes. Alternatively, so long as we can demonstrate conformity with all the relevant policies of that plan, there is no need to identify some of them as strategic.

## 9. Scoping Report and Historic England's Comments

**John A** will check that we have addressed the points made by Historic England.

## 10. Delivery Plan

Appendix A of DCC's letter of 18 December 2017 criticised the quality of our Delivery Plan. This is puzzling as we are not aware of have written a Delivery Plan, not of any requirement to do so. **Sue** will check this with Carole Dillon.

## 11. DU's Community Engagement Task Force

It was **agreed** to nominate Angela as a member of the Culture sub-group if she wished to join it.

**John L** will write to DU asking for the Living Environment sub-group to include consideration of green infrastructure issues.

## 12. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on Tuesday 16 October following the 9.00 am Forum meeting at the Miners' Hall.