

THEME 5: A CITY WITH A MODERN AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE
CATEGORISATION OF COMMENTS AND PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED FOR CONSIDERATION
15th March 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:

- L3: County Durham Local Access Forum
- L4: Campaign to Protect Rural England
- L5: Durham BID (Business Improvement District)
- L7: Durham Cathedral
- L9b: Durham County Council AppendicesABC
- L12b: Durham University
- L13: Elvet Residents Association
- L22: Network Rail
- L23: Nevilles Cross Community Association
- L25: Persimmon Homes

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 5		
EQ03 Transport systems in the city are a real issue that needs addressing. We need public transport for all not just those with passes.	Concern about transport, and particularly public transport. Addressed by Theme 5 (for example 4.192 point 5).	No action
EQ04 1. It is very important that the university makes serious efforts to discourage students from bringing cars with them. Small changes could help such as making a waiting list for car parking permits and requiring students to register their vehicle at the Durham property where the permit. The university could also use some of it's land to make walkways and cycle paths between sites. 2. The numbers of pedestrians using Church Street at key times 8-9am and 4-6pm is now dangerous. Here are a couple of ideas: pedestrianize the street so that vehicles can only drive down the street as far as St Oswald's Institute (buses, residents, delivery vehicles would still need access, but it would help), stagger the start of lectures at the university 8.30, 9.00 and 9.30 starts.	c1b. Parking permits outside remit (for Council/other bodies) c1b. Use of University land outside remit (for other bodies). c2. Concern regarding pedestrian congestion. Addressed in Policies T1/T2, Project 17 and Map 11. c1b. Suggestions for Church Street and staggering lecture times outside remit (for Council/other bodies)	No action No action No action No action
EQ05 Consideration for pedestrians and cyclists consistently Copied from Theme 1 Transport and parking needs to be appropriate and accessible to support increased employment. Much more provision for safe cycling and walking required Copied from Theme 3 Whilst laudable the desire to design for lower car ownership in some developments I do not see this as realistic in the near future. Instead good and thoughtful siting of car parking, the use of permeable surfaces , and careful design to protect the safety and comfort of footpath users should be uppermost. Adequate and safe pedestrian and cycling provision through the area with similar consideration for those using mobility aids, away from cars essential.	c2. Support for walking and cycling provision. Addressed in Policies T1/T2. c2. Concern regarding transport and parking accessibility in relation to employment. c3. Concern regarding Policy T3. c3. Concern regarding provision for those using mobility aids.	Support noted. Consider theme policies in relation to employment. Review Policy T3 regarding parking levels. Review Policy T2 regarding mobility aids.

<p>EQ06 There is mention of modernising the taxi service using electric and hybrid vehicles. This in my mind should also include the Park and Ride buses and the small cathedral bus services. possible any short run service. Copied from Further Comments</p>	<p>c2. Concern regarding taxis and bus services using electric vehicles. Addressed in Project 16.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>EQ10 ... The road system within Durham City is limited as far as possible development is concerned and potentially a system of traffic control using advanced technology will be the way to go within the City. It is difficult to understand how any of the main road arteries leading into and out of the city, such as Church Street, Hallgarth Street Whinney Hill can not be be designated as anything other than heavily used main roads when the yearly increased volume of traffic (cars, cyclists, taxi cabs, delivery vans, university maintenance vehicles, mini buses, public transport buses, coaches etc) constantly uses them and yet no extra infrastructure is built to cater for it. ... Copied from Further Comments</p>	<p>c1b. Reconfiguration of road system outside remit (for Council/other bodies).</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>EQ11 Cycles could be used much more extensively by students particularly.</p>	<p>c2. Suggests greater use of cycles. Addressed in T1, T2, T4 and Map 12.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>EQ13 Walking and public transport should be encouraged and there is still need for much clearer and more frequent simpler signs - nothing pretentious.</p> <p>Cycle routes should be incorporated into new housing developments, but there is little scope in the inner parts of the city for cycle routes. Most roads are too narrow and often with bends with higher accident risk. Tracks should usually not have cyclists. Clay Lane provides an example. In the 1980s cycling was banned and got the occasional police reprimand. Now cyclists use the lane and sometimes ride quite fast, with occasional near misses with pedestrians.</p> <p>Storage space for mobility vehicles and bicycles are separate matters. A definite percent of new houses without garages should incorporate such space. Areas for cycling parking should be grouped for a relatively large of number of bikes, with cover and lighting.</p>	<p>c2. In favour of walking / public transport. Addressed by Theme 5 policies.</p> <p>c3. Suggestion re. signage.</p> <p>c2. In favour of cycle routes in new housing developments. Addressed by Policy T2.</p> <p>c5. Concern regarding cycling provision in inner part of city and tracks such as Clay Lane. Concern regarding danger to pedestrians from cyclists.</p> <p>c3. Suggesting change to policy T4</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>Consider if signage covered by Policy T2.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>Consider Map 11 and Map 12 and policies T1, T2, and balance between pedestrian and cyclist needs.</p> <p>Consider changing policy.</p> <p>Consider project.</p>

<p>Most of the projects to improve the neighbourhood are sensible, though very doubtful about what is meant by a rolling scheme of cycle improvements. Much too vague and do not this is included in present plan. Copied from Further Comments</p>	<p>c4. Concern regarding Project 17</p>	
<p>EQ15 I fully support these policies. I would comment as follows: 1. Almost every house has 2 cars associated with it. Yet the lack of domestic parking means that narrow roads are partially blocked. So parking is important. 2. We must somehow stop the "school run". The increase in traffic levels in term time is significant. How - is a good question. Safe cycle routes, safe walking routes, lower speed limits....etc etc. It is time for the car not to be top priority. Lip service is not enough any more. 3. Some sort of "Boris bike" scheme to reduce the need for cars. Assuming a safe environment (ha!), either electric bikes or electric mopeds (yes - seen in Turkey; quiet, green simple, safe...). By safe is meant something along the Dutch model - the separation of bikes from cars, the use of secure bike parks. 4. The quite inappropriate suggestions for the Bus Station must be resisted. The current location just needs some proper investment (not just development). I know this is pie in the sky - because the solution requires imagination, investment and leadership. At least this Plan has some ideas, which merits our full support. PS As a disabled person, Durham is IMPOSSIBLE to access or get around with safety and confidence. Pavements are horribly uneven (try using a wheelchair to cross the bridges, or a rollator in the centre), drop kerbs are not good enough (even ½ inch is a shocking barrier), car parks where even a blue card attracts payment. Disgraceful!</p>	<p>c2. Support for Theme 5 policies. c3. Concern regarding car parking.</p> <p>c2. Concern about travel to schools. c2. Concern for rebalancing transport priorities. Addressed in Theme 5 policies, particularly Para 4.180. c4. Suggestion for project.</p> <p>c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.</p> <p>c2. Full support for Plan. c3. Concern re disabled access.</p>	<p>Support noted. Consider Policy T3.</p> <p>Check Theme 5 policies cover school journeys from new housing. Consider project.</p> <p>Consider Theme 5 policies and relationship to Theme 3</p> <p>Support noted. Consider detailing additional issues on Map 11. Consider policies re disabled access.</p>
<p>EQ16 A lot of the traffic which comes into Durham is through traffic. If there was a by-pass north and south east and west all of the pollution would disappear and the city would be a much more healthy place to live.</p>	<p>c1a. Support for relief roads. Outside remit (outside area)</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>EQ18 Agree [Theme 3] if appropriate parking integrated into commercial/business sites to avoid congestion elsewhere Copied from Theme 3</p>	<p>c3. Suggesting car parking provision in commercial and business sites.</p>	<p>Consider in relation to DCC parking policy.</p>

<p>Q03 New bus station needed. Relief roads needed to cut air pollution in city centre</p>	<p>c2. Preferred location for new bus station not stated. c1a. Relief roads outside remit (outside area)</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Q04 I think that residential parking should be prohibited in a controlled parking one [should this read "zone"?] as it is taking up valuable space for people[?] who want to use the facilities in Durham. I think that there should be residential storage for cycles and mobility aids of people[?] to use the facilities in Durham. There is no protection of existing community facilities. Copied to Theme 6.</p>	<p>c1b. Suggestion to restrict residential parking in CPZ. Outside remit (Council/other bodies) c2. In favour of residential cycle and mobility aid storage. Addressed by Policy T4.</p>	<p>No action No action</p>
<p>Q05 We need an integrated transport structure, but I think moving the bus station is not necessary, a complete waste of money and will not be of benefit to road users/ It will cause havoc while it is being moved.</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies and relationship to Theme 3</p>
<p>Q07 93.1 (?G3.1) Footpaths need improving. 91.4 (?G1.4) Public rights of way need improvement & signage Copied from Theme 2a</p> <p>4.19 Control of Taxi Ranks & Illegal parking on Claypath. Taxis with engines running affects air quality. Copied from Theme 1</p> <p>Public footpath need improving on/around the Sands area. Copied from Theme 2b</p> <p>Residential parking should be allowed in designated areas for 1 Hour free. Taxi zones should be within designated car parks, ie Prince Bishops car park not on the streets</p>	<p>c2. Concern about footpaths and signage. Partially addressed in Policies T1/T2.</p> <p>c2. Concern regarding illegal parking and air quality relating to taxis. Addressed in Project 21, but outside remit (not planning issue)</p> <p>c3. Suggesting footpath improvements.</p> <p>c1b. Outside remit (for Council/other bodies)</p>	<p>Consider signage aspects for projects or policies.</p> <p>Support noted</p> <p>Consider amending Map 11. Also addressed under Theme 2b. Need to ensure consistency across these themes.</p> <p>No action.</p>
<p>Q11 Cycle lanes are needed for safety, both of cyclists and of the pedestrians on pavements where speeding cyclists ride.</p>	<p>c2. In favour of safer walking and cycling provision. Addressed by Policies T1, T2. c3. Concern over shared</p>	<p>No action. Consider how Policies T1/T2 deal</p>

<p>Zebra crossings are also needed in spots where pedestrians risk their lives due to unsafe crossings.</p>	<p>pedestrian/cyclist provision. c2. Desire for more zebra crossings to assist pedestrians. No locations specified.</p>	<p>with shared provision. No action. Note that pedestrian crossings to access new developments are covered in <i>Design Guidance: Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013</i> cited in the accompanying text for policies T1 and T2.</p>
<p>Q13 The new bus station planned for the top of North Road is completely unnecessary. We are told that a departmental store would cover the area of the present bus station. The difficulty of getting any sort of store to fill the B.H.S. store must show what an impossible task this would be. The removal of the unsightly brick buildings which front the present bus station would give more space to expand. This would save the pleasant parts of North Road – the roundabout fronting the viaduct. Copied to Theme 3</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies, and relationship to Theme 3</p>
<p>Q15 The main difficulty of walking on the pavements in e.g. Elvet is the number of briskly walking students going the other way, usually, and oblivious of anyone else -</p>	<p>c2. Concern over congested pavements. Addressed in Policy T1 (particularly 4.189).</p>	<p>Consider recording additional narrow pavements in Map 11.</p>
<p>Q17 Introducing safe walking routes across the city is of paramount importance.</p>	<p>c2. Expresses strong support for safe walking routes. Addressed by Policies T1, T2 and Map 11.</p>	<p>No action.</p>
<p>Q18 A walkable & cycle friendly city requires the connectivity (Theme 2b) of the Green Infrastructure to work in tandem. Copied to Theme 2b</p>	<p>c3. Non-specific comment on co-ordination of Themes 2b and 5.</p>	<p>Consider policies and consistency across Themes 2b and 5.</p>
<p>Q19 Improving sustainable transport long overdue. No more new roads – will give us more cars & pollution. ?? electric vehicles for people to get round the city. Encourage public transport. Don't spend money moving the bus station, improve what is already here. Agree with N. Plan suggestions.</p>	<p>c2. Support for sustainable transport. Addressed by Theme 5 policies. c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.</p>	<p>No action. Consider Theme 5 policies and relationship to Theme 3.</p>
<p>Q22 Manage the pathways better and encourage their use, e.g. many students would use Prebends Bridge to go to the BB Library if they knew the route. This would lessen foot traffic on busy routes. Have a coherent website for all public transport. At the moment it is atomised</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion regarding signage and footpath management. c4. Suggesting better website for</p>	<p>Consider policies T1 and T2 or project. Consider adding to Project 16.</p>

<p>by Bus etc. company and thus frustrating / unusable. Coherent & communicated recycling firm across the city = coordinate w/ Uni as theirs is bad too. Copied to Theme 1</p>	<p>buses. Relates to Project 16.</p>	
<p>Q24 No mention of electric car charging or community bikes. No mention of electric real time information systems</p>	<p>c3. c4. Suggestions of policies/projects for electric car charging, community bikes and real time information system.</p>	<p>Consider policies or projects.</p>
<p>Q26 Anyone who thinks students don't; have cars which need to be parked lives in cloud-cuckoo land. Students' cars push out residents' cars even in CPZ's. Cyclepaths should be entirely separate from pedestrian footpaths and anyone cycling on pavements should receive an on-the-spot fine. Many cyclists have no consideration for pedestrians. Do not have either lights or bells and are a real danger to people on foot, especially those hard of hearing.</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding student car parking. c3. Advocating separation of cycling and pedestrian paths. c1c. Fines and enforcement outside remit (not a planning issue)</p>	<p>Consider policies Consider how Policies T1/T2 deal with shared/separated provision. No action.</p>
<p>Q28 ... but we really might need to discuss a bye-pass, as the only way to preserve the centre. This needs urgent re-thinking. Copied from Theme 2b Essential to insist on parking to be available also in HMO → students should only be allowed cars if there is parking at their dwelling Copied to Theme 4 Resident parking / car ownership may improve with better public transport which must be safe affordable reliable</p>	<p>c1a. Relief roads outside remit (outside area) c3. Concern regarding student parking and HMOs. c2. Comment on reducing car dependence through better public transport. Addressed by Theme 5 policies.</p>	<p>No action. Consider Policy T3 and D2. Consider policies</p>
<p>Q32 The Belmont viaduct needs to be incorporated into a path / cycle route around the N of the city. Copied from Theme 2b Durham unfortunately suffers from its topography to make it cycle friendly. There are too many narrow footpaths – eg Margery lane → University library</p>	<p>c1a. Belmont viaduct outside remit (outside area) c2. Expresses doubt regarding suitability of Durham for cycling. c2. Concern regarding narrow</p>	<p>No action. Consider addition to text re this (e.g. in para E7) similar to the way the pros and cons are briefly noted for walking in E6. No action.</p>

<p>– and too many paths blocked by advertising ‘A’ signs – North Rd & Silver St.</p> <p>Buses exiting the bus station are a menace!</p> <p>Cycle riding is suicidal.</p>	<p>footways. Addressed by Policy T1. Margery Lane recorded in Map 11.</p> <p>c2. Concern about A-boards: outside remit (not a planning issue), but could be included in Project 17.</p> <p>c3. Concern about current bus station.</p> <p>c2. Can either be read as support for safer cycling infrastructure (addressed by Policies T1, T2 and Map 12), or as an objection to cycling altogether, but in the context of the other remarks the former seems more likely.</p>	<p>Consider Project 17 and Map 11 in relation to advertising boards.</p> <p>Consider Theme 5 policies, and relationship to Theme 3. Consider addition to Map 11.</p> <p>Consider noting in Project 17 that safety measures for cyclists (from bad motor vehicle driving) and safety measures for pedestrians (from bad motor vehicle driving and from bad cycling behaviour) will be required.</p>
<p>Q35 North Rd has been greatly improved. Lower Claypath needs similar treatment. Once the PBSA is fully functional the footfall will be huge.</p> <p>Your map shows a dangerous crossing in Lower Gilesgate – we are in discussion with DCC about this – so far only refusal: service vehicles include Tesco articulated trucks which come up Claypath & Gilesgate at 3,0am disturbing the residents – the trucks cannot do the sharp turn onto the slip road.</p> <p>I am in favour of the northern bypas – the queues at the roundabouts are huge & the air pollution is above legal limits.</p> <p>The footpath beside the river from Framwellgate Bridge to Prebends Bridge is now very safe & its use should be encouraged so as to make the area around Durham School safer</p>	<p>c4. Suggestion for additional policy/project for improving Lower Claypath.</p> <p>c2. Concern about dangerous road crossing. Included in Map 11.</p> <p>c1a. Support for northern relief road. Outside remit (outside area)</p> <p>c4. Suggestion for project to promote riverside footpath.</p>	<p>Consider policy/project.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>Consider signage/promotion as project.</p>
<p>EQ20 Cycle lanes/storage should be designed to include motorcycles/scooters for those who are not disabled but physically incapable of cycling long distances</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion for Policies T2, T4.</p>	<p>Consider policy.</p>

<p>EQ21 It seems quite a challenge to separate cyclists from other road users within the limits of our roads. Wider pavements would be an asset for mobility scooters & prams as well as increased student numbers. Attention to the provision of dropped kerbs would be helpful.</p>	<p>c2. Expresses doubt about scope for accommodating cyclists separately. c2. In favour of wider pavements and dropped kerb provision. Addressed by design guidance recommended in Policies T1, T2.</p>	<p>No action. No action.</p>
<p>EQ21 Access [for older residents] is all important: shops, public transport, parking spaces & so on. Copied to Themes 3 and 5 and from Theme 4</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding access for older residents.</p>	<p>Check that policies cover the needs of elderly people adequately and ensure consistency across themes.</p>
<p>EQ22 Also I was perhaps naively surprised to the policies with regards to housing for the elderly and for people with disabilities as Durham doesn't seem to be well-equipped for these people. Cobblestones, narrow pavements, poor public transport and steep hills don't strike me as the ideal place for people with limited mobility. Copied to Theme 5 from Theme 4</p>	<p>c3. Expresses doubt that Durham could be suitable for disabled or elderly people.</p>	<p>Check that policies cover the needs of elderly and disabled people adequately and ensure consistency across themes.</p>
<p>EQ24 Bikes are at a massive loss currently in Durham. Because of the poor cycle network and lack of awareness around the city. More signs are required to make cars aware and not to hate cyclists on the road. It's a healthy way of getting around and is clearly endorsed by the government. Local Durham drivers (including the bus drivers - I've been pushed off the road by a Durham bus...) are terrible at respecting cyclists. More clearly lit cycle lanes and signs will help overcome this slowly.</p>	<p>c3. Supportive of cycling interventions, and suggesting better signage.</p>	<p>Consider policies T1, T2.</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 5: Durham City will have sustainable transport access to economic, educational, training, cultural and social opportunities for all, thereby enabling a swifter transition to a healthier environment and a low-carbon future.</p>	<p>c5. Suggesting change to vision statement.</p>	<p>Consider wording of vision statement.</p>
<p>EQ34 In the event of securing North and Western bypasses I would support some sustainable housing development inside the encompassed area with the provision of paths, cycleways, and sustainable Public Transport for access to central shops, Schools and work places. Copied from Theme 2b</p>	<p>c3. Supporting walking, cycling and public transport to serve new housing developments, to access shops, education and employment. Addressed by Policies T1/T2 but consider additional detail.</p>	<p>Check the policies cover access to shops, schools and workplaces for new developments.</p>

<p>EQ35 Durham is a town that need to factor in a number of commuter issues and the access & egress issues of all vehicular traffic but the previous plan missed a trick by not dualling all the way through the town as the recent alterations still produce a bottle neck down Bede Bank into Durham as well as the traffic lights being a permanent 24/7 operation rather than downgrading to "part-time"one seen in other areas as vehicles idling at traffic lights at midnight when they could drive through increases the carbon footprint. The consideration of a major cycle route through the city centre is devoid of any thought! you only have to go through Durham market place on a busy Saturday to see how idiotic that suggestion is! add elderly and young pedestrians with the addition of cyclists and its an accident waiting to happen and who would be the planner who would stick their head above the parapet to say they'd made that decision when there was a fatality or serious injury?. I noted with interest the photo opportunity that the plan took to allow community members to be aware of this and not one cyclist had a helmet on! hmmm. we already have a major cycle route through the town its called Route 70 it just needs to be improved especially approaching Durham from the Sunderland side on Footpath 25 (Low Pittington - Sherburn) where this route has had a semi-permanent diversion along Lady Piece Lane for years and this road is a busy fast road and not safe for Cyclist to traverse on. City shops have already been taken to task for placing advertising Bicycles outside their premises and here we see the advertising for this aspect of the plan utilising bicycles for the same purpose to raise the plans profile - is this a double standard?? (other cities use these advertising tools very effectively - please visit York, Bruge, Chester, Brussels to see what they offer & then look at Durham & see how wrong we always get it)</p>	<p>c1c. Traffic management concerns outside remit (not a planning issue)</p> <p>c3. Concern regarding Map 12 and city centre cycling provision.</p> <p>c2. Comment about a publicity photo, but this must refer to another group, as the Forum has not used such a photo.</p> <p>c5. Suggestion regarding Map 12, but partly outside remit (outside area).</p> <p>c2. The Forum did not use advertising bicycles in publicising the plan.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>Consider amending map or policy wording / para 4.196.</p> <p>No action</p> <p>Consider amending map or policy wording.</p> <p>No action</p>
<p>EQ39 As a cyclist, walker, car driver and regular user of public transport, I strongly endorse these policies.</p>	<p>c2. Strong support for policies.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>EQ40 More places to lock bicycles in the city would, I am sure, encourage cycling.</p>	<p>c4. Suggestion for more cycle parking in city.</p>	<p>Consider policy / project.</p>
<p>EQ41 I really look forward to a safe network of cycle routes across the city connecting the longer county routes. The routes should try to avoid busy roads with high emissions.</p>	<p>c2. Support for cycle network (addressed by Policies T1/T2 and Map 12)</p> <p>c3. Suggestion that routes should</p>	<p>Consider policy wording regarding air quality and connectivity with wider network.</p>

	avoid roads with poor air quality.	
EQ42 All development proposals should minimise any adverse transport impacts and avoid the need for additional motor vehicle traffic. Priority consideration should be given to sustainable modes of transport, and applications that offer a meaningful contribution to public transport infrastructure. I endorse the support to be given to development for new businesses at Aykley Heads and the Science Site in line with Economy Policies E1 & E2, however for the larger development proposals such as these traffic management/vehicular access solutions must be carefully explored (particularly at Aykley Heads). Copied from Theme 3	c3. Suggestion to strengthen support of sustainable transport. c3. Concern for traffic / access at larger business development sites.	Consider policy T1. Consider policies T1 and T2 in relation to E1 and E2 and Project 6.
EQ47 The following comments are directed to the draft Durham City Neighbourhood Plan Transport Theme, particularly the "Possible Cycle Network". Given that the stated fundamental action of a Neighbourhood Plan is to "give people more control over the development of their local area " by "giving communities the power to set priorities for local development through neighbourhood planning" ; the plan preparation process should be transparent and Durham City residents are entitled to clear answers to the following questions:- 1.Why weren't those "traffic and transport concerns", which were solicited from all those that attended the Durham City Forum's Town Hall consultation meetings, evaluated or at least given reasonable consideration, by the Neighbourhood Forum? 2.How were the "transport priorities identified and the theme format" devised? 3.By what procedure and by whom, was the transport theme "Champion" selected? 4.a) Why was a dedicated spokesperson for cycling campaign groups, given exclusive authorship of such a "multi-user" topic? b) Why was the consequent, clear "conflict of interest", not acknowledged? see footnote – "Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum Constitution" "The Good Governance Standards for Public Services", When analysed objectively, the "transport theme" is demonstrably	c5. Concern regarding Map 12. c3. Concern regarding process of policy formation. c3. Concern regarding selection of transport theme convenors. c3. Concern regarding balance of	Concern noted. Check the priority survey responses. Could ask respondent for examples of concerns which have allegedly not been considered. Review process undertaken for probity? Consider policy balance. Could ask

<p>preoccupied with promoting cycling and the self interests of cyclists and cycling groups. The map of “pedestrian issues” is superficial and little more than a cosmetic offer of balance. Often the cycling proposals, if adopted would in practice, be directly in conflict with pedestrians and entirely at the expense of all non-cycling road and footpath users. The fundamental justification for the obsessive focus upon cycling is critically flawed both in its logic and its underlying wishful suppositions. There has been no regard to the Neighbourhood Planning prerequisite, for evidence based and objectively measured information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objective data or evidence of fact or substance, regarding any quantitative assessment of need. • No assessment of financial implications; neither any consideration of likely costs and benefits, nor the consequential demands upon finite resources. • No evaluation of the practicable delivery of proposals. • No impact assessment upon pedestrians. • No impartial or objective surveys of pedestrians, taxi drivers, tourists or any road vehicle users. •No analysis of possible adverse effects upon traffic flows by any significant increase in cycling. •No analysis of the possible adverse effects, likely to be created by the greater congestion that would result from any significant increase in cycle traffic on roads in Durham City, along with the consequential increases in air pollution produced from slower moving vehicles. •No significant alternatives to increasing cycling in order to mitigate the effects of vehicular traffic, in and through Durham City have been entertained. <p>The draft Transport Theme as presented is:- Not balanced – its justification is exaggerated, as are any likely possible benefits. Not representative – from the outset it has ignored the expressed majority views of the community and concerned residents. Not objective - it is predicated upon a subjective prescription of lifestyle and choice, which is only available to a tiny minority of Durham City residents. It is not based upon objectively assessed need.</p>	<p>theme, but does not suggest amendments. c5. Concern regarding Map 11 and Map 12.</p> <p>c3. Concern regarding evidence base and consequences of policies.</p> <p>c3. Concern over impact of policies.</p>	<p>respondent for suggestions. Could ask respondent for further detail to deal with alleged superficiality of Map 11. Consider clarifying primacy of pedestrian provision in theme.</p> <p>An evidence paper has been prepared which the Forum could consider.</p> <p>Impact should be assessed through the SEA process.</p>
--	---	---

<p>If retained within the draft Durham City Neighbourhood Plan, I suggest that the “Transport Theme” should be brought into balance, so as to reflect the legitimate needs, reasonable aspirations and practicable suggestions of the vast majority of the community.</p> <p>footnote – A Neighbourhood Plan (once approved) is a statutory planning document.</p> <p>(i) “Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum Constitution” extract:</p> <p>8. Declaration of Interest</p> <p>8.1 All forum members must:</p> <p>8.1.1proposed transaction or arrangement ;</p> <p>and</p> <p>8.1.2 Absent themselves from any discussion of the Forum members in which it is possible that a conflict will arise between his or her duty to act solely in the interests of the Forum and any personal interest (including but not limited to any financial interest).</p> <p>(ii) “The Good Governance Standards for Public Services”, produced by “The Independent Commission on Good Governance in Public Services” states: “Conflicts can arise between the personal interests of individuals involved in making decisions and decisions that the governing body needs to make in the public interest. To ensure probity and to avoid public concern or loss of confidence, governing bodies have to take steps to avoid any such conflicts of interest, whether real or perceived.</p>	<p>c2. Unclear if this is intended to suggest that has been a breach of the constitution of the Neighbourhood Planning Forum.</p>	<p>A formal complaint could be reviewed by the Chair of the Forum.</p>
<p>EQ49 On E3, while I completely support the strengthening of the vitality of the primary retail core, and the reinvigoration of North Road's retail economy, I am totally opposed to any suggestion that the latter should entail moving the bus station to the north of its present site, together with the associated changes to traffic circulation that have been proposed. Copied from Theme 3</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding relocation of bus station.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies, and relationship to Theme 3</p>
<p>EQ52 It is important that development promotes public transport / green transport methods .</p> <p>Public transport and good access for pedestrians, runners, cyclists and public transport are important. Taxis should be limited as huge rows of them add little to the city and add to congestion. Copied from Theme 1</p>	<p>c2. Support for sustainable transport addressed by Theme 5 objectives.</p> <p>c4. Suggestion relating to taxis (potentially addressed through Project 21)</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>Consider project 21 wording.</p>
<p>EQ54 The city needs more loading bays where people can get dropped off</p>	<p>c3. Ideas relating to car parking.</p>	<p>Consider policy T1.</p>

<p>or collected and cheaper all day parking to reduce car journeys in and around the city centre. Insufficient protection is given to the listed buildings and the historic street environment of Saddler Street by allowing heavy vehicles to use this area on a regular basis. Heavy vehicles should be banned unless needed to transport building equipment for the use of conserving buildings, and permits for this type of use should be required. The street now feels quite dangerous for pedestrians because there are so many lorries, large vans and over-sized Cathedral buses using it. Copied from Theme 2a</p>	<p>c1b. Suggesting restricting heavy vehicle access to Saddler Street. Outside remit (for Council) c5. Concern for pedestrian safety on Saddler Street.</p>	<p>Consider projects. Consider amending Map 11.</p>
<p>Q39 So much to look for in alternative modes and routes</p>	<p>c2. Intent of comment unclear.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Q40 In term time there is severe congestion on pavements. Siting of PBSOs need to take this into account. Copied to Theme 4</p>	<p>c2. Concern regarding pavement congestion. Addressed in Policy T1 and Map 11.</p>	<p>No action.</p>
<p>Q43 It is a bit disappointing that there are no policies on key aspects of transport but perhaps some more could be included under proposals to give some force to meeting the objectives.</p>	<p>c3. Disappointment at lack of policies (not specified).</p>	<p>Consider policies against objectives. Could ask respondent which aspects were not covered?</p>
<p>Q45 South Road / Church Street do not have pavements appropriate to their heavy use. Pavement on Hallgarth Street is incredibly narrow, but does not show up on the map.</p>	<p>c2. Concern regarding some pavements. Addressed in Map 11. c5. Suggestion for Map 11</p>	<p>No action. Consider amending Map 11</p>
<p>Q47 S1: paving is hazardous in many areas Copied from Theme 1 Thought needs to be given to safety of flow of traffic and pedestrians during termtime on Church Street</p>	<p>c2. General concern about paving and specifically pedestrian flow on Church Street. Addressed in Policy T1 and Map 11.</p>	<p>Consider asking respondent for further examples to add to Map 11.</p>
<p>Q48 Ease of access must also include disabled people i.e. wheelchair users, blind, deaf and also people pushing prams. Provision for cyclists must not be at the detriment of pedestrians. Copied from Theme 1 Development at Aykley Heads should be limited to avoid traffic congestion at the small roundabout at the hospital. Copied from Theme 3 D4 This should be much more than 10%. There is a serious shortage of bungalows. Access to public transport is critical. Copied from Theme 4 All developments must be easily accessible by public transport. Copied from Theme 6</p>	<p>c3. Concern for the needs of particular subsets of the population, and about pedestrian-cyclist conflict. c3. Concern about congestion if Aykley Heads overdeveloped. c3. Need for public transport accessibility for housing for elderly people, and for other developments.</p>	<p>Consider policies T1, T2. Consider policies T1, T2 in relation to Economy Theme and Project 6. Consider policy T1.</p>

<p>There is far too much emphasis on cyclists who are a menace to pedestrians & car drivers and their aggressive behaviour. There is no mention of disabled people. Mobility scooters are becoming a menace and steps need to be taken to control reckless behaviour of their drivers. There is no hope of housing, high density or, otherwise, for real people until we can get rid of the students. Copied to Theme 4 Extend the hours of the Park & Ride</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding balance regarding cyclists, disabled people and mobility scooters. c2. Unclear if this comment relates to T3. c2. Park and Ride. Addressed by Project 19.</p>	<p>Consider policies. No action No action</p>
<p>Q49 Need more car free areas Copied from Theme 1 Need to extend parking controlled areas</p>	<p>c3. Suggestions regarding parking control.</p>	<p>Consider policies/projects, particularly Project 19.</p>
<p>Q56 New routes to serve the local population, not only students. Public transport must convert to electric (not diesel) vehicles. Properly segregated routes for pedestrians (& cyclists – who should be required to abide by the law in terms of cycling on often busy pavements, using lights at nighttime etc etc)</p>	<p>c2. In favour of electric buses and taxis. Addressed by Projects 16 and 21. c3. In favour of segregated routes for pedestrians and cyclists. c2. Enforcement is outside remit (for other bodies)</p>	<p>No action. Consider policies and need for segregation.</p>
<p>Q57 S1. Durham needs a Ring Road to take traffic out of the city. Junction 61 development and another bypass would assist this. Another Ring Road is needed at the north of the city to link the A690 to the A691. More Park & Ride facilities are needed – expanding and/or additional. Additional electric buses would be needed to support that. Less car parking in the city centre should be the incentive with more pedestrianisation. Cars entering the city centre should be for resident and business access ONLY. ... Open spaces should also be maintained to give pleasure and opportunity for residents and visitors to the city (e.g. improve the river walk footpaths, its</p>	<p>c1a. Support for ring road. Outside remit (outside area). c2. In favour of Park & Ride and electric buses. Addressed by Projects 16 and 19. c4. Suggestion for car parking reform which relate to Project 19. c1c. Restrictions on car access outside remit (not a planning matter) c2. Suggestions regarding access to open spaces and riverbanks.</p>	<p>No action No action Consider Project 19. No action. No action.</p>

<p>fencing etc.)</p> <p>H1. Less traffic in the city centre will lead to less air quality pollution which will help protect the Durham Cathedral structure and enhance its life.</p> <p>E2. There is a serious concern with access via a single entry road to HMP Frankland – should there be a prisoner security threat. Another access road should be made available.</p> <p>T1. Less cars in the city centre will support this plan.</p> <p>More Park & Ride extensions / additional facilities would support this – along with more electric buses.</p> <p>More bicycle routes would be advantageous.</p> <p>T2. Train and bus links are good in Durham, however, access to each is not good. Trains station access is not easy – surprised there have not been many accidents at this road junction. Bus station onto a pedestrianisation area is also not good – accidents have happened there – including a fatal one. More safe walking would be desirable. More bicycle routes would be advantageous.</p> <p>T3. Extending the Residential Car Parking in the Controlled Parking Zone would be welcome. Reduced speed limits on roads – particularly at schools – 30mph max –</p>	<p>Addressed by Theme 2b policies.</p> <p>c1b. In favour of traffic reduction and air quality. Air pollution mainly outside remit (for Council, other bodies) but also addressed by sustainable transport aims of policies T1 and T2, and Projects 2, 7, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21.</p> <p>c3. Concern regarding access to HMP Frankland. Outside remit (outside area)</p> <p>c2. Suggestion relating to reduction in car use. Addressed by Theme 5. c2. Support for Park & Ride and electric buses addressed by Projects 19 and 16.</p> <p>c2. Support for more cycle routes. Addressed by Policies T1, T2.</p> <p>c4. Suggestion relating to Project 16.</p> <p>c2. Concern regarding station access, addressed in Map 11. c5. Concern regarding bus station access. c2. In favour of walking and cycling aspects. Addressed in Policies T1/T2 and Maps 11 and 12.</p> <p>c4. Suggestion relating to Project 19.</p> <p>c4. Suggestion for project or policy on</p>	<p>Consider changing text in Theme 5 to demonstrate how the Plan is addressing air quality concerns. Note para. 4.19.</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>Consider Project 16 wording.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>Consider amending map.</p> <p>No action</p> <p>Consider project suggestion.</p> <p>Consider for project or policy.</p>
--	--	---

<p>preferably 20mph would make Durham safer. Durham seems to give cars priority over pedestrians.</p> <p>T4. Bicycle and mobility aid storage should be made compulsory.</p>	<p>20mph zones.</p> <p>c2. In favour of bicycle and mobility aid storage, as addressed by Policy T4.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Q58 4.177 Indicates that the NP will have limited impact in relation to transport. I think the NP should specifically address air pollution issues arising from transport within the City.</p>	<p>c2. Desire that Plan address air pollution issues arising from transport. Air pollution mainly outside remit (for Council, other bodies) but also addressed by sustainable transport aims of policies T1 and T2, and Projects 2, 7, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21.</p>	<p>Consider changing text in Theme 5 to demonstrate how the Plan is addressing air quality concerns. Note para. 4.19.</p>
<p>Q60 cycle routes need attention: not joined up. Improvement projects I particularly liked Projects no. 1,2,5,6,7,8,9,10,12,13,14 (15) Copied to Further Comments</p>	<p>c2. Concern for cycle routes, addressed by Policies T1, T2, and Map 12.</p> <p>c2. Support for various projects.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>Support for projects noted.</p>
<p>Q62 Map of pedestrian issues. I query whether the “difficult road crossings” on Fieldhouse Lane need to be included any longer, since a 20 mph zone is now in place</p>	<p>c5. Objection to inclusion of Fieldhouse Lane on Map 11.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11.</p>
<p>Q64 "While I agree with the broad aims I am concerned that currently pedestrian crossings at lights etc. are not well designed for pedestrians in timing and siting. I consider the proposals for the new bus station to be flawed and unnecessary. Copied from Theme 1</p> <p>The new proposed [bus] station will cause light issues within a listed building and is entirely inappropriate. Refurbishing the current station would be much better. Copied from Theme 2a</p> <p>While I agree with the tone of the proposals [in Theme 2b] I do not think some current ideas eg western road to relieve the A167 fit in with these ideas. Copied from Theme 2b</p>	<p>c1b. Pedestrian crossings outside remit (for Council other bodies)</p> <p>c3. Concern regarding bus station and (presumably) North Road Methodist Church.</p> <p>c1a. Concern about relationship of policies to relief road proposals. Outside remit (outside area).</p>	<p>No action. Note that pedestrian crossings to access new developments are covered in <i>Design Guidance: Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013</i> cited in the accompanying text for policies T1 and T2.</p> <p>Consider Theme 5 policies and relationship to Theme 3</p> <p>No action</p>

<p>Q65 I'm disappointed that there's no policy to greatly reduce the harmful impact of traffic emissions on pedestrians & cyclists. One very bad area for this is the northern end of Church Street, where a combination of tailbacks from the traffic lights, narrow roads & narrow pavements, plus tall buildings on both sides, provides terrible air quality for the hapless pedestrian. This is a major student thoroughfare.</p>	<p>c5. Suggesting policy on air quality in relation to pedestrians and cyclists, with example of Church Street. Air pollution mainly outside remit (for Council, other bodies) but also addressed by sustainable transport aims of policies T1 and T2, and Projects 2, 7, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21.</p>	<p>Consider changing text in Theme 5 to demonstrate how the Plan is addressing air quality concerns. Note para. 4.19</p>
<p>Q66 In my experience, the bus station operates efficiently and is not intrusive.</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies. And relationship to Theme 3</p>
<p>Q68</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>I agree with encouraging a policy to encourage cycling and making it safer however the transport policy seems to have a bias towards increasing cycling through the city center.</p> <p>As member of the "Durham City Access for all" I am against this when it involves shared footpath use.</p> <p>There is a law dating back to 1835 making it an offense to ride on pavements this was amended in 1999 making it a fixed penalty offense. It was obviously thought a danger in 1835 and like many others I think it is still is today. The Highway Code Rule 64 states you must not cycle on a pavement.</p> <p>The idea of say Silver Street being made a mixed use for pedestrians and cyclists I think is dangerous. We have an ever increasing aging population whose reactions are getting slower. By making cycling legal on some pavements I feel that some cyclists will then think they have the right to ride on all pavements. There is signage at both ends of the street saying cyclist dismount but I see this being ignored on a regular basis.</p> <p>The group represent disabled people with impaired mobility, wheelchair</p>	<p>c2. In favour of encouraging cycling and improving safety. Addressed by Policies T1, T2, T4.</p> <p>c3. c5. Concern about pedestrian/cyclist shared paths, cycling on Silver Street, and confusion from cycling being permitted on some pavements, particularly in relation to those with slow reactions, sight or hearing problems. Examples of other locations given.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>Consider amending Maps 11 and 12. Check that policies strike the correct balance between pedestrian and cyclist safety.</p>

<p>users, and those with sight and hearing problems as well as the general public.</p> <p>For example Guide dogs are trained to walk down the center of the footpath. One of our group has a Guide dog. His dog gets confused and worried by cyclists on pavements. This happened recently on the mixed use pavement at the North Durham Hospital. Cyclists might feel in danger on the roads but what about the pedestrians who feel in danger of cyclists on the pavement.</p> <p>When the Market place was refurbished it was to encourage pedestrians. There are no kerbs on some parts of Saddler street for example. Guide dogs are trained to stop at the kerb and we are all taught from childhood road safety to stop at the kerb and look both ways.</p> <p>Visitors to the City assume this is a pedestrian only zone and get confused and startled when confronted by cars and buses and cyclists using this area.</p> <p>Prior to it being refurbished we asked for a smoother surface on Silver Street this was ignored. We ended up with a mixture of finishes.</p> <p>Most pedestrians prefer to use the York stone paved edges or the two narrow smooth sections as it is much easier to walk on these than the undulating cobble stones Wheelchair and mobility scooter users in particular find the surface difficult. The smooth bits are too narrow for a wheel chair and mobility scooters and the paved edges are cluttered with advertising boards abandoned bicycles, buskers tables and chairs etc.</p> <p>Wheelchair users as well as those using pushchairs are therefore forced to use the cobbled sections and get a very rough ride. For those with bad backs in particular this exacerbates their problems making it a no go area for some.</p> <p>Access to Buildings</p> <p>Making places or buildings accessible to all makes life easier for everyone.</p>	<p>c3. c5. Concern regarding lack of kerbs in market place and Saddler Street and difficulties for guide dogs. c1c. Kerbs on current highway network outside remit (not a planning issue).</p> <p>c5. Concern regarding surfaces on Silver Street. c1c. Pavement surfaces for existing highways and advertising boards outside remit (not a planning issue), but could be highlighted in Project 17.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11. Check policies T1, T2 provide suitable guidance for kerbs associated with new development.</p> <p>Consider amending Map 11 and Project 17. Surface materials may also relate to Theme 2a policies.</p>
---	--	---

<p>You just have to look at how many customers use the automatic doors at Marks and Spencers compared to those using the other doors. It helps the mother pushing a pram or someone with both hands full of shopping as well as the disabled.</p> <p>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 to ThemeS 3 AND 4</p> <p>Disabled Parking.</p> <p>The group has regular issues about the lack of disabled parking in the City. Disabled parking was removed from the market place when it was refurbished and has not been replaced elsewhere.</p> <p>For those wishing to worship or visit the Cathedral there are only a few disabled places at the rear of the Cathedral and these are often occupied by skips.</p> <p>Parking at the Palace Green is impossible. The University/Cathedral seem unwilling to help sort it out.</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding building access.</p> <p>c3. c4. Concern about lack of disabled parking in the market place, the Cathedral and Palace Green.</p>	<p>Consider policies across Plan.</p> <p>Consider Theme 5 policies or projects.</p>
<p>Q69 Cycling facilities MUST be separated from walkways and paths on the ground of pedestrian safety. We are seriously worried about the concentration on cycling as an inherently unsafe form of transport.</p> <p>Proposals should be considered for improving the accessibility of the Railway station. The situation needs an escalator solution – the example of the centre of Hong Kong is perhaps useful, where a similarly steep set of hills are overcome by mechanical means. The same would enhance the accessibility of Wharton Park which is simply not available to many older and disabled residents, other than, by car. The Durham hills need to be tackled with radical approaches!</p> <p>As regards transport, vehicles transiting the city should be diverted to new by-passes, thus helping the air quality problem and easing current</p>	<p>c3. c5 Concern about danger to pedestrians from cycling and balance of policies.</p> <p>c4. Suggestion for project re railway station access.</p> <p>c1a. Support for relief roads outside remit (outside area)</p>	<p>Consider Policies T1/T2 and Maps 11 and 12.</p> <p>Consider projects, e.g. Projects 16, 17</p> <p>No action.</p>

<p>congestion. Copied from Theme 1 [PBSAs] Car parking will be an issue. PART Copied from Theme 4</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding PBSAs and car parking</p>	<p>Consider policy T3 or new policy, or change to Policy D3</p>
<p>Q73 The pollution levels in the City, especially at peak times, are well above the accepted safe limits. The increase of cars passing through the city has a very detrimental; effect on health especially people with lung problems. There is an argument now for a bypass.</p> <p>Also to allow only electric cars and other transport through the city. Except residents! Risk of more pollution from cars and lorries passing through the City. (Although controversial - ? need for a bypass ?!) Copied from Theme 3</p>	<p>c1a. Support for relief roads outside remit (outside area)</p> <p>c2. Concern about air quality issues arising from transport. Air pollution mainly outside remit (for Council, other bodies) but also addressed by sustainable transport aims of policies T1 and T2, and Projects 2, 7, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21.</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>Consider changing text in Theme 5 to demonstrate how the Plan is addressing air quality concerns. Note para. 4.19.</p>
<p>Q74 (1) Facilities for an ageing population are there for us all - & demand will only grow. Copied to Theme 6 (2) * Dedicated cycle ways essential * Some way to control unsafe behaviour of road users ie CYCLISTS</p>	<p>c3. Need for facilities for elderly people. c3. Take this comment as support for dedicated cycle facilities rather than paths shared with pedestrians?</p>	<p>Consider needs of elderly in policies T1, T2, T4. Consider Theme 5 policies to ensure safety of pedestrians.</p>
<p>Q75 My immediate concern is the proposed new bus station development which should be scrapped. The existing bus station should be re developed by demolishing the frontage and creating an open plan bus station visible from all sides at ground level for safety reasons and if required build outlets / units at first floor level overlooking the street and accessible by lifts etc. Copied to Theme 3</p> <p>Any future developments must include impact assessments with regards to its 'fit' within the city landscape and its provision of appropriate transport links ie walking, cycle routes, public transport. Copied from Theme 1</p> <p>I don't think a major development of a business park at Aykley Heads is warranted unless major improvements to transport links are made, ie regular public transport, improvements to paths and cycleways in order to avoid future congestion by cars and other vehicles. Copied from Theme 3</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.</p> <p>c2. Support for sustainable transport links to new developments. Addressed by Policies T1, T2.</p> <p>c3. Concern particularly for transport access to Aykley Heads.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies and relationship to Theme 3</p> <p>No action</p> <p>Consider Theme 5 policies in conjunction with Theme 3 and Project 6.</p>
<p>Q76. Electricity charging points should be included in all schemes.</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion for policy on electric</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies. May be</p>

	vehicle charging.	covered already by County Council policies.
<p>EM1. There is no call for a new bus station on the page of things that people think should be done. So please can we get the ridiculous plans for a new one stopped.. And spend a little more on North road Maintenance.</p> <p>We need to make out of town shopping have same parking charges as in town. to even things up. We have big shops out of town. Why do we need to trash in town (which is what the new bus station would do.). Sort the parking and the footfall with flow. Copied to Theme 3</p> <p>I don't think there is a problem with too many students as purpose build residences are in the pipeline. Copied to Theme 4. But non road and unadopted routes between student dense residential areas need to be improved to prevent pavement congestion. ... We need more cycle lanes and more tackling the school run, and presumably provision of umbrella, raincoats and wellies, as congestion is irrelevant on dry not school term days!</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.</p> <p>c4. c5 Desire for better maintenance of North Road</p> <p>c1a. Suggesting car parking charges for out-of-town retail. Outside remit (outside area).</p> <p>c2. Concern regarding pavement congestion and school run. Support for cycle lanes. Addressed by policies T1, T2 and Map 12</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies and relationship to Theme 3</p> <p>Consider projects or Map 11.</p> <p>No action</p> <p>No action.</p>
<p>EM7. [We] have nearly been knocked flat by pavement cyclists outside our gate. We also found out by chance that some local footpaths had become joint cycle paths. Residents of Parkside on north Road, need to know what your idea is for a cycle path through the city is. Many months have been spent seeking support from councillors and local residents to prevent some inconsiderate cyclist riding through pedestrian areas and on pavements. They are totally oblivious of pedestrians.</p> <p>Forum response (summary). Brief details provided about Transport theme and cycling, with links given to website. Explained that Map 12 is an evidence document only and does not form part of a policy defining a proposed cycle network.</p>	<p>c3. c5. Concern over pedestrian safety on footpaths or footways shared with cyclists. Concern regarding city centre cycle route.</p> <p>c1b. Enforcement outside remit (for other bodies).</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies and Maps 11 and 12.</p>
<p>EM12 Email providing contact details for the Durham City Cycling Forum, with a forwarded email attached from the Durham County Council cycling officer showing the kinds of information circulated to the group.</p>	<p>c2. Providing contact details for Durham City Cycle Forum, perhaps in response to paragraph 4.194? The bulk of this comment quotes a circular</p>	<p>No action</p>

<p>SUMMARY PROVIDED IN COLLATED COMMENTS FOR PUBLIC CONSUMPTION</p>	<p>newsletter from the DCC cycling officer and is not relevant to the Plan.</p>	
<p>EM15 Comments 4.5 THEME 5: A CITY WITH A MODERN AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE Justification (Text at the time of the Consultation) 4.195 The definition of a Transport Assessment in the glossary of the NPPF lays particular emphasis on the need to identify measures to improve accessibility for walking, cycling and public transport. To meet climate change commitments, and to build a healthier, more liveable environment, a sustained shift towards sustainable transport modes will be required, and new developments present an opportunity to increase the proportion of sustainable transport journeys over the average in the local area. Map 11: Map of Pedestrian Issues <i>Comment</i> I would like to add the danger to pedestrians of cyclists using pavements to the map of pedestrian issues. I have personal experience on three occasions when walking down Framwellgate Peth; two were individual cyclists travelling at high speed and the third was a group of 4/5 cyclists, again travelling at high speed, who caused me to lose my balance. The problem is there is no cyclist lane on the stretch from the end of Diamond Terrace to Milburngate lights and so cyclists use the whole of the pavement, while picking up speed. Also, they can see the individual pedestrians, but the pedestrian cannot see or hear the cyclist from the back, particularly on a busy street such as Framwellgate Peth or Milburngate Bridge. If a pedestrian decided at the last minute to change direction there is potential for an accident. I would go so far as to say that it is only a matter of time before there is a serious accident on the Peth. I request that the Working Group consider how to make pavements across the City safer for pedestrians. Improving accessibility for cyclists must not compromise pedestrian safety.</p>	<p>c3. c5. Concern over cycling/pedestrian conflict on shared paths and footways. Concern for pedestrian safety on pavements across the city.</p>	<p>Consider adding Framwellgate Peth and Milburngate Bridge to Map 11, and reviewing Map 12. Consider Theme 5 policies.</p>
<p>WC8 Comment on your post "Appendix A" Copied to Theme 5 North Road is the bug bear of the city. So much for redevelopment. It's an absolute nightmare. Taxis on both sides of the road with engines running day</p>	<p>c2. c5. Concern about North Road, some of which could be added to Map 11 (flooding; chewing gum).</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11.</p>

<p>and night. Buses driving far to fast. And foot paths flooding when it rains. Foot paths thick of chewing gum and groups of youths standing smoking in front of the bus station entrance. Shall I go on!</p>	<p>Taxis/buses/youths outside remit (for Council/other bodies) but see also Project 21.</p>	<p>Consider Project 21.</p>
<p>WC11 Comment on your post "Plan as pdf" Copied to Theme 5 Church Street during term time is at times crowded with vehicle and foot traffic to a dangerous degree. The average flow rate of both might meet some industry standards for safety but even before the expansion in student numbers, and the large new teaching building behind Bow School, the pavements are hazardous within ten minutes of lecture start times. Students, and locals unfortunate enough to venture out at those times, frequently need to walk in the road.</p>	<p>c2. Concern about pavement congestion on Church Street. Addressed in Policy T1 and Map 11.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>WC25 Comment on your post "Policy E1" Copied to Theme 5 POLICY E 1. In accepting the identification of the Aykley Heads site as one with the potential to locate high-tec businesses and employment opportunity it is crucial that access arrangements are planned to take account of and deal effectively with the enormous additional volume of traffic which will be generated in the Sniperley roundabout area, given plans for very major housing development at Sniperley, and the spectre of the so-called western relief road converging at this point.</p>	<p>c3. Concern about the effect of Aykley Heads development on traffic congestion, also with regard to green belt development and the relief road proposed in the withdrawn County Plan. c1a. Relief road outside remit (outside area)</p>	<p>Consider policies T1 and T2 in conjunction with Theme 3 and Project 6.</p>
<p>WC39 Comment on your post "Policy C1" Copied to Theme 5 POLICY C 1. I support this Policy very strongly, and wish to give emphasis to matters of access to possible venues, having regard to the important need for bands/performers to conveniently off-load instruments/equipment etc and the need to maximise audience attendance/participation through adjacent, (preferably free), car-parking. This is essential to assist financial sustainability.</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion for parking policies relating to community arts facilities.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies and Project 19. May already be covered adequately by Durham County Council policy.</p>
<p>WC47 Comment on your post "Chapter 5: Implementation and Monitoring" Copied to Other Comments, Theme 5 ... Many people may think that, in a place like Durham, this should be the effect of the Plan. However, with a view to the Plan being more pro-active which I think it needs to be, I suggest that the Projects listed in Appendix A should include reference to the need for the Railway Station, Bus Station (on its current site</p>	<p>c4. Suggestions for projects encompassing improvements to the rail and bus stations and additional Park & Ride sites.</p>	<p>Consider projects, particularly Projects 7, 16, 19, 20.</p>

<p>please), and North Durham Hospital to be adapted over the course of the Plan period and beyond to meet the growing and changing needs of users. In addition I would wish to see a clear proposal for the extension of "park & ride" facilities to serve traffic from the south-west from Langley Moor, Meadowfield and beyond, and from the west of the City via Broom Lane. Our Neighbourhood would derive significant additional value from such a facility which might be capable of location on a site adjacent to the A 690 in the Stone Bridge area, even though it would lie just outside the Our Neighbourhood area</p>		
<p>WC48 Comment on your post "Theme 5: A City With a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure" Stop taxis parking on double yellow lines on North Road in the city. Insist that all taxi switch off engines when parked waiting for fares . The current situation where some times up to 15 taxis are waiting to join official rank lower down North road causing road congestion and pollution. The road outside the bus station is very busy anyway with buses exiting ,the taxis illegally parked only add to the dangers .</p>	<p>c2. Concern about various aspects of taxi provision. Addressed in Project 21.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>WC49 Comment on your post "Theme 5: A City With a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure" I quote two of the Objectives: To make transport healthier and safer for all; To reduce vehicle exhaust emissions in order to meet climate change commitments and national air quality objectives; Despite this I can find no proposals in the Plan that will enhance air quality from vehicle emissions and thereby improve the health of both residents and regular commuters. It is now more than 5 years since a formal declaration of high air pollution levels within Durham City was made as they had been found to be so high to require legally mandated action. After even further reassessment of levels and a very prolonged public consultation, the Council chose the new SCOOT traffic control system as its primary means of decreasing emission levels (it probably helped that this system had already been chosen, and funds set aside, to speed traffic flows through the centre; limiting vehicle emissions was not, then, a factor!). Prior to this consultation a small group of council officers chose to reject a proposal to limit access to</p>	<p>c3. Requesting changes to policies to tackle air quality issues arising from transport. Air pollution mainly outside remit (for Council, other bodies) but also addressed by sustainable transport aims of policies T1 and T2, and Projects 2, 7, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21.</p>	<p>Consider changing text in Theme 5 to demonstrate how the Plan is addressing air quality concerns. Note para. 4.19.</p>

<p>certain vehicles, primarily diesel, despite their own data showing that this would be the most effective means of achieving a healthier atmosphere and this was not included in the subsequent consultation. Since then there is little evidence that things have improved, particularly on the main route through the city that is regularly used by commuters and school children, both walking, cycling and in vehicles. Although vehicle emission control zones are increasingly being used in UK cities our Council has failed to display a ready willingness to address this issue responsibly. I would therefore ask that this matter is considered for inclusion in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		
<p>WC64 Comment on your post "Theme 5: A City With a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure" I support these policies and the widening of pavements and creation of one-way streets.</p>	<p>c2. Support for Theme 5 policies, and pavement widening (addressed in Policy T1 and Map 11). c2. Reference to one-way streets not clear.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>WC66 Comment on your post "Map of Cycling Issues" Theme 5 Whinney Hill is not a quiet street where cyclists use the road as indicated on the cycling issues map. It is a bus route with bad visibility, blind crests and parked cars limiting the lane width to one lane. The road should be restricted to 20mph and appropriate warning signs erected. Owing to these problems cyclist use the pavements and are a danger to pedestrians.</p>	<p>c5. Concern regarding cyclist and pedestrian safety on Whinney Hill.</p>	<p>Consider amending maps 11 and 12.</p>
<p>WC67 Comment on your post "Map of Pedestrian Issues" Theme 5 Whinney Hill is not shown on the pedestrian issues map and it should be. There is an extremely high volume of student pedestrian traffic. Pavements are narrow and surfaces poor. The grass verges are constantly walked on and are churned up making the surfaces of the pavement muddy and dangerous underfoot. Consequently, passage with wheelchairs and buggies is very difficult, as is crossing the road owing to volume and speed of traffic. The road is narrowed along its length by parked cars and visibility restricted owing to blind crests. The road should be limited to 20mph.</p>	<p>c5. Concern regarding Whinney Hill and particularly use with wheelchairs and buggies.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11</p>
<p>WC70 Comment on your post "Summary: Theme 5: A City with a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure" I agree with this policy but cycling is never going to be a major form of</p>	<p>c2. General support for Theme 5 policies. c2. Doubt regarding cycling aspects.</p>	<p>Support noted. No action</p>

<p>transport in Durham - it is just too hilly. The Park and Rides are excellent. Why is there not one on the A690 coming from Crook, perhaps before you reach Meadowfield?</p>	<p>c2. Suggestion for additional Park & Ride site, addressed in Project 19.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>WC76 Comment on your post "Theme 5: A City With a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure" A trifle fanciful perhaps (particularly in view of the cost involved), but if the recent suggestion that some railway lines closed by Beeching should be reopened were put into effect in the Durham area, then commuters and shoppers might be encouraged to use rail transport rather than their cars.</p>	<p>c2. In favour of for rail service enhancement, addressed in Project 20. c1a. Otherwise outside remit (outside area and/or for other bodies).</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>WC78 Comment on your post "Map of Pedestrian Issues" Problem with crossing road at top of Gilesgate below roundabout outside Claypath Medical Practice surgery to reach bus stop or cross footbridge over A690.</p>	<p>C2. Concern over road crossing opposite Claypath Medical Practice. Addressed in Map 11.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>WC89 Comment on your post "Theme 5: A City With a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure" The bus station proposal badly needs re-consideration. Potentially it could do much more harm than good. The transport priorities seem quite right. Traffic problems during the Lumiere period demonstrated yet again the need for ambitious measures to cut down the number of private vehicles seeking to enter and cross the city.</p>	<p>c2. Concern regarding bus station relocation. c2. Supportive of transport priorities (paragraph 4.180) and of the need to reduce private vehicle use in the city.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies on bus station and relationship to Theme 3 No action.</p>
<p>WC95 Comment on your post "Plan as pdf" Copied to Theme 2b, Theme 4, Theme 5 Overall I am in favour of the proposed plan, particularly reducing student accommodation and increasing properties for first-time buyers and the elderly. A number of suggestions: 1. major student thoroughfares to the science site need a) traffic calming to 20 mph, b) expansion of pavements and the provision of cycle lanes and c) more rubbish bins to accommodate increased student numbers.</p>	<p>c3. Concern about traffic speeds on main student thoroughfares and support for widening pavements and providing cycle lanes. c2. Concern regarding rubbish. Outside remit (Council/other bodies)</p>	<p>Consider amending policies T1 and T2, Map 11 or Project 17 to refer to speed limits. No action.</p>
<p>WC113 Comment on your post "Theme 5: A City With a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure" I support the policy of improving provision of walking and cycling networks. Durham has poor infrastructure for both. In places the pathways for</p>	<p>c2. Support for walking and cycling improvements in Policies T1/T2.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

<p>pedestrians are too narrow and at busy times people are forced to walk on the road, examples; Durham School, Church Street, and North Road viaduct, and more; The provision of cycle networks is patchy at best and non-existent at worst. There needs to be continuous safe routes into the city if people are to be encouraged to cycle. Where there are shared paths, these need to be wide enough to allow both walkers and cyclists to pass each other freely without conflict. Examples of paths being too narrow are at Whitesmocks & Southfield Way, where there is ample room for widening. Innovative use of one-way systems could be used to reallocate road space for walking and cycling; eg past Durham school and Church Street/Hallgarth Street, and possibly other locations. Although the topography of Durham does not lend itself easily to casual cycling, the increasing popularity of e-bikes, could open up the opportunity for those people who would otherwise consider Durham to be too hilly.</p>	<p>c5. Suggestions for Map 11.</p> <p>c3. c5. Concern over shared pedestrian/cyclist provision and suggestions for Maps 11, 12.</p> <p>c3. Road space reallocation outside remit (for Council).</p> <p>c2. Observation that the rise in popularity of e-bikes could lead to more people taking up cycling in Durham.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11.</p> <p>Consider Theme 5 policies and amending maps.</p> <p>No action.</p> <p>Consider amending para E7 to refer to e-bikes.</p>
<p>WC118 Comment on your post "Summary: Theme 2a: A Beautiful and Historic City - Heritage" Copied to Theme 5 Theme 6 Durham's historic heritage is twofold, and while the importance of the medieval centre is immense, it would be a pity to be dazzled by it to the point of overlooking the counterbalancing theme of Durham's industrial heritage. I agree with the Plan's emphasis on protecting the areas identified, and the individual assets, listed and otherwise, but regret that consideration of the North Road seems to have been exclusively with respect to its retail offering. The North Road is for many visitors, particularly those using public transport the point of entry to the city. It contains many interesting and historic buildings: most obvious is the visual sequence running from the former cinema and adjacent Miners' Hall, past the Bethel chapel to the backdrop of the viaduct. Others are less prominent, but the Wetherspoons restoration of the former Water Board offices is attractive, and Reform Place, almost concealed, adds interest. Nothing here is incompatible with sympathetic, small scale retail, but development of the Miners' Hall as some form of visitor reception or other service point would make good use of its position. It goes without saying that proposals to move the bus station and destroy the</p>		

<p>North Road in pursuit of some phantom benefit are without merit.</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies on bus station, and relationship to Theme 3</p>
<p>WC121 Comment on your post "Theme 5: A City With a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure" There need to be better information about buses routes and timetables. At the minute the best way to find out which bus to use to get form A to B is google maps! this is disgraceful. There should be a website containing accessible, clear and up to date info about all public transport provisions within the county. There need to be better and cheaper connection to villages around Durham. At the minute parking in Durham is cheaper than using a bus from villages in 5miles radius form the city. That encourages unnecessary driving of village residents wanting to go to the city and dis-encourage people to live in the villages resulting in huge disproportions in property price between e.g Nevilles Cross and Bearpark which are less than 2 miles apart. Bus connections within the city is also not good enough for public to be able to use it as general means of moving about.</p>	<p>c4. Suggestion for project or policy for better bus route information. Concern generally about poor bus services and expense of using buses. Partly addressed in Project 16, and paragraph 4.192 allows for subsidy of bus services serving new developments.</p>	<p>Consider amending Project 16 or additional project. Consider policies T1 and T2 to enhance travel information.</p>
<p>WC126 Comment on your post "Summary: Theme 5: A City with a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure" The balance between motor transport and pedestrianisation, including pedal cycles, in a city centre is a real conundrum. Moreover, as parking space, for motor vehicles, becomes less available it is not uncommon for individual families to have two, or more cars! The problem is not made any easier by the fact that it can be less expensive to park a car in Durham City than for a family to travel into the 'City a short distance, from Belmont for example, on public transport. Public transport that is so inexpensive that it would be foolish not to use it may be the answer. Also, priority, with, if necessary an elected mayor, should be given to extending the Tyne Wear Metro into Durham City from Newcastle/Gateshead and Sunderland. I believe that the people of County Durham voted for an elected mayor in a referendum that was organised a great expense (£250,000) by Durham County Council.</p>	<p>c2. Acknowledges difficulty of forming policy in limited city centre space. c4. c5. Suggestions on public transport including bus subsidy and Metro extension.</p>	<p>No action Consider supporting text and projects.</p>
<p>WC138 Comment on your post "Summary" Copied to Theme 2b, Theme 5, Theme 4</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion regarding lighting policy: could apply to paths.</p>	<p>Consider relevant Theme 5 policies and other policies across the Plan to</p>

<p>Concerning street lighting; upgrading street lights with covers to project the light downwards, this will put the light where it is needed, and we will still be able to see the stars when we look up. Durham's natural luminaire.</p> <p>Bike paths are a good idea but when too many trees are destroyed for a small bike path this takes something away from the health benefits, without the trees we face air pollution. If you plant new trees out of the city, the city doesn't benefit, you need trees in the city to combat air pollution and to capture CO2.</p>	<p>c2 In favour of cycle paths. Addressed by policies T1, T2, Map 12, Project 17</p> <p>c3. Concern regarding cycle paths and loss of trees.</p>	<p>incorporate lighting policy.</p> <p>No action</p> <p>For Theme 2b: Consider policies to protect or provide for replacement of trees.</p>
<p>WC174 Comment on your post "Theme 5: A City With a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure"</p> <p>Although we agree with much of what is said in this Theme, we take exception to the claim that the refurbishment of paving in North Road is completed. The paving in part of North Road remains un-refurbished and is difficult to use, uncomfortable, and sometimes unsafe for users of pushchairs, buggies and mobility scooters, as well as for wheelchair users. Given the debate about the siting of a new bus station, it would appear unlikely that this part of North Road will be improved in the foreseeable future.</p>	<p>c5. Objection regarding paragraph 4.185 which suggests that work in North Road has been completed.</p>	<p>Consider rewording text. Also note inaccuracy regarding SCOOT in the same paragraph, which is not yet operational.</p>
<p>WC185 Comment on your post "Policy S1" Copied to Theme 5</p> <p>In its policy setting out requirements for all development and re-development sites in the City, the Plan draws attention to the need for a coordinated approach to paving, lighting and signage. We endorse this part of the policy, and also the part which draws attention to the need for ease of access by public transport, walking and cycling, to all development and re-development sites, provided that means ease of access for all residents and visitors, including those with disabilities.</p>	<p>c2. Support for policies on good access to new development sites for all (Policy T1).</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>WC186 Comment on your post "Theme 5: A City With a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure"</p> <p>Strongly agree with the above comments. [i.e., WC113]</p> <p>I would suggest that with the rapid increase in the use of electric cycles there is the prospect of much increased cycling even in a hilly city such as Durham. Secure parking for cycles is also necessary.</p>	<p>See categorisation of WC113.</p> <p>c3. Suggestion for additional cycle parking. Unclear if public or residential. Residential storage addressed by Policy T4. Public cycle</p>	<p>Consider public cycle parking and e-bikes in relation to DCC policy.</p>

	parking covered by DCC policy.	
<p>WC187 Comment on your post "Theme 5: A City With a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure"</p> <p>The dismissal of the potential benefits to the urban environment of relief roads such as reduced pollution and the potential for restoring some of the historic street pattern is in my view unfortunate.</p>	c5. Concern regarding paragraph 4.174.	Consider amending supporting text.
<p>WC188 Comment on your post "Chapter 3: Vision and Objectives" Theme 5</p> <p>We welcome the references to the poor quality of pedestrian experience in the City. Many pedestrian surfaces are poorly maintained and, as a consequence, dangerous for the elderly and disabled. Pavement obstructions also represent a significant hazard for pushchair users, wheelchair and scooter users, and for those who are visually impaired.</p>	<p>c2. Support for better pedestrian access to city. Addressed in T1, T2, Map 11, Project 17.</p> <p>c4. Reduction of pavement obstructions desired. Outside remit (not a planning issue) but could be mentioned in Project 17.</p>	<p>No action.</p> <p>Consider pavement obstructions in Map 11 or Project 17.</p>
<p>WC202 Comment on your post "Map of Cycling Issues" Theme 5</p> <p>Please also note and assess bicycle parking provision. For example, Palace Green has only a few stands largely hidden from view so you need to know where they are to find them. The ones marked outside the Castle are news to me, I've never found them. There are no others marked on the peninsula, which makes shopping with a bicycle very awkward. I usually come through from one side to the other with my bicycle for shopping, so leaving it on one side and returning doesn't work well, I want cycle parking en route. You don't mark the ones outside Ciao Ciao that are the only ones I know of on that side. There should be convenient cycle parking outside most public buildings, to make cycling convenient and encourage it. (The University does better, but still not good enough.)</p> <p>The "adequate" section of the A167 to Nevilles Cross is not adequate, it is on the pavement with a multitude of driveways, side roads and pedestrians to negotiate. Certainly won't be improved with extra students when the new housing comes into use. The whole of the A167 needs reassessing for cycle provision, both to maintain and improve safe routes to schools, and for those of us who prefer to cycle faster, on road.</p>	<p>c3. Comment on lack of cycle parking on peninsula, making shopping by bicycle difficult. Desire for cycle parking en route rather than just perimeter.</p> <p>(Comments on cycle parking not being marked relate to the underlying Open Street Map tiles, not Map 12.)</p> <p>c5. Suggestion to amend Map 12 regarding suitability of A167 cycle path and additional pressure when new student accommodation opens.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies on cycle parking.</p> <p>Consider amending map 12.</p>
<p>WC204 Comment on your post "Map of Pedestrian Issues" Theme 5</p> <p>Re: Access from Quarry House Lane onto footpath down to River Browney hard with a buggy (footpath 9). This is a footpath not a bridleway, and the</p>	c5. Concern over Map 11 implying that footpath by River Browney should be made suitable for buggies.	Consider amending map. Consider access policy in conjunction with Theme 2b.

<p>access as it stands is appropriate for the legal status (narrow gaps, rough paths and stile). Making it suitable for buggies would be nice, but would bring a host of other issues that require careful balancing and consultation. It would then be used by mountain bicyclists to access the railway paths, potentially by powered two-wheeled and four-wheeled vehicles (mobility scooters if not larger), and the frequent sat-nav confusion by those wanting the caravan site would be exacerbated by being "almost" accessible via that path.</p>		
<p>WC206 Comment on your post "Summary: Theme 4: A City with Attractive and Affordable Places to Live" Copied to Theme 4, Theme 5, Other Comments</p> <p>Unfortunately, I am unable to study this lengthy proposal in any real detail. I cannot see a useful overseeable summary to help me.</p> <p>When the issues are so many, and so complex it becomes too difficult to do justice to the enormous efforts made by those compiling this work. I cannot take the time to get to grips with all this.</p> <p>So if it is any use I can tell you what I think about a few issues that effect me and my family.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Residents cannot do without cars. I cannot bike hills. Bike routes run out into busy traffic. They don't work in their current form. I walk where ever I can. Public transport simply does not work for so many trips most of us need to make. Of all those proposing more and more money being used to extend public transport, can they tell me how many of them as individuals still depend on a car and own one? Don't be hypocritical please.</p> <p>Safe cross-walks are desperately needed. Those who walk, like me, cannot even cross roads safely. We need a cross-walk right on Gilesgate Green between the bus stops. And yes, you can put one in. We have to run three lanes now thanks to speeding cars and buses! It is wrong priorities - pedestrians need to cross roads! The traffic is endless and getting worse every year.</p> <p>... That's probably enough from me.</p>	<p>c3. Concern over provision for necessary car journeys.</p> <p>c5. Request for safe road crossing on Gilesgate Green.</p> <p>c2. In favour of pedestrian priority to cross roads. Addressed by Theme 5.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies.</p> <p>Consider amending Map 11. Could ask respondent for further suggestions.</p> <p>No action</p>
<p>WC207 Comment on your post "Map of Cycling Issues" Theme 5</p> <p>It could be a great achievement to turn this map to be all green! I'm looking</p>	<p>c2. In favour of improved cycle network. Addressed by Map 12 and</p>	<p>No action</p>

<p>forward to cycle around in the safe and dedicated routes.</p>	<p>Project 17.</p>	
<p>WC208 Comment on your post "Theme 5: A City With a Modern and Sustainable Transport Infrastructure" I support these great aspirational policies. We need to see some serious Council commitment with attention to a quality of new walking and cycling provision as proposed in the plan.</p>	<p>c2. Support for T1, T2, Maps 11, 12, Project 17</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>L3 We are delighted to see that representations made by the LAF in respect of your March 2017 draft are reflected in the latest version of the plan, particularly in relation to giving public health greater strategic prominence, preserving green spaces, and encouraging safer walking and cycling.</p> <p>While we feel no need to repeat our arguments, we would none the less like to take this opportunity to acknowledge your endeavours and restate our support for your proposals to conserve and enhance access to the city's green infrastructure. The notion of the Emerald Network (policy G3) is particularly welcome, building, as you say, on the redundant concept of a Necklace Park. Indeed, given the current physical and mental health challenges in County Durham and abundance of evidence proving the remedial impact of green spaces on people's well-being, the need for such a facility is more urgent than ever. To this end we recommend that ambition should extend to developing new rights of way as well as promoting and enhancing existing provision, and should like to see Section 106 monies earmarked to improve links not only within the neighbourhood area but to green spaces beyond.</p> <p>We also believe that a high profile, well-maintained environmental network accessible to all, regardless of age or disability, would add another string to the local economy by attracting more visitors.</p> <p>Marketing and design will be key to the Emerald Network's success and we would be happy to see the LAF added to the list of key stakeholders (paragraph 5.5) with a view to ensuring an independent perspective on any access proposals in the implementation phase.</p>	<p>c2. Support for encouraging walking and cycling in draft Plan.</p> <p>c3. Aspiration for the plan to assist in developing new rights of way and links to green spaces beyond the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>c3. Requesting greater emphasis on accessibility of path network to elderly and disabled people, being of benefit to local people and the economy.</p>	<p>Support noted</p> <p>Consider amending Policy T1.2.4 to assist in realising this ambition, and relationship to Theme 2b</p> <p>Addressed by Theme 2b. Consider policies or projects, and mention of economic benefits in Theme 2b or Theme 3.</p>

<p>In summary, the LAF reiterates its belief that the preservation and enhancement of Durham City's green infrastructure are critical to the social, economic and environmental well-being of local residents and that improving public access to such areas should lie at the heart of plans for a healthy and sustainable future for your neighbourhood.</p>		
<p>L4 [Copied from Theme 3] CPRE supports proposals which will help to save greenfield sites outside the City from being developed. We welcome these proposals and note that Policy E1 in respect of Aykley Heads specifically supports the development of non-Green Belt land. We believe however that the design of these developments should include provision for sustainable transport – see further below.</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion that developments, especially those at Aykley Heads, should incorporate provision for sustainable transport.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies in conjunction with Theme 3.</p>
<p>L4 We note the issues raised in this section and appreciate that the Neighbourhood Plan can only address issues within its own area. CPRE is concerned about sustainable transport generally and efforts to improve this within this Plan's area should be supported. We suggest however that they are designed in a way which will enable walking and cycling routes to connect smoothly to the wider sustainable transport network throughout the County.</p> <p>We note Policy T4 in relation to storage of cycles at residential developments. We represent that there should be a similar policy (together, where appropriate, for changing facilities) at employment sites, particularly large ones such as at Aykley Heads. There is provision for this in the now expired Cycling Strategy and it is likely to be included in the new strategy when published. Should the Plan not address this now?</p> <p>It is also important to note that there are “hubs” which attract people, such as those mentioned in the next Theme. Many people will only walk or cycle to such places if there is a safe, continuous route to enable them to do this. Where there is no such route from a new development, then perhaps the Plan should look to the developer providing, or at least contributing to, such off site routes.</p>	<p>c3. Concern that policies should enable walking and cycling routes to make smooth connections beyond the Plan area.</p> <p>c3. Suggesting policy for cycle parking at employment sites.</p> <p>c3. Suggesting that connectivity of development sites should be assessed also in relation to community facilities.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies with respect to what can be said about connections outside the Plan area.</p> <p>Consider policy T4 or additional policy (may already be covered adequately by Durham County Council policies).</p> <p>Consider Policy T1 and in relationship to Theme 6</p>
<p>L5. There is concern that proposed cycle routes though the City would impinge on the safety of the City user in areas which are [predominantly]</p>	<p>c3. Concern about the impact of creating cycle routes through the</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies and Map 12.</p>

<p>pedestrianised. These pedestrianised areas are currently safe environments in which City users can make use of all businesses within the City. A shared space for cyclists and pedestrians in Durham would likely create cycle to work routes that benefit the cyclist alone as they use the City centre as a short cut to avoid main highway routes.</p> <p>Whilst all parties agree that there should be a balanced approach to sustainable transport, the City centre should not be seen as an area where cycle routes carve up established safe environments. Instead, cycle routes should follow existing live highways with cycle stores included in the existing provision of car parks with an increase in the provision of electric car charging stations. This will create a level playing field upon which all city users can enjoy the City centre safely while designated areas of vehicular parking — motorised or peddled provide easy access to the City.</p> <p>Designated spaces for cycle parking in the City centre should be discouraged as this would create additional clutter in the City centre. There would also be the risk of cycle creep where cyclists would dismount outside of a business and temporarily park their cycle against any available wall, window or piece of street furniture. This would provide an unacceptable additional hazard to the City user as well as block access to a business.</p>	<p>predominantly pedestrianised city centre.</p> <p>c3. Expressing a preference for cycle routes along existing main roads, with cycle parking colocated in car parks.</p> <p>c3. An increase in electric car charging stations suggested.</p> <p>c3. Concern about clutter resulting from additional city centre cycle parking.</p> <p>c4. Concern that encouragement of cyclists could result in their parked bicycles giving rise to unacceptable hazards. Not a planning issue but could be addressed in Project 17.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies and compatibility with recommended assessment methods and design guides.</p> <p>Consider Theme 5 policies (may be adequately covered by existing DCC policy).</p> <p>Consider Theme 5 policies on cycle parking.</p> <p>Consider hazardous street clutter, including Map 11 and Project 17.</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:</p> <p>...</p> <p>f) Approach to transport strategy/ policy: in terms of placing a number of unjustified requirements upon applicants which do not currently exist or represent an unjustified deviation from the council's current approach to transport matters</p>	<p>c3. Concern about unjustified additional or deviant requirements upon applicants for planning permission.</p>	<p>Explore which specific Theme 5 policies are of concern. Share evidence between DCC and Forum to ensure policies are justified.</p>
<p>L9b. The county council has previously provided comments upon earlier iterations of the Durham City Neighbourhood Plan (DCNP) which have not yet been addressed. The Neighbourhood Plan Forum are again invited to</p>	<p>C3. Concern that previous comments have not yet been addressed.</p>	<p>It would be helpful if the comments previously made which the Council would like to be addressed could be</p>

<p>reconsider the comments previously provided.</p>		<p>identified: some have been addressed and others were discussed with officers at a meeting on 31 January between Roger Cornwell and Matthew Phillips of the NPF, and Peter Ollivere and John McGargill from the Council.</p> <p>There was an action point for the Council to suggest specific wording to strengthen the policies where needed, and we were awaiting this action to be completed. The two officers were not familiar with all of the comments that the Forum had received from the Council, however, and so it was not possible to resolve them at the time. The general conclusion of the meeting, in the notes which were accepted by the officers, was that they broadly supported the sustainable transport intentions of the policies and that more detailed suggestions of changes to wording would be provided by the Council shortly after, or in the formal response to the public consultation which was expected to follow in mid-February.</p> <p>There was no further correspondence on policy matters until the “health check” schedule provided through Carole Dillon, which made this same comment.</p>
---	--	--

		<p>We would be happy to work through any matters of concern which still apply and which were not set out in the detailed formal response to the public consultation.</p>
<p>L9b. In overall terms, for its four transport policies the transport chapter contains a significant amount of detailed context and justification drawing from a number of sources but specifically the emerging draft Durham City Sustainable Transport Strategy (DCSTS) which is yet to be finalised by the county council. This repetition of existing and emerging policy adds to its length. It also refers and addresses a range of issues and transport policy matters which are either already addressed elsewhere in existing policy documents, or will be subject to review through normal policy development processes in documents prepared by the county council and the Local Transport Body. Reference is also made to matters outside of the geographical scope of the plan area and matters within the plan area which will be addressed by other processes and which are outside the remit of the DCNP.</p> <p>As a general principle it is also worth highlighting that within the plan area that a neighbourhood plan may deal with transport insofar as it relates to new development. It should not deal with things like traffic management of existing networks, unless such management would be necessary to allow development to be approved.</p> <p>The chapter also contains specific views on a number of matters which are in conflict with the county council's existing views and emerging policy/strategy approach of the Council. There are also concerns that elements of the policy approach proposed are overly onerous, unworkable and non-fundable. A lot of content within the of the chapter repeats content from the National Planning Policy Framework or the DCSTS. The county council questions the need about the need for such repetition.</p> <p>Where the DCNP policy differs from the county council's stance on transport</p>	<p>c5. Concern regarding length of context and justification sections of the theme chapter.</p> <p>c3. Concern regarding overlap with transport policy matters already addressed elsewhere or to be addressed, and matters outside the area or beyond the remit of a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>c2. Statement that neighbourhood plans may only deal with transport aspects for new developments.</p> <p>c3. Concern that policies may be too onerous, unworkable and non-fundable.</p> <p>c3. Concern over higher standards</p>	<p>Seek to agree which aspects of the justification are not required to support the policies through the remainder of the plan process.</p> <p>Review these areas with officers. It would be helpful if officers could share in advance of any meeting a list of these matters, including their preferred policy development vehicle, which have not been itemised in the consultation response.</p> <p>The Theme 5 policies are already limited to those relating to new developments.</p> <p>Discuss these aspects with officers once they have been identified specifically.</p> <p>Discuss specific issues with officers,</p>

<p>matters, it is usually because it is being very prescriptive about higher standards i.e. cycling design, 20mph zones or less residential parking in the CPZ (controlled parking zone). Whilst these higher standards are well intended matters such as 20mph zones are not an issue for a development plan and are subject to a separate process. The other standards pose questions over the deliverability and effectiveness of the DCNP in these respects. Furthermore, the differential gives rise for the potential for these standards to be superseded by the forthcoming County Durham Plan and other emerging documents therefore rendering the DCNP time limited in these respects.</p>	<p>prescribed by the DCNP, deliverability and effectiveness.</p> <p>c3. Concern that policies that differ from the forthcoming County Durham Plan will be superseded.</p>	<p>and retain any which can be justified.</p> <p>Note: 20mph zones are not referred to in DCNP. Reference to 20mph design speed for residential streets accords with DCC's 2014 guidance.</p> <p>There is a process for adjusting neighbourhood plans when a new local plan comes into force, but if DCC could share relevant information about the forthcoming Plan and other emerging documents that would render assistance. Planning Practice Guidance for when a neighbourhood plan comes forward before an up-to-date Local Plan is in place (Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 41-009-20160211) notes the need for "The local planning authority should take a proactive and positive approach, working collaboratively with a qualifying body particularly sharing evidence and seeking to resolve any issues to ensure the draft neighbourhood plan has the greatest chance of success at independent examination."</p>
<p>L9b. Objectives The county council is satisfied that the objectives of this section of the DCNP are broadly the same as what is in the existing Local Transport Plan, the saved policies of the City of Durham Local Plan and the draft DC STS. For example, the Local Plan contains a range of saved policies including those</p>	<p>c2. Broad support for Theme 5 objectives.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>

<p>relating to traffic generation/highway safety and amenity (T1); road proposals (T2); the route and design of new road proposals (T4); public transport (T5); traffic management (T8); parking (T10), parking in the city centre (T11)(T12) (T13); taxi ranks (T18); cycle routes (T19); cycle facilities (T20); and walker's needs (T21). Similarly, the DCNP encourages walking, cycling, public transport as well as the use of electric vehicles and cleaner, fuel-efficient cars among those who still need to use cars for their daily travel. However, unlike the DCSTS, the DCNP objectives ignore economic growth and access to education and training (despite it forming part of the DCNP vision).</p>	<p>c5. Suggestion to add support of economic growth and access to education and training to objectives.</p>	<p>Consider suggestion.</p>
<p>L9b. Context (including paragraphs 4.174) The county council notes that these paragraphs draw heavily upon the draft DCSTS which has yet to be finalised by the county council. It is also noted that it refers to a number of matters outside the jurisdiction of the DCNP, and inappropriately provide the views of the Forum on matters which are addressed within the adopted Local Plan (i.e. the Northern Relief Road or will be addressed by future planning applications i.e. the re-siting and redevelopment of Durham Bus Station). Unless it can be demonstrated that these paragraphs properly and directly relate and provide the reasoned justification for the four proposed transport policies the inclusion of these paragraphs should be reconsidered or at the very least moderated. For example, the DCNP is correct in that “the building relief roads is beyond the remit of Our Neighbourhood Plan as their proposed locations fall outside Our Neighbourhood”, however, it is unnecessary for DCNP to provide a view on such a matter i.e. “our Neighbourhood plan considers it unwise to invest heavily in constructing in roads....”.</p>	<p>c5. Concern over references to matters outside the jurisdiction of a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>c5. Objection to inclusion of a view on the building of relief roads.</p>	<p>Review context paragraphs.</p> <p>Objection noted</p>
<p>L9b. A misunderstanding which the county council has identified in the section summarising the DC STS is that the DCNP makes reference to ‘relief roads’ in the STS. The draft DC STS only makes reference to the Northern Relief Road (i.e. only one relief road not two). This needs to be addressed in the interests of accuracy. The background text on states that “with traffic volumes over the Millburngate Bridge in decline over the last sixteen years” This is not accurate, although levels did fall during the recession the DCNP needs evidence to justify this statement through traffic counts or the text should be amended.</p>	<p>c5. Objection to detail of Highways section of paragraph 4.174.</p>	<p>Objection noted</p> <p>The references to relief roads are accurate in the November 2017 consultation draft plan.</p> <p>The DCNPF would be happy to reword the text relating to traffic levels by reviewing the latest</p>

		evidence if the DCC can provide this.
L9b. The county council disagrees with the conclusion in the walking and cycling section. Although walking and cycling at 35% should be a priority, it is this very high proportion and the scale of the City that results in smaller than expected number of people cycling.	c5. Objection to statements attributing low cycling levels to poor cycling infrastructure.	Objection noted. It would be useful if DCC could share any evidence backing up this assertion.
L9b. The text relating to the proposed bus station does not relate to the scope of the DCNP and sets out an individual groups views on a matter which will be considered through other planning processes. The text relating to the operation of public transport services and existing infrastructure is also an individual groups views and is not necessary. The DC STS does indeed highlight the amount of free parking at major employment sites, however, the majority of this parking is outside of the plan area i.e. at Belmont and at Newton Hall. The text relating to the management of car parking is not appropriate.	c5. Objection to text relating to the bus station and public transport services. c5. Objection to text relating to free parking at major employment sites.	Objections noted While the DCNPF would be happy to discuss this further with officers, the views derive from the public events and engagement conducted by the Forum and are not merely an “individual group's view”. The objection is inaccurate, as the DCSTS refers to substantial parking at County Hall and Durham University.
L9b. At 4.5.3 the inclusion of additional justification over and above that which set out below each policy is questioned.	c5. Concern regarding overall justification section.	Note that this format is followed in all themes apart from Theme 1. Discuss with officers how best to avoid duplication of justification under each policy, while providing sufficient backing for the remainder of the plan process. The approach was to provide at the beginning of a theme justification relevant to all policies. Then under each policy any additional justification relevant only to that policy

<p>In relation to paragraph 4.177 the county council agrees with DCNP in respect of the statement, that “there is a limit to what our Neighbourhood Plan can achieve with respect to transport”. It is considered that the justification of this chapter be reconsidered taking this into account after due reflection of the role of the county council in this regard.</p>	<p>c5. Suggestion that the justification of the policies be reconsidered.</p>	<p>This can be tackled in conjunction with the discussion of the Theme 5 policies with officers.</p>
<p>Specifically in regard to paragraph 4.186 the list of City of Durham Local Plan policies which are potentially relevant the list of relevant saved City of Durham Local Plan policies are incomplete.</p>	<p>c5. Matter of fact to be corrected in paragraph 4.186.</p>	<p>Clarify which saved policies relate to transport in the Neighbourhood Plan area, and which of these have been incorporated into the policies.</p>
<p>L13. [Commenting on projects, but relevant to theme.] Careful consideration should be made when deciding long term improvements. Electric vehicles are not proven to be the future and currently only produce cleaner air where the vehicle is being driven. However, the pollution still occurs somewhere else.</p>	<p>c3. Advising caution on relying on electric vehicles as the future of motorised road traffic. Addressed partly by user hierarchy in paragraph 4.180.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies.</p>
<p>L23. [Copied from theme 2b] G1.4 rights of way: we would go further and argue that existing rights of way – which have been mapped in the NX area – should in themselves be protected whether or not they are subject to development proposals. We also propose that rights of way should also be protected from ‘enhancement’, such as low-level lighting or gravelling for cycle use, so that they retain their traditional features. As noted below, and given the topography of the City, these ways are as important as cycle routes and should be given equal prominence;</p>	<p>c3. Arguing for greater protection for pedestrian rights of way, and avoiding changes such as lighting or resurfacing.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies and relationship to Policy G1.4</p>
<p>L23. We propose that the objectives of this theme – 4.172 – include reference to the managed control of car parking in the City. We are aware of the balloon effect of the CPZ with non-CPZ areas used as free car parks by workers, train users, etc. We are also aware of the numbers of student cars in the City.</p>	<p>c5. Suggestion for addition to objectives to cover management of car parking.</p>	<p>Consider objectives.</p>
<p>L23. We propose that there should be greater encouragement of DCC and other car parks in the City and consideration given to one or two additional Park-and-Ride schemes (on, for example, the A690 at Langley Moor);</p>	<p>c3. Proposing “greater encouragement” of car parks and additional Park and Ride sites, the latter being addressed in Project 19. Not clear what is meant by encouraging “DCC and other car</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies in relationship to Theme 3 after seeking clarification from respondent.</p>

	parks" (assume this means public car parks, rather than County Hall).	
L23. We would welcome more circular bus routes, subsidised by the University, to ease pedestrian traffic into the City (particularly from the colleges along the A167).	c3. c4 Support for new bus routes to the University. Partly addressed by Project 16.	Consider explicit mention of services to the University in the project or the supporting text for policy T1.
L23. We are aware that current student accommodaton developments must either provide their own parking or are not granted parking permit rights but it is clear that many student-occupied houses have access to permits through landlords. We would ask that DCC begins to exercise due diligence over eligibility, matching Council Tax exemptions against permit issuing.	c1b. Concern over abuse of parking permit regulations. Outside remit (for Council)	No action.
Policy T1		
EQ31. Policies T1 and T2: in the policy and/or accompanying text add wording about the need to provide ergonomically designed seating and to provide handrails.	c3. c5. Proposing policy wording regarding seating and handrails.	Consider policies T1 and T2 and accompanying text in relation to recommended design guidance to avoid duplication.
Q42 T1: Cycling on Milburngate Bridge should be only in a defined cycle lane. It is hazardous to pedestrians at the moment.	c5. Concern over unsuitable shared pedestrian cycle facility.	Add issue to Map 11 (route already marked as needing improvement in Map 12). Consider Theme 5 policies in relation to primacy of pedestrian provision.
Q76 T1. Excessive student development in the city centre has put a huge amount of pressure on the medieval road network and narrow streets and pavements of our city. This needs to be considered in the future. Copied to Theme 4	c2. Concern over pavement congestion. Addressed in Policy T1 and Map 11.	No action.
WC35 Comment on your post "Policy T1" POLICY T 1. I support this Policy,and suggest that T 1.2 be reworded to help those as stupid as I am to understand it more easily. I also wonder whether a more assertive statement could be made in relation to funding suggestions via planning obligations-(para.4.192)	c2. Support for policy T1 c3. c5. Concern about wording of T1.2 and suggestion for change to 4.192.	Support noted. Consider Policy T1 wording and supporting text.
WC75 Comment on your post "Policy T1" Pressure on the pavements in the city is likely to increase if the University	c2. Concern over pavement congestion. Addressed in Policy T1	No action.

<p>expands as much as it currently proposes to do. It seems to me that there is a serious flaw in the argument made by the University authorities that to be a world-class institution it must have a massive growth in numbers of students. St Andrews and Harvard (to name but two) are both world-class bodies, but show no inclination to expand beyond their current modest size. Durham is a small city which already at times feels overwhelmed by the student population. Widening pavements and improving pinch-points (though desirable) are not adequate solutions to this in the long run.</p>	<p>and Map 11.</p> <p>c5 Concern over long-term impact of university expansion. c1b University expansion outside remit (for Council, other bodies)</p>	<p>Consider how to address this across the Plan as a whole.</p>
<p>WC164 Comment on your post "Policy T1" The north end of Hallgarth Street, leading to the junction with New Elvet, has an excruciatingly narrow pavement on the left side going north, accessible in part only by one person at a time. The pedestrian crossing points near the New Inn pub and the Main Univ. Library are a serious pedestrian bottle neck. This is a complex junction and waiting times for walkers are exasperatingly long. This can lead to people dashing across recklessly. The observation, standing there, that most cars have only one occupant only adds to the deep resentment this area can induce. I suspect that, as long as these machines dominate most public space with their noise and violence, the best solution here would be some sort of underpass, even though such spaces tend to be unattractive. The pressure increasing student numbers must put on the limited pavement space needs to be fully acknowledged. The situation in some areas is already becoming dangerous, with people swerving into the roads. The pavement at the north end of New Elvet (outside the two pubs there) is a third pressure point to be added to the two already mentioned.</p>	<p>c5. Suggestions for Map 11 relating to Hallgarth Street, the New Inn junction and New Elvet.</p> <p>c2. Concern over pavement congestion. Addressed in Policy T1 and Map 11.</p>	<p>Consider amending map 11.</p> <p>Consider particular acknowledging issue of student pedestrians in supporting text.</p>
<p>WC170 Comment on your post "Policy T1" The map of pedestrian issues identifies some of the City's pavements which are in need of repair or improvement. We note that the issue concerning the use of Owengate to access the WHS by wheelchair and mobility scooter users is flagged, but there are many other streets which present severe difficulties for such users. Pavements along the whole of The Bailey are in a poor state, and in South Bailey are visually unusable because of the lack of dropped kerbs. Even where refurbishment has been undertaken, as in Dun Cow Lane, the needs of wheelchair users have been entirely ignored. Silver</p>	<p>c5. Various suggestions for improving Map 11.</p>	<p>Consider amending map 11 with the examples provided.</p>

<p>Street, despite recent refurbishment, remains a difficult and uncomfortable street for wheelchair users to negotiate, partly because of its poor surface design. Similarly the surfaces on Elvet and Framwellgate Bridges have presented difficulties and discomfort for wheelchair users. Sutton Street, Alexander Crescent, Crossgate and Marjory Lane can be hazardous for some wheelchair users because the pavements are narrow. Also, some City streets have steep inclines and, for that reason, are hazardous for wheelchair users; they should be identified even if there is little that can be done to make them safe.</p>		
<p>WC195 Comment on your post "Policy T1" I am in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan in general, including this section with its emphasis on prioritising the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. I wonder, however, whether words should be added to the effect of: 'Nothing in the plans for the city should be seen as in anyway justifying further road building schemes around the perimeter.' I say this because I remember a proposal being mooted to cut the traffic lanes on the A690 Milburngate Bridge from two lanes down to one, ostensibly to enhance it for cyclists and pedestrians. The alleged justification for cutting the road lanes on the bridge is plainly untrue: the current dual use path for cyclists and pedestrians works perfectly well, and the real reason for the proposal is to cause sufficient traffic jams to justify building another road and bridge downriver.</p>	<p>c2. Support for Plan and Policy T1</p> <p>c5. Concern that improvements for cycling and walking might be used to justify relief road building.</p> <p>c5. Expressing opinion that shared pedestrian/cycle path on Milburngate Bridge works well.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Consider supporting text.</p> <p>Consider amending Map 12 to upgrade assessment of this route.</p>
<p>L7 Map 11 shows pedestrian issues. The map needs to be amended because surely it must be missing markings along North Bailey. This has some of the worst pavements in the city because heavy vehicles drive over them every day since the road is so narrow and other delivery vehicles are often parked. Cracked paving stones along the whole length of pavement are a trip hazard and look unsightly. I know that this will never be solved completely because of the daily heavy vehicles, but the principle remains that this is as bad a stretch of road and pavement as others in the Plan area which are identified. Also, in places (eg outside Bow Church) the pavements are not wide enough to stand on.</p>	<p>c5. Suggestion for additional problems to be added to Map 11 on North Bailey.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11.</p>
<p>In the light of that comment, I did not notice a policy that contractors should</p>	<p>c1c. Concern regarding unsightly</p>	<p>No action.</p>

<p>restore road surfaces and pavements to their former state after digging them up. The Bailey (and elsewhere) has patches in the wrong materials which look unsightly on the pavement and often turn into pot holes in the road. As I only skimmed parts of the Plan, I may have missed a policy on that, or perhaps the plan is relying on the Council's existing policies, but it appears to be a significant omission.</p>	<p>repairs to road surfaces and footways. Outside remit (not a planning issue).</p>	
<p>L9b. The numbering of the policy criteria should be reconsidered for sake of clarity.</p>	<p>c3. Observation that numbering is unclear.</p>	<p>Renumber policy criteria.</p>
<p>L9b. The county council understands the DCNP aspirations for a transport policy upon accessibility. However, the accessibility of proposed developments and transport assessments, statements and travel plans are considered by the county council to be strategic issues. The inclusion of a policy on these matters are therefore questioned.</p>	<p>c3. Questioning whether accessibility is a matter for the DCNP.</p>	<p>Discuss identification of strategic matters with officers.</p>
<p>L9b. Criterion T1.1. It is considered that the majority of development will only be assessed against criteria T1.1.</p> <p>In relation to (T1.1 1) it is considered that this criteria is not sufficiently clear in its meaning, for example it is unclear as to what is meant by infrastructure and what is meant by favours. For example is a new access onto a public highway considered to be infrastructure or does infrastructure mean for example a new building?</p>	<p>c3. Observation on scope of policy as currently drafted.</p> <p>c3. Concern over clarity of wording.</p>	<p>Discuss policy scope with officers to ensure a suitable definition of which criteria apply. Consider amendments to wording to improve clarity.</p>
<p>L9b. Criterion T1.1 2 The necessity of this criteria is questioned given that all new buildings will be required to meet established Building Regulations standards. It is noted that the reasoned justification provides no explanation of these matters.</p>	<p>c3. Suggesting that T.1.1.2 is superfluous and unjustified.</p>	<p>Consider removing criterion or strengthening as appropriate.</p>
<p>L9b. Criterion T1.2 and T1.3. It is considered that the policy and supporting text of the DCNP is not the appropriate place for addressing Transport Statements and Transport Assessment and or Travel Plans. In this regard there is already significant guidance on transport assessments and statements within the Planning Practice Guide. However, in line with the PPG if this policy is to be retained in some form it is considered that discussions are required to agree what evaluation is needed for both Transport Assessments and Statements.</p>	<p>c3. Objection that there is already sufficient guidance within Planning Practice Guidance.</p>	<p>PPG gives considerable scope to the Planning Authority to set the appropriate level of analysis for proposed developments. Discuss further with officers the level of evaluation to be required.</p>

<p>L9b. Criterion T1.4 This criteria states, “provide high quality routes which prioritise foot and cycle traffic within the site, are direct and continuous and segregated from other road users, directly linked to external foot and cycle networks”. This criteria appears to give equal weight to walking and cycling and should be reconsidered. It is considered to prescriptive to insist on continuous and segregated cycle routes in all larger developments. This could lead to overly engineered designs that is inefficient in terms of space and costs. It may not be possible to link with external foot and cycle networks if such routes are not already present.</p>	<p>c3. Objection to three aspects of T1.2.4, namely the apparent equal weight given to walking and cycling, the requirement for segregated cycle routes and for linking with external foot and cycle networks.</p>	<p>Discuss detail of criteria with officers. Ensure that user hierarchy is made clear, with clear criteria for determining when segregated cycle provision is appropriate. Consider requiring links to planned networks as well as existing.</p>
<p>L9b. The consistency of this policy with paragraph 32 of the NPPF is questioned. Paragraph 32 is clear that “Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe”.</p>	<p>c3. Concern that policy T1 may not be compatible with NPPF.</p>	<p>Discuss further with officers. Part of the intent of the policy is to help to ensure all transport impacts are effectively evaluated.</p>
<p>L9b. With respect to the supporting text The Active Travel (Wales) guidance has not been adopted by the county council. Rather, it is used as best practice guidance as part of auditing work on existing routes.</p> <p>There is no justification as to why a developer should be required to assess the quality of existing publically maintained walking and cycling routes to a development site (paragraph 4.189) including assessment of routes outside of the NP area (paragraph 4.190).</p>	<p>c2. Comment regarding status of the Active Travel (Wales) Act design guidance.</p> <p>c3. Concern over lack of justification for paragraph 4.189, and reference to routes outside the Plan area.</p>	<p>The status is understood, but it is observed that many councils are now adopting similar guidance (for example, North Tyneside).</p> <p>Discuss further with officers how to achieve rigorous assessments of walking and cycling accessibility. How to ensure cross-boundary travel needs are catered for within policies.</p>
<p>L9b. In relation to offsite improvements (paragraph 4.192) it is considered that the issue of how s106 money is to be used is the role of a local authority.</p>	<p>c5. Objection to wording of paragraph 4.192</p>	<p>Discuss wording with officers.</p>
<p>L9b. In relation to map 12 Map of Cycling Issues and paragraph 4.196, this is considered unnecessary, as referred to within the document through the DCSTS, the County Durham Plan and the Local Cycling and Walking Investment Plan work is being undertaken on this issue.</p>	<p>c5. Objection to inclusion of map of cycling issues.</p>	<p>Discuss timing of LCWIP work with officers and community input to process. Query position of Map 11 also. Consider need for map or other evidence to support policies.</p>
<p>L23. We have concerns about the imbalance in informaton on walking routes</p>	<p>c3. c5. Suggestion that walking routes</p>	<p>Consider Maps 11 and 12 and</p>

<p>outside paved pedestrian routes and cycle routes. Much of the Conservation Area is criss-crossed by traditional walking routes and we would welcome a clear policy on the maintained use of such routes without 'enhancement', and mapped along the lines of map 12. We note that map 12 in any case appears to address an area greater than encompassed by the Plan and in a number of instances seems to contradict pedestrian and safety concerns that have been regularly raised at for example, CCP meetings, in relation to cycling through City centre streets. We consider that the prominence given to cycling is too great and unconditional, and should be redrafted alongside an equivalent policy on walkways.</p>	<p>should be mapped in a similar way to cycling routes and thereby be given greater prominence. Concern over priority of cycling and walking needs, with the example of the city centre.</p>	<p>policies.</p>
<p>Policy T2</p>		
<p>EQ31. Policies T1 and T2: in the policy and/or accompanying text add wording about the need to provide ergonomically designed seating and to provide handrails.</p>	<p>c3. Proposing policy wording regarding seating and handrails.</p>	<p>Consider policies T1 and T2 in relation to recommended design guidance to avoid duplication.</p>
<p>EQ46 Particularly agree with T2 and T4 - Would be great to have better bike routes and more designated residential bike storage.</p>	<p>c2. Support for T2, T4.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Q45 T2: wholeheartedly!</p>	<p>c2. Wholehearted support for Policy T2</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Q68. T2. should also include disabled access</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion that disabled access needs be added to Policy T2.</p>	<p>Consider policy T2.</p>
<p>Q76. T2.2. Routes should be direct and well signposted. The surfaces should use high quality surfaces / materials. Routes should be overlooked where possible and safe.</p>	<p>c3. Suggestions for refinement of policy wording relating to surfaces and social safety.</p>	<p>Consider refining policy, but in context of recommended design guidance.</p>
<p>WC36 Comment on your post "Policy T2" POLICY T 2. I support this Policy</p>	<p>c2. Support for Policy T2</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>WC77 Comment on your post "Policy T2" Policy T2. Well considered. It will help to make the City a better place to live and visit. I support this policy</p>	<p>c2. Support for Policy T2.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>WC99 Comment on your post "Policy T2" The Sidegate Residents Association made the following general points about sustainable transport: * more electric charging points are needed to encourage the use of electric vehicles.</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion for more electric charging points for vehicles. c3. Need to avoid conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, observing</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies. Consider Theme 5 policies and Maps 11, 12</p>

<p>* routes have to be arranged to avoid conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. Most pavements are too narrow for shared use in the city. * taxis and buses should not stand with engines running.</p>	<p>that most pavements are not suitable for sharing. c1c. Concern about taxi and bus engines idling outside remit (not a planning issue). Addressed in Projects 16 and 21</p>	<p>No action.</p>
<p>WC122 Comment on your post "Policy T2" Cycling paths need to be separate from the roads for cars. There is no benefit in painting the cycling lane on the narrow road (as it is i.e. on A177 leading from university sport campus to roundabout leading to Stockton road) The road is too narrow so cycle lane is used by cars all the time to avoid collision with the cars coming from opposite direction. The cycle lane there is meaningless. Cycling infrastructure should be separate form driving roads and provide shortcuts leading through residential areas to encourage use and make cycling safer and quicker way to commute comparing with driving.</p>	<p>c2. In favour of cycling infrastructure separated from motor vehicles, with shortcuts to encourage cycle commuting. Addressed by Policies T1, T2. c2. Comment regarding Shincliffe Peth identified on Map 12.</p>	<p>No action No action</p>
<p>WC146 Comment on your post "Policy T2" This is an interesting and worthwhile policy.</p>	<p>c2. Support for Policy T2.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>WC163 Comment on your post "Policy T2" I support these suggestions. As someone with asthma who does not have a car, I would also support any measures against cars idling there engines in residential areas.</p>	<p>c2. Support for Policy T2 c3. Concern over air pollution arising from car engines idling. Air pollution mainly outside remit (for Council, other bodies) but also addressed by sustainable transport aims of policies T1 and T2, and Projects 2, 7, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21.</p>	<p>Support noted. Consider changing text in Theme 5 to demonstrate how the Plan is addressing air quality concerns. Note para. 4.19.</p>
<p>L9b. The aspiration for new residential road and streets to be designed to reflect the principles set out in T2.2 is understood and accepted and reflect best practice.</p>	<p>Support for Policy T2.2</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>L9b. Criterion T2.1 and paragraph 4.197 the Active Travel (Wales) guidance has not been adopted by the County council. Rather, it is used as best practice guidance as part of auditing work on existing routes.</p>	<p>c2. Comment on status of Active Travel (Wales) Act design guidance.</p>	<p>Status understood. Justification for stipulating this guidance is set out in paragraphs 4.197 to 4.199 and can</p>

<p>Where new development is delivered this would have to be done in agreement with the county council who would have to maintain the infrastructure in perpetuity. Such agreement has not been sought.</p>	<p>c2. Comment on need for County Council to agree infrastructure designs.</p>	<p>be discussed with officers. Agreement from DCC would be sought by the developer as usual, subject to compliance with the plan.</p>
<p>L9b. Criterion T2.2.4 “Provision for car parking within the curtilage of each property or within a nearby neighbourhood parking area. Where on-street parking is necessary, it should be provided in designated bays.....” taken with the following policy of only reducing parking standards when “it can be demonstrated that there will be no adverse impact on existing car parking users in the vicinity” provides a policy which is too aggressive against non-car developments. It appears to give the message that sustainability is the predominant feature in transport unless it can impact on the parking of existing residents.</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding unintended consequences of the wording of T2.2.4.</p>	<p>Discuss detail of wording with officers.</p>
<p>L12b. The vast majority of DU student’s access the University on foot or by bike. The University are improving access for students and staff on land under our control through projects included in the Masterplan and therefore support the NPF’s policy to improve the walking and cycling infrastructure throughout the plan area.</p>	<p>Support for Policy T2.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>L22. Whilst there is mention of the railway there are no specific policy features regarding the railway.</p> <p>As you will be aware there is high demand at Durham station for car parking. As such there are aspirations to provide additional car parking at Durham station through the double stacking of the station car park.</p> <p>We would welcome the inclusion in policy T2 -Sustainable travel for the support of additional car parking at Durham station to aid the use of rail travel which supports the aims of policy T2 for the use of sustainable transport.</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion for inclusion of wording to support provision of additional car parking at Durham railway station.</p>	<p>Consider wording of Policy T2.</p>
<p>Policy T3</p>		
<p>EQ18. Policy T3: if owners of residential property are car owners then parking spaces ought to be provided, otherwise the parking problems will be pushed elsewhere.</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding overspill of car parking if insufficient provided.</p>	<p>Consider policy T3.</p>

Q09 T3: Need more residential car parking.	c3. Concern that more residential car parking is needed.	Consider policy T3.
Q29 T3: * More students now have cars and do require parking.	c3. Concern for the needs of students parking cars (or the pressure on residents created by students parking cars – not sure which).	Consider policy T3.
Q37 Would hope under T3 some consideration could be given to restrictions on student car parking in CPZ and encouragement of County Council & Durham University to accept some responsibility in this area.	c3. Concern regarding pressures caused by student car parking.	Consider policy T3.
EQ31. The purpose of Policy T3 needs to be made clearer.	c3. Lack of clarity in the intent of the policy.	Consider clarifying policy T3.
Q53 T3: I,m not sure if I understand this one.	c3. Lack of clarity in the intent of the policy.	Consider clarifying policy T3.
Q62. Policy T3 – he extent / boundary of the controlled parking zone is not defined.	c3. Comment that the CPZ has not been delineated in the plan.	Consider map of current CPZ, though intention was for policy to apply to the CPZ as it changes over time.
Q76. T3. Concerned about reduced parking provision can impact on existing residents and services elsewhere. This needs to be considered carefully.	c3. Concern at possible impact of policy.	Consider policy T3.
WC2 Comment on your post "Policy T3" Some thought needs to be given to the extension of the CPZ particularly into Gilesgate Green to prevent a fringe effect, however this will only push the fringe outwards and therefore a city wide CPZ needs to be examined. Thought must also be given to a relaxation on contractors vehicles and business permits as it is becoming impossible to get contractors to work in the city and the council are missing a rich source of income on business permits.	c1b/c4. Suggestion for extension of CPZ to Gilesgate Green or city-wide. Issues regarding contractors' vehicles and busiiness permits. Partly outside remit (for Council) but also addressed in Project 19.	Consider Project 19.
WC37 Comment on your post "Policy T3" POLICY T 3. Whilst the spirit and general intention of this Policy is understood and supported it is at this stage difficult to give unqualified support without knowing (a) that the satisfaction of conditions 1 to 7 would not in practice weaken	c3. Concern that policy might weaken the effect of the County Durham Parking and Accessibility Standards. c3. Concern over the practical	Consider policy T3.

<p>the effect of minimum parking levels prescribed in the County Durham Parking and Accountability Standards, and (b) in what way condition 1 could in practice be demonstrated in advance of completion of any particular development.</p>	<p>application of T3.1.1.</p>	
<p>WC159 Comment on your post "Policy T3" Discussion at the drop-in event at St Oswald's Institute highlighted that the current DCC policy is also possibly problematic in its requirements for parking spaces for students at purpose-built student accommodation. Currently there is no student parking requirement (except for disabled students) for sites in the Controlled Parking Zone. But outside that zone, 1 space per 15 students is stipulated. Unlike the residential parking policy, this is a maximum, so less parking could be acceptable. We understand that the university policy on parking permits is very restrictive on students having permits, but privately-developed accommodation might seek to use parking as an attractor. There could be situations where a PBSA or college building is proposed which is much closer to the University than some of the PBSAs recently built, yet because it is outside the CPZ might be allowed to have more student car parking, which could lead to an increase in student car use. (Parking for visitors might need accommodating, however, if further from the city centre.) This needs looking at again, particularly with respect to the fringe effects on nearby residential streets. Either the policy itself or paragraph 4.203 might need some attention.</p>	<p>c3. Suggestions for policy regarding student parking.</p>	<p>Consider policy T3.</p>
<p>WC181 Comment on your post "Policy T3" I support this policy. In Durham, as in other historic towns, many otherwise attractive streets are defiled by doubling as car parks. A city wide CPZ would be very welcome.</p>	<p>c2. Support for policy T3. c4. Suggestion for city-wide CPZ which could be picked up in Project 19.</p>	<p>Support noted. Consider project 19.</p>
<p>L9b. This policy relates to an aspect that the county council is seeking to cover. Furthermore the county council is concerned that the approach in the DCNP does not align with this. The policy should be revised in light of the following comments. This policy assumes developers will want to provide less (not more) car parking in the CPZ. It over-complicates the issue of providing less parking in the CPZ. If anything, to accord with strategic direction of travel this policy</p>	<p>c3. Concern over the implications of the policy and compatibility with the DCC approach.</p>	<p>Discuss policy T3 with officers. In particular: 1) whether it is clear to developers how much car parking is likely to be required within the CPZ but more than 400m from the market place, as the DCC policy appears to</p>

<p>should have the intention of making it easier for developers wanting to provide less parking in the CPZ. In practice, the county council will be seeking developments to provide no more than 1 space per unit in the CPZ as it would class the CPZ as an accessible town centre location.</p> <p>The county council would not necessarily issue new development parking permits unless it felt there was the capacity in the appropriate streets. This is backed up by the Councils Parking Service Manual which states: 'Please note, due to the historic nature of the streets within the CPZ the supply of on street parking space is limited in some areas. We are therefore unable to provide resident permits for occupiers of new developments/conversions after 2000. Before moving to a new development/converted property please ensure that the parking provision available to you is adequate for your needs.'</p> <p>Therefore, then danger of over-provision of parking spaces in the CPZ is very low as it stands currently. Making it more onerous for developers to provide for less parking does not appear to be the logical approach.</p>		<p>specify a minimum not a maximum provision;</p> <p>2) how, in practice, the requirement is determined (using recent examples such as The Avenue, former Durham County Club building, former print works on Claypath, etc.)</p> <p>3) whether the number of permits issued for each zone is limited to the number of parking spaces;</p>
<p>L9b. The suggestion that any non-car development must be within 800m of a pharmacy (criteria 4) would preclude development of student residencies next to the main university sites.</p>	<p>c3. Objection to T3.1.4</p>	<p>Policy was intended to require less parking, never more. Student residences on Mount Oswald would be outside CPZ and according to DCC policy would be subject to a maximum of 1 space per 15 students. Discuss requirement for accessibility of key local services.</p>
<p>L13. Consideration should be made to restrict student parking to those with a disability, and Durham County Council and Durham University should accept some responsibility around this area of increasing concern.</p>	<p>c1b. Suggestion to restrict student parking permits. Outside remit (for Council/other bodies)</p>	<p>No action.</p>
<p>L23. We would welcome an extension of the CPZ to all areas within the Conservation Area, whereby specific streets must opt-out by a simple majority from the scheme. Conversely streets within the Conservation Area should have the right to move from a permit/ticket scheme to a permit-only scheme by a simple majority.</p>	<p>c1b. Suggestions regarding management of CPZ. Outside remit (for Council) but could be addressed in Project 19.</p>	<p>Consider Project 19.</p>

<p>L25. Persimmon Homes welcome the policy approach of T3.1 which seeks to offer greater flexibility to parking standards in sustainable city centre locations. However the policy needs to be adjusted to a 3 tier approach as the County Durham Parking Standards set a standard of a maximum requirement of 1 space per dwelling within 400m of the Market Place. Any development within this catchment should be free from the requirements of Policy T3.1 in justifying a parking provision below the minimum parking standard currently applicable to sites beyond 400m of the Market Place.</p> <p>The justification test within Policy T31 should only apply to sites within the Controlled Parking Zone beyond 400m of the Market Place. This would represent the 2nd tier. Test 2 requirement of “demonstrating that genuine demand exists for car free or low car housing in the proposed location” should be deleted as this would be difficult to evidence and the justification for reduced parking stems from intrinsic sustainability and promotion of sustainable transport patterns rather than demand for parking.</p> <p>The 3rd tier of sites shall be those beyond the controlled parking zone which should be subject to the County Durham Minimum Parking Standards.</p>	<p>c2. Support for policy T3.1.</p> <p>c3. Suggestion to refine wording of Policy T3.1 to ensure the provision for dwellings within 400m of the Market Place are not made more onerous.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Consider clarifying wording, which implies that the policy will never require more parking provision than the DCC policy.</p>
<p>Policy T4</p>		
<p>EQ04. 3. I would seriously consider having an electric vehicle if there were more charge points in the city, I'm sure I'm not alone. Maybe under T4 new residential development should include requirements for access to vehicle charge points.</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion to add car charging points to policy.</p>	<p>Consider policy T4.</p>
<p>EQ31. Policy T4. should include provision for charging electric cars.</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion to add car charging points to policy.</p>	<p>Consider policy T4.</p>
<p>EQ46 Particularly agree with T2 and T4 - Would be great to have better bike routes and more designated residential bike storage.</p>	<p>c2. Support for Policy T4</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>Q62. T4 – this is over the top for an individual property.</p>	<p>c3. Objection to policy on the grounds of being excessive for individual properties.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Consider policy T4.</p>
<p>WC34 Would it be worth making specific reference to the need to make provision for electric charging points for cars in the context of new residential</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion to add car charging points to policy.</p>	<p>Consider policy T4.</p>

development? Copied from Theme 4		
WC38 Comment on your post "Policy T4" POLICY T 4. I support this Policy.	c2. Support for Policy T4.	Support noted.
WC147 Comment on your post "Policy T4" Policies such as these which encourage bicycle use should be encouraged.	c2. Support for Policy T4.	Support noted.
WC169 Comment on your post "Policy T4" We are pleased to see the inclusion of a specific policy concerning the residential storage of cycles and mobility aids. The burgeoning use of mobility aids, particularly by the elderly, indicates the need for this policy.	c2. Support for Policy T4	Support noted.
WC184 Comment on your post "Policy T4" I support these policies but add that secure public parking for cycles is necessary.	c2. Support for Policy T4. c3. Suggestion regarding secure public cycle parking also.	Support noted. Consider public cycle parking policy.
WC201 Comment on your post "Policy T4" These are very welcome proposals.	c2. Support for Policy T4.	Support noted.
L9b. The county council is concerned that the requirements of this policy seem excessive. Any deviation from the county council's adopted standards needs to be fully justified. It is unclear what evidence exists to demonstrate that two covered secure cycleparking spaces/equivalent space for other mobility aids should be provided per residential dwelling. The county council is seeking to revise these guidelines shortly and there will be an opportunity to comment on this in due course. Whilst its aims well meaning, the policy is very prescriptive in its requirements, cycles/mobility aids are commonly stored with garages, sheds and indeed within the dwelling house or its curtilage. It is also considered that it is not appropriate to be so prescriptive, step free access may not be appropriate or possible on some development sites and the proposed storage space at the front of a dwelling is unlikely to be acceptable in design terms, particularly within the Conservation Area, and may increase the occurrence of crime. However, it is agreed that there may be some merit in PBSA or retirement accommodation for the elderly incorporating appropriate storage space given that space is a premium within individual accommodation. Should this policy be retained in its current format then this issue needs to be fully justified.	c3. c5. Concern over requirements of policy and the need for full justification. c3. Concern over storage provision at the front of a dwelling.	Clarify points of misunderstanding. Discuss detail of text with officers, and what justification would be acceptable. Wording requires storage "convenient for the front of the property", not at the front. Should clarify this.

<p>L23. We do not agree with T4.1 relating to secure cycle parking spaces which we consider disproportionate in cost and requirements on householders to the level of cycle use within the Conservation Area and excluding student use.</p>	<p>c3. Objection to Policy T4</p>	<p>Objection noted Consider objection to policy T4.</p>
<p>L25. Persimmon Homes contend that Policy T4 is wholly unnecessary and will add an unnecessary and unjustified additional burden to development for the following reasons.</p> <p>As currently drafted the policy would require each dwelling to provide a covered area, sufficiently large to store 2 bicycles with a power supply to charge electric mobility aids and e-bikes. It is noted that paragraph 4.209 states that “in houses with garages, cycle and mobility aid storage may be catered for by simply providing extra garage space”, Persimmon Homes would object to the need to provide “extra garage space” as it should be noted that Durham County Council do not count garages as parking spaces and therefore they are deemed to be used purely for storage purposes therefore the need to provide extra space to store specific items is unnecessary and unjustified.</p> <p>Providing “extra garage space” would render integral house types undeliverable within the Neighbourhood and would unnecessarily impact on the development viability and affordability of homes through increasing build costs. For new homes provided with a garage this policy requirement should be met simply through the provision of a standard sized garage.</p> <p>For dwellings where no garage is provided this option would not be available to meet the requirement and further provisions would have to be made.</p> <p>As modern buggies and prams are both costly and collapsible it is considered that occupiers would store these items indoors and as such the need to provide an outdoor space for their storage is unnecessary. Similarly given the cost of powered wheelchairs and mobility scooters and the value of them to their users in terms of facilitating their mobility it is again unlikely that occupiers would store these items outdoors due to the threat of them being stolen.</p>	<p>c3. Objection to Policy T4</p>	<p>Consider objection to policy.</p>

Therefore it remains that the only item listed likely to be stored outdoors would be bicycles. As such the need to provide a power supply would fall away. In addition to this however Persimmon Homes feel it is wholly inappropriate and unjustified to require all new dwellings (without a garage) to provide two covered cycle spaces as on moving into their new home purchasers will have the option of placing a shed or installing a cycling loop to secure their bicycles to in their own rear gardens if they have the need for such a provision.

Being forced to provide this to every new dwelling regardless of the occupiers need or demand for such a provision will seek only to increase house prices of new homes, reducing affordability, and increase the overall development cost, potentially to detriment of the viability. The proportion of purchasers who firstly own a bicycle and secondly wish to securely store it outdoors can install their own preferred form of storage as and when they see fit.

For the above reasons Persimmon Homes request that Policy T4.1 is deleted.