

**2019 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION
CATEGORISATION OF COMMENTS AND PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED**

COMMENTS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY

18 September 2019

The comments have unique codes as follows:

- SEQ = electronic questionnaire response
- SQ = paper questionnaire response
- SEM = email response
- SWC = web comment

However, no personal details have been provided.

The letters making comments relevant to this theme are coded as follows:

- L2 = City of Durham Trust
- L3 = Durham Cathedral
 - L3a = Durham Cathedral Letter dated 05/07/2019
- L5 = Durham County Council
 - L5a = Durham County Council Covering email
 - L5b = Durham County Council Appendix
- L6 = Durham University
 - L6a = Durham University Response
 - L6c = Durham University Response dated 12/12/2017
- L8 = Historic England
 - L8a = Historic England, Letter on Plan
 - L8b = Historic England, Letter on Sustainability Appraisal
- L9 = Kier Property Ltd
- L10 = Nevilles Cross Community Association
- L11 = Northumbrian Water
- L12 = Resident1
- L16 = St Nicholas Community Forum
- L17 = Southlands Management Ltd
- L18 = WHS Coordinator
- L19 = Natural England

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 input into initiatives in 'Looking Forwards'
- c5: suggesting changes to the other text of the Plan

Comments of General Applicability

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
COMMENTS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY		
<p>SEQ4: I truly agree with this plan. It is written by those with deep understanding of the City and the many problems that have been allowed to happen. These include excessive student domination which causes huge problems to those still resident here (17,000 students and only 7,000 permanent residents). There needs to be far more control and reduction on student housing, there needs to be far more permanent residents again to give rise to a balanced community and there needs far greater support to independent city retailers and stricter control over the excessive and dominant number of bars, pubs, clubs, cafes and late night entertainment. Durham should try harder to restore its history and greenness and become a place to visit for interest and culture not just the drinking place it has become. Local people need to be listened to and this plan does do that and respond knowingly to what we need. The council plan has hardly changed from the previous submission and is written by those with little sympathy for the City and who are driven by economics above all other quality of life measures. The community needs to be healthy, well balanced and happy. Where are the family houses or accommodation for older persons? All possible sites have been given over to the university and its development. Where are the community spaces and halls and where are places of</p>	c2.	Support for Plan noted

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>cultural interest. Why do we have no museum, art gallery or similar? I fully endorse this plan and applaud it for understanding the City and the permanent community and also it's thoughtful long term ideas. {Resident DH1}</p>		
<p>SEQ6: {Part added to Themes 2b and Theme 5} ... Other thoughts. There is a problem with noise pollution in central Durham. 1. There are too many buskers in the centre, of very varying quality. Durham centre is also a place where people work in offices and, from my room in Elvet Riverside, the long sessions of often bad music coming from Elvet Bridge can sabotage concentration. 2. If you sit in any quiet corner or garden in the city, you will soon hear the aggressive noise of emergency vehicle sirens, if, that is, you are not hearing them already. The racket will continue like a artificial migraine for some time, followed by a period of silence before another one starts up. The vast majority are from the NE Ambulance Service and various FOI requests have suggested that the actual number of medical emergencies per day, either as call-outs or as transfers, is a great deal less (about 5 a day) than the frequent siren use would suggest. Members of the public can also see perfectly well that sirens are also being used when the roads are close to empty. University research work in my room in Elvet Riverside is something I have learnt to keep to a minimum to avoid the hideous freight noise coming from the main roads to the north. If walking around the city is not to become too much of an ordeal at times (for people on the autism spectrum for example) then action on this gratuitous nuisance must be welcome, if it is possible. {Part added to Theme 5} {Resident DH1}</p>	<p>c2. c1b. c1.b. c1.c.</p>	<p>Concern over noise pollution The County Council is responsible for dealing with noise nuisance The County Council has the powers to license and regulate busking. Sound proofing is covered by Building Regulations Comment noted</p>
<p>L12 Resident 1 {parts copied to Themes 3,4,6, Comments}</p>	<p>c5</p>	<p>Action. Correct typos / grammar / factual points. Notes:</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>2nd Contents page: Policy T1 is the only one not to have capitals for main words. It is the same in the main text on p.122.</p> <p>2nd Contents page: Appendix B title should have comma after “assets”.</p> <p>1.3: Instead of “compliance” (in both of the first two paras) I would prefer to see “in general conformity with the strategic policies...” The same issue arises with the use of “consistent” in 2.13. It is, in my view, correctly stated in 2.22.</p> <p>2.2: It would help to give the date of the Localism Act. 2011?</p> <p>2.10: This confuses me. Could there be designated economic sites in Zone 3a. If not, why not say that in the NP there are no designated housing or economic sites in Zones 3a and 3b? Policy S1 j) on p.23 refers to Zones 2 and 3. The same issue occurs again on pp.26-7 and in para 4.139. We need to get this clear and consistent.</p> <p>2.24: This twice has “the DCN Plan Forum” rather than “Planning”.</p> <p>2.26: Refers to accompanying reports but the Sustainability Report is not fully referenced and the Basic Conditions Report (Statement) is not yet completed.</p> <p>4.4: The last line should have “Plan” rather than “Planning”.</p> <p>4.26: “site” should be “Site”.</p> <p>4.28: “conservation areas” should also start with capitals.</p> <p>4.32: Insert comma between “environment” and “provides”</p> <p>4.39: Insert closing bracket after “landowners”.</p> <p>4.43: Omit commas after the first “City” and after “setting”.</p> <p>H2 on p.38: Sub-para n) is the same as k).</p> <p>4.53: The first sentence repeats what was said in 4.51. Should we add references to Crook Hall and Kepier Hospital in the summary of Framwellgate? They are very significant historical features.</p> <p>4.55 at the top of p.44: “properties” needs the apostrophe.</p> <p>4.67: This is very cryptic. It is dealt with fully in 4.95 and perhaps there could be a cross-reference.</p> <p>4.79: The reference to the ROWIP that follows the abbreviation looks like a sentence rather than a title, though there is no full stop.</p> <p>G1 on p.54: In the top section, omit “in” after “within”.</p> <p>4.86: This point is already made twice within the text of G1.</p>		<p>2.26 {Note: It is see sentence above, and there is a section of the website with SA and draft basic conditions}</p> <p>4.53 {Covered in Appendix A}</p> <p>p.96 {Note: Only the Proposals Maps have legal weight. That is why they are separately named and numbered. The other maps are for information/illustration only. In the previous plan one sequence of maps caused confusion. Make a clarification statement in 4.2 to 4.6}</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>4.87: This point has already been made in 4.70.</p> <p>4.91: In the last line it should be “value” rather than “values”.</p> <p>G2 on p.57: Need to identify it as Proposals Map 2 (as in 4.95).</p> <p>4.95, G2.1 on p.59: Insert “the” in “It provides iconic views to the WHS”.</p> <p>4.95, G2.2 on p.59: Insert “of” in “It provides important views towards and of the WHS....”</p> <p>4.95, G2.2 on p.59: The two sets of brackets after “adjacent fields” are confusing. I would suggest omitting the set after “St Mary’s College”.</p> <p>4.95, G2.2 on p.60: Insert “St” before “Aidan’s”.</p> <p>4.95, G2.3 on p.60: Should something follow “...are an integral part”? Of...?</p> <p>4.95, G2.7 on p.61: It should be “Neville’s” with the apostrophe.</p> <p>4.96: I think it would help to name the neighbouring parish or parishes. Is it just Bearpark?</p> <p>4.102 in sub-para 3: Should be “animal” rather than “animals”.</p> <p>4.103: This could be usefully expanded. I know that Visit County Durham is sponsoring a Church Trails project and the Pointers have some trails maps; both of these are in the City.</p> <p>4.110: It should be “Neville’s” with the apostrophe.</p> <p>4.114: Can we say that DU with 4000 employees is the most important employer when UHND has the majority of the Trust’s 7000 employees?</p> <p>4.116 last sentence: Four private schools are listed on p.172.</p> <p>4.118 first line: Replace “is” with “are”.</p> <p>4.133, Site E1.1 on p.79: In the penultimate line “meet” should be “meets”. The text includes a helpful reference to Policy S1. Could it also refer to S2 as it mentions the need for a master plan?</p> <p>4.133, Site E1.2 on p.80: The sentence that starts with “This suggests” is far too long and difficult to follow. When recast it would also benefit from references to S1 and S2 as for Site E1.1.</p> <p>E3 on p.85: In the first line we need to state that the number of the Proposals Map is 6.</p> <p>E5 sub-para c) on pp.90-91: This does not follow from the stem.</p> <p>4.153 on p.92: Omit a “the” from the first line.</p> <p>4.163: I don’t think the last line should mention “Colleges”. Proposals</p>		

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>Map 8 shows just six PBSAs. But should some of them be labelled as colleges?</p> <p>4.164: The second reference to Appendix C should give para numbers. p.96 And on the subject of maps, I've been confused more than once by the fact that we have two sets of maps with the same numbering: Proposals Maps that are listed in the Contents page, and others that appear without warning.</p> <p>4.175: Towards the end of the main para, it should be "three" rather than "four" possible allocations.</p> <p>4.175, D1.5 on p.101: After "mitigated" it should be "it" rather than "It". D2 on p.103, sub-para k): The reference should be to "T2 and T3".</p> <p>4.180: It would be helpful to define C4 and sui generis as well as C3. These are mentioned in the text of D3 but not fully defined.</p> <p>4.205 on p.114: Towards the end of the first para is should be "Ipsos" not "Ipsos".</p> <p>4.208: In the middle it should say "...uses 12 questions...." Plural.</p> <p>4.216: It should say "paras" Plural.</p> <p>Page 125, Policy T1, para a): Delete one of the "be"s in "...garages may be instead be provided...."</p> <p>4.257: First line should be "are" rather than "is".</p> <p>4.258: Is something missing after the final "Durham"?</p> <p>4.265: "Miners' Halls" and "Miners' Association" need apostrophes.</p> <p>4.269: Why say the evidence is "anecdotal"? It is a fact.</p> <p>5.1: In the middle it should be "The identification" rather than "The Identification".</p> <p>A6 on p.146: In the penultimate line it should be "Neville's" with the apostrophe.</p> <p>A7 on p.146: In the penultimate line delete "which".</p> <p>D3 on p.174: In the middle delete the second bracket after "Commute".</p> <p>D9 on p.178, last line: I understand that there is now a ticket scheme for Tyne and Wear that provides interoperability.</p> <p>D10: At peak travel times it is easier to go by train and metro to Newcastle Airport than to drive round the Western Bypass, especially if you live 2 minutes from Durham Station!</p>		

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
Reference on p.192: In the middle, the NPPF should be “2012”, not “202”.		
<p>SQ4 How is this to be achieved? We are Dream CIC and very interested in partnering to achieve your aims. email: dreamcharitycommunity@gmail.com Tel: 07895216171 {Work / run business}</p>	c2. c4.	<p>Offer of involvement in implementation This could be via 'Looking Forwards'</p> <p>Comment noted. Provide contact to Parish Environmental Committee</p>
<p>SQ7 It would be hard to disagree with any of these policies. {Resident DH1}</p>	c2.	Support for Plan noted
<p>SQ8 I agree with everything in this plan. I hope the council pays attention to it, before any more inappropriate developments spoil our city. {Resident}</p>	c2.	Support for Plan noted
<p>SQ10 Parts copied to Theme 1, 2b,3,4,Comments} I generally like the emphasis in the Plan on good stewardship of the city. {Resident DH1}</p>	c2.	Support for Plan noted
<p>SQ17 Very inspirational!! How realistic though?? Where is the drive & determination. Don't let party politics SPOIL everything. Put PEOPLE, PLACE AND COMMUNITY FIRST!! Business must thrive too. {Resident DH1}</p>	c2. c4.	<p>Support for Plan noted 'Looking Forwards' is an approach to implement change</p>
<p>SQ19 It is reprehensible that durham county council have obstructed this plan. It should have been in place much earlier. {Resident}</p>	c2. c2.	<p>Criticism of County Council. Comment noted Support for Plan noted</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>SQ21 Durham used to have well-regarded planning processes and outcomes, which seem to have been lost, to the obvious detriment of the City and its residents and visitors. Can we have back planning in the public interest, please, that benefits the "users" not the developers. {Resident DH1}</p>	c2.	Criticism of changes to the planning process. Comment noted.
<p>SQ22 Don't sell off Durham to students {Visits DH9 nearly all disagree}</p>	c2.	Concern over impact of students on City. Comment noted
<p>SQ24 {Parts copied to Comments, Theme5) Thank you for your time & efforts in working on the plan. It's a huge step forward. {Resident DH1}</p>	c2.	Support for Plan noted
<p>L18 WHS Coordinator {parts copied to Themes 1,2a,2b,3,4,5, Comments} The Neighbourhood Plan as refined from the previous draft is again particularly welcome in relation to its inclusion of the World Heritage Site (WHS) and its setting. The descriptions of heritage and how it relates to Durham and the support for the WHS Management Plan 2017 help the WHS Committee deliver its action plan. I would like to note policies of particular interest for the WHS and make comments as follows. {copied under the relevant themes}</p>	c2.	Support for Plan noted
<p>SEM2 Hi thank you for posting consultation draft. The first thing that strikes me before beginning to read it is that you are placing the onus on residents to travel purposely to pick up a copy of the questionnaire at key locations. We are being encouraged to engage and yet at the first post to</p>	c2.	Criticism of consultation process Dealt with by email correspondence at time explaining access routes to the draft plan and previous consultations held

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>do so the responsibility is placed on residents to do so. Some are more bake than others to do so. If the parish council were serious about resident public engagement and wish to encourage it I would like to ask why the questionnaire cannot be posted out to all residents please.</p> <p>I'm in favour of Parish council as it gives more power to residents and opens up simpler channels of communication yet appears to have stumbled at the first post.</p> <p>Please could you say why a questionnaire has not been posted out if the Parish Council are indeed carrying out a desire to engage as many people as possible?</p> <p>A second question please. How did you collate residents of the Pariah Council's opinions before making decisions as I don't recall being asked for my comments prior to the draft.</p> <p>I will comment on the plan once I've read it but felt the need to comment on the questionnaire because I truly hope Durham City has a council who wish to engage with their residents frequently. It was marketed as one of the advantages in having such small, local councils.</p> <p>I will purposely make a trip to one of the locations to pick one up and complete. Others may not be able to do so or they may not have access to a computer.</p>		
<p>SEM3 {Parts copied to Themes 1,2a,2b,3,6,Comments) Thank you for putting together the NPF proposal, which I assume allies with the County Plan and latest planning guidance. It is a useful review of the City planning and economic environment, however, it would be very useful to identify where the gaps lie between the current County guidance and this. I assume that this has been collated to address specific issues that are not covered by the County guidance.</p> <p>I have some specific comments in relation to recent events: {see under themes} ...</p>	<p>c2.</p> <p>c2.</p>	<p>Support for Plan noted</p> <p>Query re Neighbourhood and Local Plan alignment The Basic Conditions for a Neighbourhood Plan include the requirement for general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local plan. Currently, the relevant development plan is the Saved Policies of the City of Durham Local</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>Many thanks for all of your time in collating the plan and attempting to support the sustainability of the city. I hope some of the above comments make sense.</p>		<p>Plan 2004 as deemed compliant by Durham County Council with the NPPF.</p>
<p>SEM4 Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the Draft Neighbourhood plan. Having assessed the documents I can advise that we support the plan and policies and have attached a formal response letter. (L7)</p>	<p>c2.</p>	<p>Support for Plan noted</p>
<p>SEM5 {parts copied to Theme 5. Comments}</p>	<p>c2.</p>	<p>Correspondence re difficulties accessing website: beyond the Working Party's control. Some people had problems caused by a national ISP provider. Email correspondence at time</p>
<p>SEM6 {parts copied to Theme 4, Comments} We thank you for the opportunity to comment and wish you well going forward with the plan.</p>	<p>c2.</p>	<p>Support for Plan noted</p>
<p>SEM9 {parts copied to Themes 2a,3,4,5,Comments} I apologise immediately if this method of commenting on the Draft Plan does not fit your expectations of how such comments would be structured, but I confess that I found the "box-ticking" approach of the electronic questionnaire somewhat restrictive with, apparently, no opportunity to expand or clarify the choices. In any case I wished to confine comments to a fairly small number of topics and I trust that you will be able to "cut and paste" these into the appropriate sections in drawing results together. {see Themes}</p>	<p>c2.</p>	<p>Problem with electronic questionnaire. However, the questionnaire did provide a mechanism to give written comments in addition to ticking boxes. Email correspondence at time.</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>...</p> <p>SEM9 /cont (i) Strategic Policies Further information as to WHY such policies would be deleted needs to be included in the Plan.</p>	c2.	<p>Strategic policies. The Basic Conditions for a Neighbourhood Plan include the requirement for general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local plan, i.e. to provide finer-grained local policies. It does not require deletion of a policy in a Neighbourhood Plan because it is addressed as a strategic issue in the Local plan. Currently, the relevant development plan is the Saved Policies of the City of Durham Local Plan 2004 as deemed compliant by Durham County Council with the NPPF. Comment noted</p>
<p>SEM11 {parts copied to Theme 4,Comments} I would like to thank you for your work on the Neighbourhood Plan, particularly as I guess most, if not all of it, was carried out unpaid and took up hours of your time. Apologies not not being to comment on every item as it is very time-consuming, as I'm sure you know only too well. I particularly welcome the opportunity to comment on housing policy, following a frustrating moment in April 2019 when the Spatial Policy Team in Durham County Council told me that my one chance to comment on the Interim Policy on Student Accommodation had been during the consultation on the County Durham Plan (which closed in March 2019). Failing that I had to wait for another 10 years, or 5 years if the County Durham Plan had a mid-term review. I was not told that the Neighbourhood Plan could provide another opportunity.</p>	<p>c2.</p> <p>c2.</p>	<p>Support for consultation process noted</p> <p>Criticism of County Council. Comment noted</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>When I comment to you I feel that my comments are valued and given careful consideration, even if they touch on issues that are beyond your remit, and that you do not say 'it is what is' and 'nowt to be done'. Your approach is an example of the trust-building approach that the Raynsford Review of Planning concluded is urgently needed in the UK. I must emphasize that I am not anti-planners, as I recognise that they are in a difficult position trying to balance the interests of different stakeholders whilst constrained by planning law, and whatever they do, someone will always complain.</p> <p>But, sadly, my sympathy has been eroded following Durham County Council's East and Central planning committee's decision to approve the conversion of the Corner House from a C3 to a C4 property, even though both the officers and councilors had been presented with credible evidence (by residents, the Neville's Cross Community Association and the Parish Council) that their figure of 8.8% of HMO accommodation within 100 metres of the property might be inaccurate. They acknowledged the risk of inaccuracy, but nether put their decision on hold in order to seek out further information, nor said 'we need to improve our methodology'. That is not good decision-making.</p> <p>Since then I have been reading planning applications on Durham County Council's planning website, and am struck by the repeated failure of ordinary residents to have their views taken into full and proper consideration in decision-making. Whinney Hill residents are a particularly painful example - they appear to be up against the unspoken but very powerful assumption that it's inevitable that their housing estate (and whole swathes of the city centre) will be taken over by landlords renting to transient students, and that's the way it is, tough.</p> <p>So thank you Neighbourhood Plan for trying to develop a different and more progressive vision of Durham that benefits us all - I salute you!</p>		
<p>SEM13 {parts copied to Theme 5, Comments}</p>	<p>c2.</p>	<p>Support for Plan noted</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>Thank you to all involved in developing the plan and for putting in the hard work. I feel there is much to commend.</p>		
<p>L5a Stuart Timmiss Subject: Durham County Council's Response to Durham City's Neighbourhood Plan Dear Durham City Parish Councillors, In response to your public consultation on the latest draft Durham City Neighbourhood Plan please find attached the county council's detailed representations. As you are aware officers of this council have continued to offer their support to the Parish Council in preparing this neighbourhood plan. Whilst I am pleased to see that the plan has evolved as a consequence of this input, there are still a number of very important matters outstanding which are of significant concern to the county council. These principally relate to the scope of some of the policies proposed, their alignment with national policy, the clarity of wording and/or implications of some policies. This plan also continues to miss the opportunity to provide finer grained, locally distinctive policies which would supplement and add value to the national and local plan policy context. These concerns and potential solutions are set out in the attached appendix. I consider it pertinent to raise these matters at this stage in the plan making process. I do hope that you are able to take them on board in the next version of the neighbourhood plan. I would also like to take this opportunity to remind you of the availability of the support and the experience that this council can continue to offer in preparing the neighbourhood plan in order that the most appropriate and effective neighbourhood plan for the area can be secured which compliments and builds upon the national and local plan context. I would be happy to discuss this matter further. Kind regards</p>	<p>c2.</p>	<p>Covering letter to response City of Durham Parish Council letter sent in reply to the issues raised, with request for meeting with Parish Councillors. This will be made public on the website along with the completed categorisation documents and Red and Green files.</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>Stuart Stuart Timmiss Head of Development and Housing Durham County Council [See also L5b]</p>		
<p>L5b Durham County Council {parts copied to all Themes, Comments} The council would be happy to work closely with the Parish Council to address the concerns raised about this policy.</p>	c3.	<p>Concerns re policies During the workshops held with DCC staff in 2018 specialist officers offered to provide detailed feedback on policy wording and, if necessary, meetings with convenors to discuss these. Despite repeated requests from the Working Party these did not materialise. See the City of Durham Parish council letter in response to L5a.</p> <p>Substantive issues addressed under the individual Themes</p>
	c3,c5.	<p>Concerns re policies and accompanying text The detailed comments from the DCC are given and addressed under the individual themes. However, there are general points to be made about the types of comments the DCC has made. Some comments are very helpful, offering help with wording etc and pointing out flaws and how to address them. Some comments note flaws, but provide no guidance on how these flaws can be addressed. Some</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
	c3.	<p>state that the policy does not provide local context or distinctiveness, but with no guidance on how this can be achieved (note our response above about lack of specific help). Some comments note that the policy does not accord with the NPPF, but do not reference the relevant NPPF paragraph(s). Some comments note that the policy is not in accordance with the emerging CDLP, but do not reference the relevant CDLP policy numbers or paragraphs. See the City of Durham Parish council letter in response to L5a re general conformity between the Neighbourhood Plan and the CDLP.</p> <p>Concern re general conformity with strategic policies in the Local plan. The Basic Conditions for a Neighbourhood Plan include the requirement for general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local plan, i.e. to provide finer-grained local policies. Currently, the relevant development plan is the Saved Policies of the City of Durham Local Plan 2004 as deemed compliant by Durham County Council with the NPPF. The Neighbourhood Planning Forum (later subsumed under the City of Durham Parish Council) were</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
		informed by the DCC representative that the DCC's legal opinion was that the Working Group could only see information about the emerging County Plan once it had been made public.
<p>SEM16 {parts copied to Themes 1,2b,3,4,5, Comments}</p> <p>Forewords The Neighbourhood Plan is exemplary in its procedures and content. It deserves to be welcomed by the public, local groups and organisations and the County Council. In pursuit of that, perhaps it could be accompanied by a short further statement signed by supporting groups and organisations to demonstrate its widespread approval and relevance and their part in the preparation of the Plan.</p>	<p>c2.</p> <p>c5.</p>	<p>Support for Plan noted</p> <p>Changes to text of 'Forewords' Obtain input into forewards sections by Roberta and Elizabeth (this should be sufficient)</p>
<p>SEM16 /cont (i) The Climate Crisis and the Neighbourhood Plan Recent and growing concern about the climate crisis and the need for rapid transition to a low carbon economy suggests that neighbourhood plans will increasingly be judged by their effectiveness in these matters. Our Plan has been successful in doing this, but could benefit from more direct evidence that it is formative part of the development of the Plan. Here are some suggestions for changes in presentation to bring these concerns into a clearer focus. Challenges – Global, regional and local. This section could be restructured to show that these challenges that Durham faces are wide and serious and have been be factored into the strategy, policy and resilience of the Plan. The challenges could be expressed as: 1. The climate crisis. (At present, para. 2.10 only highlights the need to avoid development in the local flood plain rather than an existential challenge posed by climate change to be addressed within the Plan. This would relate directly to sustainability policyS1 as the Plan's response to this threat).</p>	<p>c5.</p>	<p>Changes to text of 'Challenges' section Make the suggested changes</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>2. A low carbon economy. (The challenge is to address the weakness of the local economy in part caused by the continual drain of resources in particular young people, skills and talent to London and the South East. The solution (which is first referred to in Figure 1) should be presented here ie innovation to create a low carbon economy by encouraging green jobs, technological innovation and green tourism) . There are three other challenges already covered. Perhaps we should be clearer that there are 5(?) challenges rather than the rather unstructured chapter we currently have.</p> <p>3. The growth of the University in an historic city. (The control of accelerating growth of the the University in a City incapable of accommodating the impact with consequences for the availability of affordable housing, the viability of shopping, and community cohesion. Durham City has the highest ratio of students to permanent residents in the UK could be mentioned.)</p> <p>4. The City as a focus for growth in the County. (Pressure for general development in and adjacent to a beautiful and historic city, and the consequences for its World Heritage Site and its setting.)</p> <p>5. Improve to benefit the lives of residents, employees and its visitors in terms of diversity, choice, and fairness.</p> <p>...</p>		
<p>SEM16 /cont (ii) Chapter 5: Monitoring the Plan Para 5.3 should perhaps extend the 3rd bullet point to read ‘ the sustainability principles within new development has (sic) been effectively applied within the context of adaptation and mitigation of climate change and the transition towards a low carbon economy’</p>	c5.	Changes to text of Chapter 5 Make the suggested changes
<p>SQ16 {parts copied to Themes 3,6, Comments} Plan needs to show more acknowledgement & tackling issue of University strategic/master plan. {Work / run business & student DH1}</p>	c5.	More coverage of University impact Comment noted
<p>SQ26</p>	c2.	Support for Plan noted

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
{parts copied to Themes 3,4,5, Comments} ... Otherwise a remarkably good Neighbourhood Plan. {Resident DH1}		
SQ29 {parts copied to Themes 4,5, Comments} This is a good plan. ... {Resident DH1}	c2.	Support for Plan noted
Kier (L9) SQ30 Whilst the need for conservation is recognised and accepted, the Policies as drafted do not adopt an approach which is proportionate to the level of impact as required by the NPPF. Please see the accompanying representations for further details and suggested Policy amendments. {i.e. L9)	c2.	General text in response Substantive issues addressed under the individual Themes
SQ31 Need to reclaim the city for the benefit of the local population and bring families back to the city. {resident DH1}	c2.	Concern over lack of a balanced community in the City Comment noted
SQ33 See L4		
SEQ7 I welcome this opportunity to comment on the Plan and am going to make a longer comment about Policies D2-5, either by emailing a letter or by going back into the website to find an online opportunity. {resident, work/run business, DH1}	c2.	Comment noted
SEQ8 {parts copied to Theme 4, Comments} We MUST protect and continue to enhance our beautiful city and not allow it to be destroyed and become like any other city in the UK. It is unique in it's heritage and this must be protected at all costs. Affordable housing is being sadly neglected, as an important issue and should be	c2. c2.	Support for Plan noted Concern re development impacts on the City Comment noted

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>addressed quickly. Whilst progress rolls on, the developers need to reigned in and attention brought back to the needs of the city's residents and not only it's student population. This Neighbourhood Plan, outlines all these issues and I feel should be warmly accepted for it's invaluable contents. {resident, DH1}</p>		
<p>L16 {parts copied to Theme 2a,2b,4,5, Comments} St Nicholas Community Forum is the residents' group for the centre of Durham City, encompassing The Peninsula, The Sands, and Claypath/ Lower Gilesgate. This area has a great deal of student housing both HMO and PBSA. We welcome much of what is in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, for example the protection of heritage and green spaces and promotion of sustainable travel. We do however have major concerns regarding the scale and pace of growth of Durham University because of the impact it brings, already out of balance with this small town. To date we have 17,000 students and only 7,000 residents.</p>	<p>c2. Support for Plan c2.</p>	<p>Support for Plan noted Concern over lack of a balanced community Substantive issues addressed under the individual Themes</p>
<p>L11 Northumbrian water {parts copied to Themes 1,2b,3,4,Comments} We previously provided a consultation response to the first draft of the plan in 2017 and took positive note of a range of issues identified within the plan particularly including the emphasis of sustainable development, management of natural resources and climate change. We welcome your aspirations to support and promote a long term sustainable future for the historic city centre. As the statutory water and sewerage undertaker we make comments only on issues which we feel are of relevance or have an impact on us and our operational duties. We understand that this Neighbourhood Plan is coming forward in advance of the County Plan by Durham Council and that policies may need to be reviewed in due course once the County Plan is adopted. The plan appears to have developed and been refined since the</p>	<p>c2. c2.</p>	<p>Support for Plan noted General text in response Substantive issues addressed under the individual Themes</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>previous iteration in 2017.</p> <p>We encourage all policies to adopt the principles of sustainable drainage and water management in order to support climate change, resilience and minimise flood risk.</p> <p>To conclude, in addition to earlier comments made on your previous draft plan we trust that the comments above will assist in taking the Neighbourhood Plan through to adoption and we look forward to seeing the vision implemented.</p>		
<p>L2 {parts copied to Themes 1,2b,4,5,6, Comments}</p> <p>The City of Durham Trust is warmly supportive of this document. The Plan sets out considered and lucid aims and principles for the future development of the central area of Durham City, rightly sensitive to its heritage, social make-up and natural environment.</p> <p>The Trust has had first-hand experience of the various pressures faced by the City since the abolition of the City Council in 2009. Many of the large-scale developments in the City since that time, and some before, have been damaging to its unique character, and the Neighbourhood Plan gives hope for mitigation and improvement in the future, even though the final say on planning applications still belongs to the unitary County Council.</p> <p>....The Trust particularly welcomes several elements of the Plan.</p> <p>...</p> <p>.....Finally, as several Trustees are also members of the Parish Council, it should be stated that, although they are aware of the Trust's endorsement of the Plan, they took no part in the preparation of this response, the content of which was unanimously agreed by those Trustees, the majority of the Board, who had no connection with either the Parish Council and/or the Neighbourhood Planning Forum.</p>	c2.	Support for Plan noted
<p>L9 {parts copied to Themes 1,2a,2b}</p> <p>These representations have been prepared on behalf of our Client, Kier</p>	c2.	Covering text to response Substantive issues addressed under the individual Themes

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>Property Ltd, in response to the Durham City Neighbourhood Draft Plan (“DCNDP”) Consultation. In short, whilst noting the importance of the conservation of key historic and environmental assets within Durham City there is also a need to ensure that proportionality and the planning balance is better represented within the DCNDP Policies. As such, Kier Property Ltd objects to the wording of a number of Policies within the DCNDP and suggested amendments are proposed to ensure they meet the basic Neighbourhood Planning conditions as required by law.</p> <p><u>The National Planning Policy Context</u></p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) states, at paragraph 37, that Neighbourhood Plans are required to meet certain “basic conditions” and “other legal requirements” before they can come into force. These conditions and requirements are specified in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The first basic condition as set out in the legislation above requires a Neighbourhood Plan to have regard “to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State”.</p> <p>Furthermore, paragraph 13 of the NPPF states that Neighbourhood Plans should support “the delivery of strategic policies contained within local plans or spatial development strategies”. It is within this context that these representations are made. Further commentary on specific policies is set out below.</p> <p><u>DCNDP Commentary</u> {See under the Themes 1,2a,2b}</p> <p>...</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>Whilst our client recognises the need to conserve and enhance Durham City in accordance with National Policy, Kier Property Ltd objects to the wording of a number of policies relating to masterplanning, flood risk, heritage and biodiversity on the grounds that they are either ambiguous or do not reflect the proportionate tests as set out within the DCDP, the NPPF and the NPPG. It is necessary for a Neighbourhood Plan to be prepared having regard to national planning policy and guidance as</p>	<p>c2.</p>	<p>Basic conditions (1) Compliance with NPPF (2) Conformity with Local Plan strategic policies The Basic Conditions for a Neighbourhood Plan include the requirement for general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local plan, i.e. to provide finer-grained local policies. Currently, the relevant development plan is the Saved Policies of the City of Durham Local Plan 2004 as deemed compliant by Durham County Council with the NPPF.</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>required by Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The suggested amendments outlined in these representations will assist the City of Durham Parish Council in ensuring the Neighbourhood Plan accords with the “basic conditions” established in legislation.</p> <p>...We would be obliged if the comments in this document and the requested amendment are taken into account during the final stages of preparing the Neighbourhood Plan and its subsequent examination. In the meantime, we would be most grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this submission and, if you have any queries with regard to this correspondence, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>{Receipt acknowledged.}</p>		
<p>L17 {parts copied to Theme1,2a,2b,3,4,Comments}</p> <p>We respond on behalf of our client Southlands Management Ltd who are property owners in the City. Our client also responded to the earlier consultation on the draft Neighbourhood Plan which ended on 18 December 2017.</p> <p>Our client’s comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan (2019) are explained below and structured by Theme. {see under Themes}</p> <p>...</p> <p>We have no further comments on the remaining part of the draft Neighbourhood Plan but reserve the right to provide further comments on any further iterations of the Plan.</p>	c2.	Covering text in response Substantive issues addressed under the individual Themes
<p>L10 Nevilles Cross Community Association {parts copied to Themes 2b,4,5,Comments}</p> <p>(i) The Neighbourhood Plan is out for consultation. It has been drawn up to reflect what residents, businesses and visitors have said are their priorities for planning policies to conserve and improve our city, including the Nevilles Cross area (and summaries and linked have already been circulated). It is vital that communities have the</p>	c2.	Covering text in response Substantive issues addressed under the individual Themes

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>opportunity to be involved in shaping the contents of the Plan. If over 50% of those who vote in a referendum give approval to the Plan it then becomes the statutory development plan by which, along with national and County planning policies, development and enhancement proposals within the City of Durham Parish are decided (relevant documents and sources were circulated to the NXCA membership earlier).</p> <p>(ii) In relation to the NX area, the NXCA had commented on the Plan's proposals for the Observatory Hill area, the former Shell garage and the policy on student HMOs, as well as any other matter relevant to an NXCA response.</p> <p>RECEIVED A presentation from John Lowe, secretary to the Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Working Party, on the background to the Plan, the process and status of the Plan and the final deadline for comments by 5th July.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED {See under individual themes}</p>		
<p>L3a Durham Cathedral {parts copied to Themes 2b,5,Comments} Thank you for consulting with us, for taking the time to meet myself and representatives from Durham University on site, and for graciously extending the consultation period. ...Please note our comments in this letter, which are in addition to the arguments set out in the attached letter from Savills. The latter was submitted on our behalf in response to the Pre-Submission Draft of the Durham City Neighbourhood Plan (NP) last year, but I understand that it was not yet officially admitted to consultation. Please do admit it now - the letter sets out comments on Policy G2 of the proposed plan. We would welcome acknowledgement of receipt of this letter. If you have any queries regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact me. In the meantime, we respectfully request that the</p>	c2.	<p>Covering text in response All the Cathedral's letters accepted as their response to this consultation Substantive issues addressed under the individual Themes</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>comments above as well as in the attached letter are taken fully into consideration as the Neighbourhood Plan progresses to its next stage. {Receipt acknowledged}</p>		
<p>L8b Thank you for consulting Historic England on the above Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which, as set out on p3 of the report, has been completed in lieu of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). As the public body that advises on England’s historic environment, we are pleased to offer our comments.</p> <p>We broadly welcome the process set out in the SA report, which has moved forwards considerably and favourably since our engagement with the SEA screening and scoping stages from 2017. However, we have the following comments to make, referring to our guidance in <i>Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment</i> (Historic England Advice Note 8, December 2016):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As well as the Co Durham Plan, para 2.3 of our guidance identifies other plans, programmes and policies which will be relevant to the context of this SA, including acts of parliament and international treaties. • The third bullet under Landscape and Historic Environment on page 13 does not identify archaeology (either scheduled monuments or non-designated remains) in the range of heritage assets set out. It should also note that registered parks and gardens and registered battlefields are designated heritage assets (ie. national statutory designations) and not just identified locally. It should also set out that the significance of any heritage asset can be generated by its setting, a very important issue for this neighbourhood plan. These concerns are also seen in para 5.29. • Whilst the assessment should follow a proportionate approach, more could be done to set out evidence for the current and future likely condition of the historic environment in terms of its significance, sensitivity and capacity to accommodate change. Our guidance says that simply identifying heritage assets is unlikely to produce the most 	<p>c5.</p>	<p>Changes to Sustainability Appraisal Report Addressed by AECOM in updating of SA report</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>helpful baseline analysis. I accept that the appendix provides some of the evidence in use for the neighbourhood plan project, but clearer reference to the evidence would strengthen the assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the assessment framework, including a question in the Landscape and Historic Environment theme around keeping historic buildings in use would recognise the issue of growing vacancy in the city centre. Seeking a reduction in the impact of traffic on the historic environment could have been identified under the Transport theme. We broadly welcome the approach taken to assessing housing allocations, although we have not seen the <i>Site Assessment Report Addendum</i> (2018) referred to. We are satisfied that the most harmful options have been discounted for reasons relevant to the historic environment. We have previously expressed concern about potential allocations at Lovegreen (Site E) due to their impact on Crook Hall and other nearby listed buildings, as well as on the Durham City Conservation Area and World Heritage Site. <p>The report does not address indicators and monitoring of the plan's effects. Paras 2.13-2.16 of our guidance set out how historic environment indicators should be included to enable monitoring.</p> <p>We agree with the report's recommendations on mitigation or optimisation as far as they affect our area of interest. The key issue now will be for the plan's wording to be refined to ensure the policies achieve the desired objectives.</p>		
<p>L8a Historic England {parts copied to Themes 1,2a,2b,3,4, Comments} Thank you for consulting Historic England on the second pre-submission draft of the above neighbourhood plan. As the public body that advises on England's historic environment, we are pleased to offer our comments. ...Historic England is keen to ensure protection of the historic environment is appropriately taken into account in neighbourhood plans. Having reviewed the information provided in the 2019</p>	<p>c2. c3,c5.</p>	<p>Covering text in response Substantive issues addressed under the individual Themes</p> <p>Reference to Historic England guidance Previous Historic England guidance has been used Use this new Historic England guidance (which we've just been</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>consultation, I am happy to offer detailed advice on the plan at this stage. We have previously commented on the plan in letters of 16 January 2017 and 18 December 2017, and several meetings including most recently on 15 May 2018. Since then, Historic England has updated and strengthened its advice on neighbourhood plans, including publishing an advice note. Although you are a long way through the process of preparing the plan, it is still appropriate for me to refer to this new national advice as it is relevant to the Regulation 14 stage. I therefore set out below general advice followed by some detailed comments on the draft plan.</p> <p>General advice</p> <p>We now publish a full advice note on <i>Neighbourhood Planning & the Historic Environment</i> (HE Advice Note 11) which can be downloaded here: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/neighbourhood-planning-and-the-historic-environment/. It should be the first port of call for advice on heritage in neighbourhood plans. Written specifically for those preparing plans, it explains why you should consider the historic environment, and sets out how to gather and use evidence on heritage to help prepare your plan. It also signposts a number of other resources, including how to explore what the community values in your area's heritage. We also have a wealth of neighbourhood planning advice and case studies on our website, here: http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/.</p> <p>...The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) says neighbourhood plans have the power to develop a shared vision for their area, to shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development (NPPF para 29). Specifically, this can include detailed policies on conserving and enhancing the historic environment and on design (NPPF para 28). The national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) is clear that, where relevant, neighbourhood plans should include enough information about heritage to guide planning decisions and to put strategic heritage policies into action at a neighbourhood scale.</p>		<p>notified of) as applicable in making changes</p>

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>...It is therefore important that your plan identifies heritage assets in the area, and includes a positive strategy to safeguard those elements that contribute to their significance. This will ensure they can be appropriately conserved and enjoyed now and in the future. This is particularly important due to the high number and high significance of heritage assets in your plan area. For example, policies might address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considering how the plan's objectives can be achieved by maximising the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits flowing from heritage, eg. regeneration, tourism, learning, leisure, wellbeing and enjoyment. Locating new development to protect heritage assets and their settings. Giving detail on the expected scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development. Offering solutions to heritage assets that are at risk from their condition or vacancy, or are vulnerable to becoming so during the life of the plan, including those on the national and any local Heritage At Risk registers. Considering how heritage assets can be enhanced. <p>As well as designated heritage assets (such as listed buildings, scheduled monuments, conservation areas, and registered parks and gardens), your plan is also an important opportunity to include a positive strategy for local heritage assets. Such 'non-designated heritage assets' may include buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes that are important to the local community for their heritage value. If identifying these, your plan should include enough information to set out the elements that make them special so they, too, can be appropriately conserved and enjoyed. More information is given in our advice note.</p> <p>The strategy and policies in your plan should be based on proportionate, robust evidence. For heritage, this might include a characterisation study, historic area assessment or archaeological appraisal, a summary historical narrative, or identifying locally</p>		

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>significant buildings, areas and other assets. Rather than just the presence or absence of heritage assets, evidence should focus on what makes them significant and, where relevant, vulnerable. This helps you to identify the issues and options for your policies to address. More information is given in our advice note.</p> <p>....To help in preparing the plan, your local authority has offered you support, including suitable mapping and providing evidence on heritage assets (eg. from the local Historic Environment Record). You have taken advantage of funding provided by Locality to enable you to hire suitable historic environment expertise, for example to help prepare evidence, develop policy and produce the plan. More information is given in our advice note.</p> <p>...Neighbourhood plans also give you the opportunity to tackle other issues important to the heritage, more on which can be found in our advice note. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You can make allocations for new development such as housing or commercial uses; these can include small and medium-sized housing sites (NPPF para 69). You can designate Local Green Space important to the community, for example because of its historical significance (NPPF paras 99-101). You can include design policies to identify the special qualities of the area (or sub-areas) and explain how this should be reflected in development (NPPF paras 125, 127). You can identify future actions or aspirations, including those on topics beyond land use and development, setting them out separately in an annex to the plan (PPG para 41-004-20170728). <p>Communities with a neighbourhood plan in force can claim 25% of funds raised through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in their area. You plan can set out how CIL can be used to fund conservation of relevant heritage assets (eg. transport infrastructure such as historic bridges, or green and social infrastructure such as historic parks and gardens).</p> <p>Other Historic England advice that may also be of use includes:</p>		

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p><i>HE Advice Note 2 - Making Changes to Heritage Assets:</i> https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/making-changes-heritage-assets-advice-note-2/</p> <p><i>HE Good Practice Advice in Planning 3 - The Setting of Heritage Assets:</i> https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/gpa3-setting-of-heritage-assets/</p> <p><i>HE Advice Note 3 - Site Allocations in Local Plans (which also applies to neighbourhood plans):</i> https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans</p> <p><i>HE Advice Note 7 - Local Heritage Listing:</i> https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note-7</p> <p>You can familiarise yourself with the terminology of historic environment planning (such as “historic environment”, “conservation”, “significance”, “heritage asset”, and “setting”) by referring to the glossary in the NPPF. Where relevant, we recommend accurately copying these and other terms across to your plan’s own glossary. You can also familiarise yourself with basic legislative and policy protections that heritage assets in England enjoy by browsing our online Heritage Protection Guide at https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/hpg/.</p> <p>Detailed comments</p> <p>The following comments relate mainly to heritage policies on which we have previously commented, but also to some other issues. {see individual Themes}</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Overall, the main concern now should be to refine the wording of the plan’s policies to ensure the objectives can be met as intended. I am writing a separate letter about the sustainability appraisal which accompanies the draft plan, but I am broadly satisfied that it is helping to influence the plan and, despite some concerns, broadly concludes with my advice above. {See L8b above}</p>		

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
<p>L6a Durham University {parts copied to all Themes, Comments} Page 5 - Paragraph 2.7 and 2.8 The University considers these paragraphs to be unnecessarily pejorative.</p>	c5.	Objection to wording Consider the wording
<p>L6a /cont (i) Page 5 - Paragraph 2.7 and 2.8 Over the same period most towns and cities have had a similar evolution due to the changing residential, retail & leisure preferences of the local populace. These paragraphs suggest that the changes faced by Durham City are purely as a result of the growth of Durham University which is an overly negative interpretation and without substantive evidence.</p>	c5.	Objection to wording Consider the wording
<p>L6a /cont (ii) Page 5 - Paragraph 2.7 and 2.8 The University considers that its growth has actually insulated Durham City from the worst of deprivations suffered by much larger towns and cities in the North East such that the city continues to be an attractive place to live, work, study and invest.</p>	c5.	Change to wording Consider the wording
<p>L6a /cont (iii) Page 5 - Paragraph 2.7 and 2.8 Therefore, we request that these paragraphs be rewritten in a more positive/neutral tone similar to and in line with wording included in the Local Plan Pre-Submission Draft to outline the positive impacts that the growth of the University has had; including attracting new businesses, creating jobs, increasing entrepreneurship, increasing diversity in science and high-tech industries and the role it has played in developing the tourism offer.</p>	c5.	Wording changes Consider the wording
<p>L6c Durham University Response dated 12/12/2017</p>	c3 c5	Response already dealt with This was considered and responded to, as reflected in the Plan presented

COMMENTS TO PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION DRAFT	CATEGORISATION	PLANNING ISSUE OR ACTION IDENTIFIED
		for consultation in 2019. See documents on the website for details: http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/your-views/2017consultation/analysis/
<p>L19 Natural England Planning consultation: Durham City Neighbourhood Plan - SEA/SA carried out by AECOM Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 03 July 2019 which was received by Natural England on the same date. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Durham City Neighbourhood Plan SEA/SA. Natural England have assessed the above section of the submitted document by AECOM and concur with the conclusions of this document. Natural England have no further comment to make. We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	c2	Endorsement of SA noted