

Durham City Neighbourhood Plan Working Party 20 November 2018, Miners' Hall

1. Welcome and apologies

Present: Sue Childs (Chair), Peter Jackson, John Lowe, John Pacey, Matthew Phillips, Angela Tracy.

Apologies: John Ashby, Pippa Bell, Roger Cornwell, Ann Evans, David Miller,

2. Notes of working party meeting on 13 November 2018

- a) **Accuracy:** The notes were agreed as a true record and **Sue** will post them on the website.
- b) **Matters arising:** None

3. Timetables for Neighbourhood Plan and County Local Plan

John P pointed out that the timetable for December depends upon AECOM sending the *Sustainability Appraisal* early that month. It is unlikely that we shall be able to respond to it in time for the PC to approve it for the further Reg 14 consultation on 20 December and that this should be moved to 24 January. Subsequent stages would then be a month later, but it is possible that the final stages could be completed more quickly than stated in the timetable and so the final date might still be July 2020. **John L** will amend the timetable accordingly.

All are asked to proof-read the Plan text sent to AECOM and send any minor amendments to Sue **by the end of November**. Sue had circulated a black and white copy of this text and any amendments should be made using red for deletions and green for new text.

4. Consultation Statement

Ann had circulated a revised draft about the Heritage theme using the Tattenhall template and Matthew had done the same for the Transport theme. The structure and content of these was welcomed.

In response to comments from Peter it was **agreed** that the word “survey” would only be used in relation to the “Priorities Survey”. Other consultation events would be described as “Meetings with...” or “Engagement with...”. Sue drew attention to the template she had provided for Stakeholder Engagements that **all** should use to record meetings with individuals or groups that had been held by theme convenors and others. This should include a declaration of interest if the working party member was also a member of the group being consulted.

Matthew had suggested that the Theme title should be at the head of the table rather than taking up a column and that we needed to date the pre-submission consultation as the PC would be conducting a second one. These suggestions were **agreed**.

5. Basic Conditions Statement

No developments were reported but it was **agreed** that **John L** would write to Carole Dillon to ask for DCC’s document listing the policies it considered strategic from the Durham City plan and also for DCC’s advice about the EU Directives with which we have to conform.

As far as showing compliance with the NPPF is concerned, **all** are asked to check that references and any quotations reflect the NPPF as revised in July 2018. **John L** will produce a template table in which we can provide a summary showing compliance of our policies with the NPPF.

6. Revision of *Looking Forward*

John P said the revised document was a great improvement and he suggested three small textual changes that were **agreed**:

- In the 1st para replace “concerns” with “aspirations”
- In the 1st para delete “therefore”
- In the 2nd para add “Durham University”

It was agreed that the sample Initiative 1 was a monitoring initiative that should apply across all initiatives and that all initiatives were not of the same type of level. This should be reflected in the description of the nature of public engagement in each initiative. It was **agreed** that the structure of each should be: a) Proposal and b) Nature of Public Engagement. **All** were asked to check the proposed initiatives and ensure that they included an appropriate description of community engagement.

The question of the status of this document then arose. It is a companion to the Neighbourhood Plan, but not part of it. Will the PC adopt it so that it is not simply the work of a group of volunteers? It is important that people see that ideas they put forward during consultations have not been forgotten, even though they could not be included as planning issues. Reference to its status should be made in the introduction to the Plan. Should it be made available alongside the Plan during the further Reg 14 consultation? It was **agreed** to include these issues as a specific agenda item at our next meeting.

7. Any other business:

- Sue has responded to AECOM about the confusion over policy numbering.
- Sue has responded to Matthew Wright about the Observatory Hill green space and will provide AECOM with the information it needs.
- John P noted that the Green Belt Protection Bill is due to have its 2nd reading in the House of Commons on Friday.

11. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on Tuesday 27 November at 9.00 am at the Miners’ Hall.