

**THEME 5: A CITY WITH AN MODERN AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE  
PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION FOR CONSIDERATION  
18 April 2018**

The comments for Theme 5 that raise planning issues or actions that need consideration are listed below.

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

The issues for consideration are listed under a general section and then under each policy. For clarity, under each section only the relevant text in the columns is included. Similar comments have been grouped together as far as is possible.

## Contents

	Page No:
<b>General comments about theme, or relevant across policies</b>	4
• Air quality	4
• Bus station	6
• Car parking (including electric car charging)	8
• Children, disabled and elderly people	10
• Cycling (including conflict with needs of pedestrians)	11
• Other	18
• Projects	27
• Maps	33
<b>Policy T1: Accessibility of proposed developments</b>	43
• Aykley Heads and larger business developments	43
• Cycling and walking: balance	44
• Children, disabled and elderly people	45
• Signage and information	46
• Other	47
<b>Policy T2: Designing for sustainable transport</b>	51
• Aykley Heads and larger business developments	51
• Cycling and walking: balance	52
• Children, disabled and elderly people	52

• Signage and information	53
• Other	54
<b>Policy T3: Residential Car Parking in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)</b>	56
<b>Policy T4: Residential Storage for Cycles and Mobility Aids</b>	60

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
<b>General comments about theme, or relevant across policies</b>		
Sub sections below cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality</li> <li>• Bus station</li> <li>• Car parking (including electric car charging)</li> <li>• Children, disabled and elderly people</li> <li>• Cycling (including conflict with needs of pedestrians)</li> <li>• Other</li> <li>• Projects</li> <li>• Maps</li> </ul>		
<b>Air quality</b>		
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.	c2. Support for cycle network (addressed by Policies T1/T2 and Map 12) c3. Suggestion that routes should avoid roads with poor air quality.	Consider policy wording regarding air quality and connectivity with wider network.
Q57 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.	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.	Consider changing text in Theme 5 to demonstrate how the Plan is addressing air quality concerns. Note para. 4.19.
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.	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	Consider changing text in Theme 5 to demonstrate how the Plan is addressing air quality concerns. Note para. 4.19.

	aims of policies T1 and T2, and Projects 2, 7, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21.	
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.	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.	Consider changing text in Theme 5 to demonstrate how the Plan is addressing air quality concerns. Note para. 4.19
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.	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.	Consider changing text in Theme 5 to demonstrate how the Plan is addressing air quality concerns. Note para. 4.19.
WC49 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 certain vehicles, primarily diesel, despite their own data showing that this	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.	Consider changing text in Theme 5 to demonstrate how the Plan is addressing air quality concerns. Note para. 4.19.

<p>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>WC163          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>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>Consider changing text in Theme 5 to demonstrate how the Plan is addressing air quality concerns. Note para. 4.19.</p>
<p><b>Bus station</b></p>		
<p>EQ15          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.</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies and relationship to Theme 3</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>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</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies, and relationship to Theme 3</p>

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		
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.	c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.	Consider Theme 5 policies and relationship to Theme 3.
Q32 Buses exiting the bus station are a menace!	c3. Concern about current bus station.	Consider Theme 5 policies, and relationship to Theme 3. Consider addition to Map 11. [Also included under Maps]
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	c3. Concern regarding relocation of bus station.	Consider Theme 5 policies, and relationship to Theme 3
Q64 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	c3. Concern regarding bus station and (presumably) North Road Methodist Church.	Consider Theme 5 policies and relationship to Theme 3
Q66 In my experience, the bus station operates efficiently and is not intrusive.	c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.	Consider Theme 5 policies. And relationship to Theme 3
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	c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.	Consider Theme 5 policies and relationship to Theme 3
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..	c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.	Consider Theme 5 policies and relationship to Theme 3.
WC89 Comment on your post "Theme 5: A City With a Modern and	c2. Concern regarding bus station	Consider Theme 5 policies on bus

<p>Sustainable Transport Infrastructure"</p> <p>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>	relocation.	station and relationship to Theme 3
<p>WC118</p> <p>It goes without saying that proposals to move the bus station and destroy the North Road in pursuit of some phantom benefit are without merit.</p>	c3. Concern regarding bus station relocation.	Consider Theme 5 policies on bus station, and relationship to Theme 3
<p>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.</p> <p>The text relating to the operation of public transport services and existing infrastructure is also an individual groups views and is not necessary.</p>	c5. Objection to text relating to the bus station and public transport services.	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".
<p><b>Car parking (including electric car charging)</b></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>	c5. Suggestion for addition to objectives to cover management of car parking.	Consider objectives.
<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>	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 parks" (assume this means public car parks, rather than County Hall).	Consider Theme 5 policies in relationship to Theme 3 after seeking clarification from respondent.
<p>EQ15 PS As a disabled person, Durham is IMPOSSIBLE to access or get around with safety and confidence. Pavements are horribly uneven (try using</p>	c3. Concern re disabled access.	Consider policies re disabled access. [Also included in Maps]

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!		
EQ18 Agree [Theme 3] if appropriate parking integrated into commercial/business sites to avoid congestion elsewhere Copied from Theme 3	c3. Suggesting car parking provision in commercial and business sites.	Consider in relation to DCC parking policy.
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.	c3. Concern regarding student car parking.	Consider policies
Q28 ... Resident parking / car ownership may improve with better public transport which must be safe affordable reliable	c2. Comment on reducing car dependence through better public transport. Addressed by Theme 5 policies.	Consider policies
Q49 Need more car free areas Copied from Theme 1 Need to extend parking controlled areas	c3. Suggestions regarding parking control.	Consider policies/projects, particularly Project 19. [Also included under Projects]
Q76. Electricity charging points should be included in all schemes.	c3. Suggestion for policy on electric vehicle charging.	Consider Theme 5 policies. May be covered already by County Council policies.
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.	c3. Suggestion for parking policies relating to community arts facilities.	Consider Theme 5 policies and Project 19. May already be covered adequately by Durham County Council policy. [Also included under Projects]
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.	c3. Suggestion for more electric charging points for vehicles.	Consider Theme 5 policies.

...		
L5. ... 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.	c3. An increase in electric car charging stations suggested.	Consider Theme 5 policies (may be adequately covered by existing DCC policy).
L9b. 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 free parking at major employment sites.	The objection is inaccurate, as the DCSTS refers to substantial parking at County Hall and Durham University.
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.	c3. Advising caution on relying on electric vehicles as the future of motorised road traffic. Addressed partly by user hierarchy in paragraph 4.180.	Consider Theme 5 policies.
<b>Children, disabled and elderly people</b>		
EQ15 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.  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!	c2. Concern about travel to schools.  c3. Concern re disabled access.	Check Theme 5 policies cover school journeys from new housing.  Consider policies re disabled access. [Also included in Maps]
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	c3. Concern regarding access for older residents.	Check that policies cover the needs of elderly people adequately and ensure consistency across themes.
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	c3. Expresses doubt that Durham could be suitable for disabled or elderly people.	Check that policies cover the needs of elderly and disabled people adequately and ensure consistency

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		across themes.
<p>Q68 Making places or buildings accessible to all makes life easier for everyone. 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>	c3. Concern regarding building access.	Consider policies across Plan.
<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>	c3. c4. Concern about lack of disabled parking in the market place, the Cathedral and Palace Green.	Consider Theme 5 policies or projects. [Also included under Projects]
<b>Cycling (including conflict with needs of pedestrians)</b>		
<p>Q32 Durham unfortunately suffers from its topography to make it cycle friendly.</p>	c2. Expresses doubt regarding suitability of Durham for cycling.	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.
<p>EQ35 Durham is a town that need to factor in a number of commuter issues and the access &amp; 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</p>	c3. Concern regarding Map 12 and city centre cycling provision.	[Also included under Maps]  Consider amending map or policy wording / para 4.196.

<p>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?.</p> <p>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.</p>	c5. Suggestion regarding Map 12, but partly outside remit (outside area).	Consider amending map or policy wording.
EQ40 More places to lock bicycles in the city would, I am sure, encourage cycling.	c4. Suggestion for more cycle parking in city.	Consider policy / project. [Also included under Projects]
<p>EQ47 The following comments are directed to the draft Durham City Neighbourhood Plan Transport Theme, particularly the "Possible Cycle Network".</p> <p>Given that the stated fundamental action of a Neighbourhood Plan is to <b>"give people more control over the development of their local area "</b> by <b>"giving communities the power to set priorities for local development through neighbourhood planning"</b>;</p> <p>the plan preparation process should be transparent and Durham City residents are entitled to clear answers to the following questions:-</p> <p>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?</p> <p>2.How were the "transport priorities identified and the theme format" devised?</p> <p>3.By what procedure and by whom, was the transport theme "Champion" selected?</p> <p>4.a) Why was a dedicated spokesperson for cycling campaign groups, given exclusive authorship of such a "multi-user" topic?</p> <p>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",</p> <p>When analysed objectively, the "transport theme" is demonstrably preoccupied with promoting cycling and the self interests of cyclists and</p>	<p>c5. Concern regarding Map 12.</p> <p>c3. Concern regarding process of policy formation.</p> <p>c3. Concern regarding selection of transport theme convenors.</p> <p>c3. Concern regarding balance of theme, but does not suggest</p>	<p>Concern noted.</p> <p>Check the priority survey responses. Could ask respondent for examples of concerns which have allegedly not been considered.</p> <p>Review process undertaken for probity?</p> <p>Consider policy balance. Could ask respondent for suggestions.</p>

<p>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"> <li>• No objective data or evidence of fact or substance, regarding any quantitative assessment of need.</li> <li>• No assessment of financial implications; neither any consideration of likely costs and benefits, nor the consequential demands upon finite resources.</li> <li>• No evaluation of the practicable delivery of proposals.</li> <li>• No impact assessment upon pedestrians.</li> <li>• No impartial or objective surveys of pedestrians, taxi drivers, tourists or any road vehicle users.</li> <li>•No analysis of possible adverse effects upon traffic flows by any significant increase in cycling.</li> <li>•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.</li> <li>•No significant alternatives to increasing cycling in order to mitigate the effects of vehicular traffic, in and through Durham City have been entertained.</li> </ul> <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.          If retained within the draft Durham City Neighbourhood Plan, I suggest that</p>	<p>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>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>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. <i>Declaration of Interest</i></p> <p>8.1 <i>All forum members must:</i></p> <p>8.1.1 <i>.....proposed transaction or arrangement ..... ;</i></p> <p><i>and</i></p> <p>8.1.2 <i>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).</i></p> <p>(ii) “The Good Governance Standards for Public Services”, produced by “The Independent Commission on Good Governance in Public Services” states: <i>“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.</i></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>Q42 T1: Cycling on Milburngate Bridge should be only in a defined cycle lane. It is hazardous to pedestrians at the moment.</p>	<p>c5. Concern over unsuitable shared pedestrian cycle facility.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies in relation to primacy of pedestrian provision. [Also included under Maps]</p>
<p>Q56 Properly segregated routes for pedestrians (&amp; 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>c3. In favour of segregated routes for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	<p>Consider policies and need for segregation.</p>
<p>Q68 As member of the “Durham City Access for all” I am against this when it involves shared footpath use. 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</p>	<p>c3. c5. Concern about pedestrian/cyclist shared paths, cycling on Silver Street, and confusion from cycling being permitted on some</p>	<p>Consider amending Maps 11 and 12. Check that policies strike the correct balance between pedestrian and cyclist safety. [Also included</p>

<p>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>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>pavements, particularly in relation to those with slow reactions, sight or hearing problems. Examples of other locations given.</p>	<p>under Maps]</p>
<p>Q74 (2) * Dedicated cycle ways essential * Some way to control unsafe behaviour of road users ie CYCLISTS</p>	<p>c3. Take this comment as support for dedicated cycle facilities rather than paths shared with pedestrians?</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies to ensure safety of pedestrians.</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>Consider Theme 5 policies and Maps 11 and 12. [Also included under Maps]</p>
<p>EM14 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</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. [Also included under Maps]</p>

<p>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>WC99 Comment on your post "Policy T2" The Sidegate Residents Association made the following general points about sustainable transport: ... * routes have to be arranged to avoid conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. Most pavements are too narrow for shared use in the city.</p>	<p>c3. Need to avoid conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, observing that most pavements are not suitable for sharing.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies and Maps 11, 12 [Also included under Maps]</p>
<p>WC113 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 &amp; Southfield Way, where there is ample room for widening.  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>c3. c5. Concern over shared pedestrian/cyclist provision and suggestions for Maps 11, 12.  c2. Observation that the rise in popularity of e-bikes could lead to more people taking up cycling in Durham.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies and amending maps. [Also included under Maps]  Consider amending para E7 to refer to e-bikes.</p>
<p>WC186 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</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion for additional cycle parking. Unclear if public or</p>	<p>Consider public cycle parking and e-bikes in relation to DCC policy.</p>

Durham. Secure parking for cycles is also necessary.	residential. Residential storage addressed by Policy T4. Public cycle parking covered by DCC policy.	
<p>WC202</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 new 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.</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.	Consider Theme 5 policies on cycle parking.
<p>L5. There is concern that proposed cycle routes through the City would impinge on the safety of the City user in areas which are [predominantly] 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.</p>	<p>c3. Concern about the impact of creating cycle routes through the 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>Consider Theme 5 policies and Map 12. [Also included under Maps]</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>
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	c5. Objection to statements attributing low cycling levels to poor cycling infrastructure.	It would be useful if DCC could share any evidence backing up this assertion.

expected number of people cycling.		
<b>Other</b>		
EQ05 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	c2. Concern regarding transport and parking accessibility in relation to employment.	Consider theme policies in relation to employment.
Q07 91.4 (?G1.4) Public rights of way need improvement & signage Copied from Theme 2a	c2. Concern about footpaths and signage. Partially addressed in Policies T1/T2.	Consider signage aspects for projects or policies.
Q18 A walkable & cycle friendly city requires the connectivity (Theme 2b) of the Green Infrastructure to work in tandem. Copied to Theme 2b	c3. Non-specific comment on co-ordination of Themes 2b and 5.	Consider policies and consistency across Themes 2b and 5.
Q24 No mention of electric car charging or community bikes. No mention of electric real time information systems	c3. c4. Suggestions of policies/projects for electric car charging, community bikes and real time information system.	Consider policies or projects. [Also included under Projects]
Q35 North Rd has been greatly improved. Lower Claypath needs similar treatment. Once the PBSA is fully functional the footfall will be huge.	c4. Suggestion for additional policy/project for improving Lower Claypath.	Consider policy/project. [Also included under Projects]
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.	c5. Suggesting change to vision statement.	Consider wording of vision statement.
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	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.	Check the policies cover access to shops, schools and workplaces for new developments.

<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>Q57 Reduced speed limits on roads – particularly at schools – 30mph max – preferably 20mph would make Durham safer. Durham seems to give cars priority over pedestrians.</p>	<p>c4. Suggestion for project or policy on 20mph zones.</p>	<p>Consider for project or policy. [Also included under Projects]</p>
<p>Q75 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 particularly for transport access to Aykley Heads.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies in conjunction with Theme 3 and Project 6. [Also copied to Projects]</p>
<p>WC75 Pressure on the pavements in the city is likely to increase if the University 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>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>WC126 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>c4. c5. Suggestions on public transport including bus subsidy and Metro extension.</p>	<p>Consider supporting text and projects. [Also included under Projects]</p>

<p>WC138 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>c3. Suggestion regarding lighting policy: could apply to paths.</p>	<p>Consider relevant Theme 5 policies and other policies across the Plan to incorporate lighting policy.</p>
<p>WC164 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 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>c2. Concern over pavement congestion. Addressed in Policy T1 and Map 11..</p>	<p>Consider particular acknowledging issue of student pedestrians in supporting text.</p>
<p>WC174 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>WC187 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>	<p>c5. Concern regarding paragraph 4.174.</p>	<p>Consider amending supporting text.</p>

<p>WC206 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>c3. Concern over provision for necessary car journeys.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies.</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>c3. Concern that policies should enable walking and cycling routes to make smooth connections beyond the Plan area.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies with respect to what can be said about connections outside the Plan area.</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: ... 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 reconsider the comments previously provided.</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 identified: some have been addressed and others were discussed with officers at a meeting</p>

		<p>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</p>
--	--	--

		apply and which were not set out in the detailed formal response to the public consultation.
<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 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</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 prescribed by the DCNP, deliverability and effectiveness.</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, and retain any which can be justified.</p>

<p>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>c3. Concern that policies that differ from the forthcoming County Durham Plan will be superseded.</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 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)</p>	<p>c5. Suggestion to add support of economic growth and access to education and training to objectives.</p>	<p>Consider suggestion.</p>

<p>(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>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>Consider text</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>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 evidence if the DCC can provide this.</p>
<p>L9b. At 4.5.3 the inclusion of additional justification over and above that which set out below each policy is questioned.</p>	<p>c5. Concern regarding overall justification section.</p>	<p>Note that this format is followed in all themes apart from Theme 1. Discuss with officers how best to</p>

<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>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. Suggestion that the justification of the policies be reconsidered.</p> <p>c5. Matter of fact to be corrected in paragraph 4.186.</p>	<p>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> <p>This can be tackled in conjunction with the discussion of the Theme 5 policies with officers.</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>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 would welcome more circular bus routes, subsidised by the University, to ease pedestrian traffic into the City (particularly from the colleges along the A167).</p>	<p>c3. c4 Support for new bus routes to the University. Partly addressed by Project 16.</p>	<p>Consider explicit mention of services to the University in the project or the supporting text for policy T1.</p>
<p><b>Projects</b></p>		

<p>EQ13 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>Consider project.</p>
<p>EQ15 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.</p>	<p>c4. Suggestion for project.</p>	<p>Consider project.</p>
<p>Q07 91.4 (?G1.4) Public rights of way need improvement &amp; signage Copied from Theme 2a</p>	<p>c2. Concern about footpaths and signage. Partially addressed in Policies T1/T2.</p>	<p>Consider signage aspects for projects or policies.</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 by Bus etc. company and thus frustrating / unusable. Coherent &amp; communicated recycling firm across the city = coordinate w/ Uni as theirs is bad too. Copied to Theme 1</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion regarding signage and footpath management. c4. Suggesting better website for buses. Relates to Project 16.</p>	<p>Consider policies T1 and T2 or project. [Also included under Policies T1 and T2] Consider adding 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. [Also included under General]</p>
<p>Q32 There are too many narrow footpaths – eg Margery lane → University library – and too many paths blocked by advertising 'A' signs – North Rd &amp; Silver St. Cycle riding is suicidal.</p>	<p>c2. Concern about A-boards: outside remit (not a planning issue), but could be included in Project 17. c2. Can either be read as support for safer cycling infrastructure (addressed by Policies T1, T2 and Map 12), or as</p>	<p>Consider Project 17 and Map 11 in relation to advertising boards. [Also included under Maps] Consider noting in Project 17 that safety measures for cyclists (from bad motor vehicle driving) and</p>

	an objection to cycling altogether, but in the context of the other remarks the former seems more likely.	safety measures for pedestrians (from bad motor vehicle driving and from bad cycling behaviour) will be required.
<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>I am in favour of the northern bypass – the queues at the roundabouts are huge &amp; the air pollution is above legal limits. The footpath beside the river from Framwellgate Bridge to Prebends Bridge is now very safe &amp; 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>c4. Suggestion for project to promote riverside footpath.</p>	<p>Consider policy/project. [Also included under General]</p> <p>Consider signage/promotion as project.</p>
EQ40 More places to lock bicycles in the city would, I am sure, encourage cycling.	c4. Suggestion for more cycle parking in city.	Consider policy / project. [Also included under General]
EQ52 It is important that development promotes public transport / green transport methods . 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	c4. Suggestion relating to taxis (potentially addressed through Project 21)	Consider project 21 wording.
EQ54 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	c5. Concern for pedestrian safety on Saddler Street.	Consider projects. Consider amending Map 11. [Also included under Maps]
Q48 Development at Aykley Heads should be limited to avoid traffic congestion at the small roundabout at the hospital. Copied from Theme 3	c3. Concern about congestion if Aykley Heads overdeveloped.	Consider policies T1, T2 in relation to Economy Theme and Project 6. [Also included under Policy T1, T2]
Q49 Need more car free areas Copied from Theme 1	c3. Suggestions regarding parking	Consider policies/projects,

Need to extend parking controlled areas	control.	particularly Project 19. [Also included under General]
<p>Q57 Less car parking in the city centre should be the incentive with more pedestrianisation.</p> <p>T2. Train and bus links are good in Durham, however, access to each is not good.</p> <p>T3. Extending the Residential Car Parking in the Controlled Parking Zone would be welcome.</p> <p>Reduced speed limits on roads – particularly at schools – 30mph max – preferably 20mph would make Durham safer. Durham seems to give cars priority over pedestrians.</p>	<p>c4. Suggestion for car parking reform which relate to Project 19.</p> <p>c4. Suggestion relating to Project 16.</p> <p>c4. Suggestion relating to Project 19.</p> <p>c4. Suggestion for project or policy on 20mph zones.</p>	<p>Consider Project 19.</p> <p>Consider Project 16 wording.</p> <p>Consider project suggestion.</p> <p>Consider for project or policy. [Also included under General]</p>
<p>Q57 Reduced speed limits on roads – particularly at schools – 30mph max – preferably 20mph would make Durham safer. Durham seems to give cars priority over pedestrians.</p>	c4. Suggestion for project or policy on 20mph zones.	Consider for project or policy. [Also included under General]
<p>Q68 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. 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>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>c5. Concern regarding surfaces on Silver Street.</p> <p>c1c. Pavement surfaces for existing highways and advertising boards outside remit (not a planning issue), but could be highlighted in Project 17.</p> <p>c3. c4. Concern about lack of disabled parking in the market place, the Cathedral and Palace Green.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11 and Project 17. Surface materials may also relate to Theme 2a policies. [Also included under Maps]</p> <p>Consider Theme 5 policies or projects. [Also included under General]</p>
<p>Q69 Proposals should be considered for improving the accessibility of the</p>	c4. Suggestion for project re railway	Consider projects, e.g. Projects 16,

<p>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>station access.</p>	<p>17</p>
<p>Q75 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 particularly for transport access to Aykley Heads.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies in conjunction with Theme 3 and Project 6. [Also copied to General]</p>
<p>EM1. And spend a little more on North road Maintenance.</p>	<p>c4. c5 Desire for better maintenance of North Road</p>	<p>Consider projects on Map 11. [Also included under Maps]</p>
<p>WC2 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.</p>	<p>c1b/c4. Suggestion for extension of CPZ to Gilesgate Green or city-wide. Issues regarding contractors' vehicles and business permits. Partly outside remit (for Council) but also addressed in Project 19.</p>	<p>Consider Project 19.</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 and night. Buses driving far too 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>c2. c5. Concern about North Road, some of which could be added to Map 11 (flooding; chewing gum). Taxis/buses/youths outside remit (for Council/other bodies) but see also Project 21.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11. Consider Project 21. [Also included under Maps]</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</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</p>	<p>Consider policies T1 and T2 in conjunction with Theme 3 and Project 6. [Also included under Policy T1, T2]</p>

<p>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>Plan. c1a. Relief road outside remit (outside area)</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 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 &amp; 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>PROc4. Suggestions for projects encompassing improvements to the rail and bus stations and additional Park &amp; Ride sites.</p>	<p>Consider projects, particularly Projects 7, 16, 19, 20.</p>
<p>WC95 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.</p>	<p>Consider amending policies T1 and T2, Map 11 or Project 17 to refer to speed limits. [Also included under Policy T1, T2, Maps</p>
<p>WC121 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.</p>	<p>c4. Suggestion for project or policy for better bus route information. Concern generally about poor bus services and expense of using buses.</p>	<p>Consider amending Project 16 or additional project. Consider policies T1 and T2 to enhance travel information. [Also included under Policies T1, T2]</p>

<p>WC126 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>c4. c5. Suggestions on public transport including bus subsidy and Metro extension.</p>	<p>Consider supporting text and projects. [Also included under General]</p>
<p>WC181 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>c4. Suggestion for city-wide CPZ which could be picked up in Project 19.</p>	<p>Consider project 19.</p>
<p>WC188 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>c4. Reduction of pavement obstructions desired. Outside remit (not a planning issue) but could be mentioned in Project 17.</p>	<p>Consider pavement obstructions in Map 11 or Project 17. [Also included under Maps]</p>
<p>L5. 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>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 hazardous street clutter, including Map 11 and Project 17. [Also included under Maps]</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</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>

scheme by a simple majority.		
<b>Maps</b>		
EQ13 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.	c5. Concern regarding cycling provision in inner part of city and tracks such as Clay Lane. Concern regarding danger to pedestrians from cyclists.	Consider Map 11 and Map 12 and policies T1, T2, and balance between pedestrian and cyclist needs. [Also included under Policies T1 and T2]
EQ15 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!	c3. Concern re disabled access.	Consider detailing additional issues on Map 11. [Also added to General]
Q07 Public footpath need improving on/around the Sands area. Copied from Theme 2b	c3. Suggesting footpath improvements.	Consider amending Map 11. Also addressed under Theme 2b. Need to ensure consistency across these themes.
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 -	c2. Concern over congested pavements. Addressed in Policy T1 (particularly 4.189).	Consider recording additional narrow pavements in Map 11.
Q32 There are too many narrow footpaths – eg Margery lane → University library – and too many paths blocked by advertising ‘A’ signs – North Rd & Silver St.  Buses exiting the bus station are a menace!	c2. Concern about A-boards: outside remit (not a planning issue), but could be included in Project 17.  c3. Concern about current bus station.	Consider Project 17 and Map 11 in relation to advertising boards. [Also included under Projects]  Consider Theme 5 policies, and relationship to Theme 3. Consider addition to Map 11. [Also included

		under General]
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)	c3. Concern regarding Map 12 and city centre cycling provision.  c5. Suggestion regarding Map 12, but partly outside remit (outside area).	[Also included under General]  Consider amending map or policy wording / para 4.196.  Consider amending map or policy wording.
EQ54 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	c5. Concern for pedestrian safety on Saddler Street.	Consider projects. Consider amending Map 11. [Also included under Projects]

Cathedral buses using it. Copied from Theme 2a		
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).
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.	c5. Suggestion for Map 11	Consider amending Map 11
Q57 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.	c5. Concern regarding bus station access.	Consider amending map.
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	c5. Objection to inclusion of Fieldhouse Lane on Map 11.	Consider amending Map 11.
Q68 As member of the “Durham City Access for all” I am against this when it involves shared footpath use. 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. 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. 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	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.	Consider amending Maps 11 and 12. Check that policies strike the correct balance between pedestrian and cyclist safety. Also included under General]

<p>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>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. 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>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. [Also included under Policies T1 and T2]</p> <p>Consider amending Map 11 and Project 17. Surface materials may also relate to Theme 2a policies. [Also included under 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>c3. c5 Concern about danger to pedestrians from cycling and balance of policies.</p>	<p>Consider Policies T1/T2 and Maps 11 and 12. [Also included under Policy T1 and T2]</p>
<p>EM1. And spend a little more on North road Maintenance.</p>	<p>c4. c5 Desire for better maintenance of North Road</p>	<p>Consider projects or Map 11. [Also included under Projects]</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. 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>Consider Theme 5 policies and Maps 11 and 12. [Also included under General]</p>

<p>EM14 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. [Also included under General]</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 and night. Buses driving far too 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>c2. c5. Concern about North Road, some of which could be added to Map 11 (flooding; chewing gum). Taxis/buses/youths outside remit (for Council/other bodies) but see also Project 21.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11. Consider Project 21. [Also included under Projects]</p>
<p>WC66 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</p>	<p>c5. Concern regarding Whinney Hill and particularly use with wheelchairs and buggies.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11</p>

<p>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>WC95 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.</p>	<p>Consider amending policies T1 and T2, Map 11 or Project 17 to refer to speed limits. [Also included under Policy T1, T2, Projects]</p>
<p>WC99 Comment on your post "Policy T2" The Sidegate Residents Association made the following general points about sustainable transport: * routes have to be arranged to avoid conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. Most pavements are too narrow for shared use in the city.</p>	<p>c3. Need to avoid conflict between cyclists and pedestrians, observing that most pavements are not suitable for sharing.</p>	<p>Consider Theme 5 policies and Maps 11, 12 [Also included under General]</p>
<p>WC113 I support the policy of improving provision of walking and cycling networks. Durham has poor infrastructure for both. In places the pathways for 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 &amp; Southfield Way, where there is ample room for widening.</p>	<p>c5. Suggestions for Map 11.  c3. c5. Concern over shared pedestrian/cyclist provision and suggestions for Maps 11, 12.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11.  Consider Theme 5 policies and amending maps. [Also included under General]</p>
<p>WC164 The north end of Hallgarth Street, leading to the junction with New Elvet, has</p>	<p>c5. Suggestions for Map 11 relating to</p>	<p>Consider amending map 11.</p>

<p>an excruciatingly narrow pavement on the left side going north, accessible in part only by one person at a time.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>	Hallgarth Street, the New Inn junction and New Elvet.	[Also included in General]
<p>WC170</p> <p>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 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>	c5. Various suggestions for improving Map 11.	Consider amending map 11 with the examples provided.
WC188		

<p>We welcome the references to the poor quality of pedestrian experience in the City. Many pedestrian surfaces are poorly maintained sand, 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>c4. Reduction of pavement obstructions desired. Outside remit (not a planning issue) but could be mentioned in Project 17.</p>	<p>Consider pavement obstructions in Map 11 or Project 17. [Also included under Projects]</p>
<p>WC195 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>c5. Expressing opinion that shared pedestrian/cycle path on Milburngate Bridge works well.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 12 to upgrade assessment of this route.</p>
<p>WC202 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 peninsular, 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.) 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>(Comments on cycle parking not being marked relate to the underlying Open Street Map tiles, not Map 12.)  c5. Suggestion to amend Map 12 regarding suitability of A167 cycle path and additional pressure when new student accommodation opens.</p>	<p>Consider amending map 12.</p>
<p>WC204 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>	<p>c5. Concern over Map 11 implying that footpath by River Browney should be made suitable for buggies.</p>	<p>Consider amending map. Consider access policy in conjunction with Theme 2b.</p>

<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 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>c5. Request for safe road crossing on Gilesgate Green.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11.</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] 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>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>c3. Concern about the impact of creating cycle routes through the predominantly pedestrianised city centre.</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 Map 12. [Also included under General]</p> <p>Consider hazardous street clutter, including Map 11 and Project 17. [Also included under Projects]</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</p>	<p>c5. Suggestion for additional problems to be added to Map 11 on North Bailey.</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11.</p>

<p>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>		
---	--	--

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
<b>Policy T1: Accessibility of Proposed Developments</b>		
Sub sections below cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aykley Heads and larger business developments</li> <li>• Cycling and walking: balance</li> <li>• Children, disabled and elderly people</li> <li>• Signage and information</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>		
<b>Aykley Heads and larger business developments</b>		
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. [Also included under Policy T2]
Q48 Development at Aykley Heads should be limited to avoid traffic congestion at the small roundabout at the hospital. Copied from Theme 3	c3. Concern about congestion if Aykley Heads overdeveloped.	Consider policies T1, T2 in relation to Economy Theme and Project 6. [Also included under Policy T2 and Projects]
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	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	Consider policies T1 and T2 in conjunction with Theme 3 and Project 6. [Also included under Policy T2]

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.	Plan. c1a. Relief road outside remit (outside area)	
<b>Cycling and walking: balance</b>		
EQ13 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.	c5. Concern regarding cycling provision in inner part of city and tracks such as Clay Lane. Concern regarding danger to pedestrians from cyclists.	Consider Map 11 and Map 12 and policies T1, T2, and balance between pedestrian and cyclist needs. [Also included under Policy T2 and Maps]
Q11 Cycle lanes are needed for safety, both of cyclists and of the pedestrians on pavements where speeding cyclists ride.	c3. Concern over shared pedestrian/cyclist provision.	Consider how Policies T1/T2 deal with shared provision. [also included under Policy T2]
Q26 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.	c3. Advocating separation of cycling and pedestrian paths.	Consider how Policies T1/T2 deal with shared/separated provision. [Also included under Policy T2]
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.	c3. c5 Concern about danger to pedestrians from cycling and balance of policies.	Consider Policies T1/T2 and Maps 11 and 12. [Also included under Policy T2 and Maps]
L23. We have concerns about the imbalance in information on walking routes 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	c3. c5. Suggestion that walking routes 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.	Consider Maps 11 and 12 and policies.

<p>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>EM14 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. [Also included under General]</p>
<p><b>Children, disabled and elderly people</b></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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>c3. Need for public transport accessibility for housing for elderly people, and for other developments.</p>	<p>Consider policies T1, T2. [Also included under Policy T2]</p> <p>Consider policy T1.</p>
<p>Q68 When the Market place was refurbished it was to encourage pedestrians.</p>	<p>c3. c5. Concern regarding lack of</p>	<p>Consider amending Map 11. Check</p>

<p>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>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>policies T1, T2 provide suitable guidance for kerbs associated with new development. [Also included under Policy T2 and Maps]</p>
<p>Q74 (1) Facilities for an ageing population are there for us all - &amp; demand will only grow. Copied to Theme 6</p>	<p>c3. Need for facilities for elderly people.</p>	<p>Consider needs of elderly in policies T1, T2, T4. [Also copied to Policy T2 and T4]</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. c5. Proposing policy wording regarding seating and handrails.</p>	<p>Consider policies T1 and T2 and accompanying text in relation to recommended design guidance to avoid duplication. [Also included under Theme 2]</p>
<p><b>Signage and information</b></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.</p>	<p>c3. Suggestion regarding signage and footpath management.</p>	<p>Consider policies T1 and T2 or project. [Also included under Policies T2 and Projects]</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. [Also included under Policy T2]</p>
<p>WC121 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.</p>	<p>c4. Suggestion for project or policy for better bus route information. Concern generally about poor bus services and expense of using buses.</p>	<p>Consider amending Project 16 or additional project. Consider policies T1 and T2 to enhance travel information. [Also included under Policies T2, Maps]</p>

<b>Other</b>		
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.	c3. Suggestion to strengthen support of sustainable transport.	Consider policy T1.
EQ54 The city needs more loading bays where people can get dropped off or collected and cheaper all day parking to reduce car journeys in and around the city centre.	c3. Ideas relating to car parking.	Consider policy T1.
WC95 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.	T1c3. Concern about traffic speeds on main student thoroughfares and support for widening pavements and providing cycle lanes.	Consider amending policies T1 and T2, Map 11 or Project 17 to refer to speed limits. [Also included under Policy T2, Maps, Projects]
L3 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.	c3. Aspiration for the plan to assist in developing new rights of way and links to green spaces beyond the neighbourhood area.	Consider amending Policy T1.2.4 to assist in realising this ambition, and relationship to Theme 2b
L4 It is also important to note that there are "hubs" which attract people, such as	c3. Suggesting that connectivity of	Consider Policy T1 and in

<p>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>development sites should be assessed also in relation to community facilities.</p>	<p>relationship to Theme 6</p>
<p>WC35 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)</p>	<p>c3. c5. Concern about wording of T1.2 and suggestion for change to 4.192.</p>	<p>Consider Policy T1 wording and supporting text.</p>
<p>WC195 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>c5. Concern that improvements for cycling and walking might be used to justify relief road building.</p>	<p>Consider supporting text. [Also included under Maps]</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>c3. Observation on scope of policy as currently drafted.</p>	<p>Discuss policy scope with officers to ensure a suitable definition of which criteria apply.</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. Concern over clarity of wording.</p>	<p>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>c2. Comment regarding status of the Active Travel (Wales) Act design guidance.</p>	<p>The status is understood, but it is observed that many councils are now adopting similar guidance (for</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>c3. Concern over lack of justification for paragraph 4.189, and reference to routes outside the Plan area.</p>	<p>example, North Tyneside). 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>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
<b>Table T2: Designing for Sustainable Transport</b>		
Sub sections below cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aykley Heads and larger business developments</li> <li>• Cycling and walking: balance</li> <li>• Children, disabled and elderly people</li> <li>• Signage and information</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>		
<b>Aykley Heads and larger business developments</b>		
Q48 Development at Aykley Heads should be limited to avoid traffic congestion at the small roundabout at the hospital. Copied from Theme 3	c3. Concern about congestion if Aykley Heads overdeveloped.	Consider policies T1, T2 in relation to Economy Theme and Project 6. [Also included under Policy T1 and Projects]
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.	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)	Consider policies T1 and T2 in conjunction with Theme 3 and Project 6. [Also included under Policy T1]
EQ42 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. Concern for traffic / access at larger business development sites.	Consider policies T1 and T2 in relation to E1 and E2 and Project 6. [Also included under Policy T1]

<b>Cycling and walking: balance</b>		
EQ13 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.	c5. Concern regarding cycling provision in inner part of city and tracks such as Clay Lane. Concern regarding danger to pedestrians from cyclists.	Consider Map 11 and Map 12 and policies T1, T2, and balance between pedestrian and cyclist needs. [Also included under Policy T2 and Maps]
Q11 Cycle lanes are needed for safety, both of cyclists and of the pedestrians on pavements where speeding cyclists ride.	c3. Concern over shared pedestrian/cyclist provision.	Consider how Policies T1/T2 deal with shared provision. [also included under Policy T1]
Q26 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.	c3. Advocating separation of cycling and pedestrian paths.	Consider how Policies T1/T2 deal with shared/separated provision. [Also included under Policy T1]
EQ20 Cycle lanes/storage should be designed to include motorcycles/scooters for those who are not disabled but physically incapable of cycling long distances	c3. Suggestion for Policies T2, T4.	Consider policy. [Also included under Policy T4]
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.	c3. c5 Concern about danger to pedestrians from cycling and balance of policies.	Consider Policies T1/T2 and Maps 11 and 12. [Also included under Policy T1 and Maps]
Q48 Provision for cyclists must not be at the detriment of pedestrians. Copied from Theme 1	c3. Concern about pedestrian-cyclist conflict.	Consider policies T1, T2. [Also included under Policy T1]
<b>Children, disabled and elderly people</b>		
EQ05 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	c3. Concern regarding provision for those using mobility aids.	Review Policy T2 regarding mobility aids.

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.		
Q68 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.	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).	Consider amending Map 11. Check policies T1, T2 provide suitable guidance for kerbs associated with new development. [Also included under Policy T1 and Maps]
Q74 (1) Facilities for an ageing population are there for us all - & demand will only grow. Copied to Theme 6	c3. Need for facilities for elderly people.	Consider needs of elderly in policies T1, T2, T4. [Also copied to Policy T1 and T4]
Q48 Ease of access must also include disabled people i.e. wheelchair users, blind, deaf and also people pushing prams.	c3. Concern for the needs of particular subsets of the population.	Consider policies T1, T2. [Also included under Policy T1]
Q68. T2. should also include disabled access	c3. Suggestion that disabled access needs be added to Policy T2.	Consider policy T2.
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. Proposing policy wording regarding seating and handrails.	Consider policies T1 and T2 in relation to recommended design guidance to avoid duplication. [Also included under Policy T1]
<b>Signage and information</b>		
EQ13 Walking and public transport should be encouraged and there is still need for much clearer and more frequent simpler signs - nothing pretentious.	c3. Suggestion re. signage.	Consider if signage covered by Policy T2.
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.	c3. Suggestion regarding signage and footpath management.	Consider policies T1 and T2 or project. [Also included under Policy T1 and Projects]
WC121		

<p>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 from 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.</p>	<p>c4. Suggestion for project or policy for better bus route information. Concern generally about poor bus services and expense of using buses.</p>	<p>Consider amending Project 16 or additional project. Consider policies T1 and T2 to enhance travel information. [Also included under Policies T1, Maps]</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><b>Other</b></p>		
<p>WC95 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>T2c3. Concern about traffic speeds on main student thoroughfares and support for widening pavements and providing cycle lanes.</p>	<p>Consider amending policies T1 and T2, Map 11 or Project 17 to refer to speed limits. [Also included under Policy T1, Maps, Projects]</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>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>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 status of Active Travel (Wales) Act design guidance.</p> <p>c2. Comment on need for County Council to agree infrastructure designs.</p>	<p>Status understood. Justification for stipulating this guidance is set out in paragraphs 4.197 to 4.199 and can be discussed with officers.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>c3. Concern regarding unintended consequences of the wording of T2.2.4.</p>	<p>Discuss detail of wording with officers.</p>

<p>predominant feature in transport unless it can impact on the parking of existing residents.</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>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
<b>Policy T3: Residential Car Parking in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)</b>		
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.	c3. Concern regarding overspill of car parking if insufficient provided.	Consider policy T3.
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 – The 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.
WC37 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	c3. Concern that policy might weaken the effect of the County Durham Parking and Accessibility Standards.	Consider policy T3.

<p>(a) that the satisfaction of conditions 1 to 7 would not in practice weaken the effect of minimum parking levels prescribed in the County Durham Parking and Accountability Standards, and</p> <p>(b) in what way condition 1 could in practice be demonstrated in advance of completion of any particular development.</p>	<p>c3. Concern over the practical application of T3.1.1.</p>	
<p>WC159</p> <p>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>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.</p> <p>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 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</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:</p> <p>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 specify a minimum not a maximum provision;</p>

<p>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>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>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</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>Consider clarifying wording, which implies that the policy will never require more parking provision than the DCC policy.</p>

<p>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>EQ05 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.</p>	c3. Concern regarding Policy T3.	Review Policy T3 regarding parking levels.
<p>EQ15 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.</p>	c3. Concern regarding car parking.	Consider Policy T3.
<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</p>	c3. Concern regarding student parking and HMOs.	Consider Policy T3 and D2.
<p>Q69 [PBSAs] Car parking will be an issue. PART Copied from Theme 4</p>	c3. Concern regarding PBSAs and car parking	Consider policy T3 or new policy, or change to Policy D3

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	COMMENT CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED
<b>Policy T4: Residential Storage for Cycles and Mobility Aids</b>		
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.	c3. Suggestion to add car charging points to policy.	Consider policy T4.
EQ31. Policy T4. should include provision for charging electric cars.	c3. Suggestion to add car charging points to policy.	Consider policy T4.
Q62. T4 – this is over the top for an individual property.	c3. Objection to policy on the grounds of being excessive for individual properties.	Consider policy T4.
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 development? Copied from Theme 4	c3. Suggestion to add car charging points to policy.	Consider policy T4.
WC184 I support these policies but add that secure public parking for cycles is necessary.	c3. Suggestion regarding secure public cycle parking also.	Consider public cycle parking policy.
<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>c3. c5. Concern over requirements of policy and the need for full justification.</p> <p>c3. Concern over storage provision at</p>	<p>Clarify points of misunderstanding. Discuss detail of text with officers, and what justification would be acceptable.</p> <p>Wording requires storage</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>the front of a dwelling.</p>	<p>“convenient <b>for</b> the front of the property”, not <b>at</b> the front. Should clarify this.</p>
<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>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>c3. Objection to Policy T4</p>	<p>Consider objection to policy.</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>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For the above reasons Persimmon Homes request that Policy T4.1 is deleted.</p>		
<p>EQ13 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>	c3. Suggesting change to policy T4	Consider changing policy.
EQ20 Cycle lanes/storage should be designed to include	c3. Suggestion for Policies T2, T4.	Consider policy. [Also included

motorcycles/scooters for those who are not disabled but physically incapable of cycling long distances		under Policy T2]
Q74 (1) Facilities for an ageing population are there for us all - & demand will only grow. Copied to Theme 6	c3. Need for facilities for elderly people.	Consider needs of elderly in policies T1, T2, T4. [Also copied to Policy T1 and T2]
L4 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?	c3. Suggesting policy for cycle parking at employment sites.	Consider policy T4 or additional policy (may already be covered adequately by Durham County Council policies).