

Durham City Neighbourhood Plan Working Party 6 November 2018, Miners' Hall

1. Welcome and apologies

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

Apologies: None

2. Notes of working group meeting on 30 October 2018

- a) **Accuracy:** The notes were agreed as a true record and **Sue** will post them on the website.
- b) **Matters arising from Item 5:**
 - John L reported that he had only received two expressions of interest in being added to the continuation mailing list. Roger noted that members of this group would be contacted by the Parish Clerk about their contact details.
 - John L reported that he had written to the Interim Parish Clerk and the incoming Parish Clerk about the formation of the Working Party but had not received a reply. **Roger** will chase this up.

3. Timetables for Neighbourhood Plan and County Local Plan

Roger, John A and John L had met DCC officers at County Hall on 2 November to discuss their view that the Parish Council should conduct a further Regulation 14 consultation. John L had circulated notes of the meeting. Roger, John A and John L recommended that we should accept DCC's cautionary advice that not conducting the extra consultation risked challenge and further delay to the plan.

John L had also circulated parallel revised timetables, with and without the extra consultation. If the 4-week consultation with the statutory bodies were included in the extra 6-week consultation and other tasks such as preparing the *Consultation Statement* and *Basic Conditions Statement* were carried out in parallel with other activities, the delay might only be about one month. It is difficult to set precise times for completion of each stage, but any delays are likely to affect both timetables.

DCC had given an assurance that the Parish and Plan boundaries could be quickly and simply aligned as part of this process.

Colleagues reluctantly **agreed** to recommend to the Parish Council that it should follow DCC's advice. **John L** will write to the Clerks accordingly and include a request that the Chair of the PC should immediately request DCC to start the process of aligning the boundaries. **Roger** and **John A** will discuss links between the PC and the Working Party with the Clerks.

John L will also write to DCC officers to send them his notes of their meeting and to press upon them the urgency of dealing with the boundary issue. He will also remind them that they promised to let us have a document they have already drawn up identifying the saved policies of the Durham City plan that they consider strategic and also to provide us with guidance about the need for compliance with EU directives. Both of these will help greatly with the *Basic Conditions Statement*.

4. Consultation Statement

John L apologised that he had not been able to make much progress on this due to focussing on the preparation for, and aftermath of, the above meeting with DCC. However, in response to emailed questions from Matthew he clarified that the summary in the Tattenhall template should include all stages of the consultation, that it was useful to divide the template by stages, and that it was important to align the responses we have made with the issues people have identified.

In response to a query from Pippa, it was **agreed** that we should **all** retain any hard copies of consultation materials in case they were required by the Examiner. Perhaps they can be handed to the Parish Clerk once he is in post. Pippa reported that she was scanning all the newspaper articles and Sue reminded **all** that they should use the template for reporting stakeholder engagements.

5. Basic Conditions Statement

Ann had circulated a very helpful summary clarifying the EU Directives and Matthew had done a note showing the contribution of the Transport theme to meeting the Air Quality Directive. The advice from DCC about the EU Directives and the strategic nature of the saved Durham City policies (mentioned in Item 3 above) would also be helpful. It was **agreed** that we should send a draft of the *Basic Conditions Statement* to DCC once it was ready.

John A reported that he had not updated the *Screening Report* and *Scoping Report* but simply included an addendum in both to show that they had been endorsed by the Parish Council.

6. Revision of “Part B”

David and Angela had circulated a revised version of this document which they had called *Working Title*. It is to be separate from the Neighbourhood Plan but clearly related to it and this needs explaining at the beginning. The Plan contains the policies and this document outlines future actions, as expressed in our Vision. The document is structured according to the Plan’s themes and **all theme convenors** are asked to check the initiatives linked to their theme.

Ideally it should be endorsed by the Parish Council, perhaps through its Planning Committee, as the main body to champion the initiatives in the document, though many other bodies would also be involved. In fact, it was suggested that there are three levels initiatives: DCC, PC and Grassroots respectively taking the lead but with other involvement as required.

One fundamental purpose of the document is to ensure that people’s ideas gathered through our consultation processes should not be lost. The document is meant to be a stimulus to community engagement but also to involve official stakeholders. It is meant to continue the process begun by our consultations and to be a document that would evolve as all involved creatively discussed the initiatives.

David will discuss with **Matthew** ways to increase the level of community engagement in the transport initiatives.

7. Any other business: None

11. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on Tuesday 13 November at 9.00 am at the Miners’ Hall.