

**Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum
Working Group Meeting, 22 August 2017, Miners' Hall**

1. Welcome and apologies

Present: John Ashby, Sue Childs, Roger Cornwell (Chair), Peter Jackson, John Lowe, Ros Ward.

Apologies: Pippa Bell, Ann Evans, David Miller, Matthew Phillips.

Roger reported that Matthew's wife is ill in hospital.

2. Notes of 25 July

- The notes were agreed and **Sue** will post them on the website.
- John A reported that the draft plan has been sent to Mike Allum for distribution to DCC officers. **John L** was asked to write to Carole Dillon to ask about feedback from them. (Post-meeting note: Carole has replied that officers are studying the plan. John has asked her for feedback as soon as possible, preferably before 5 September.)

3. Review of the amended Scoping Report

John A is incorporating the suggested amendments. **Sue** will prepare it for publication on the website.

4. Review of the Sustainability Appraisal

Discussion of this item included discussion of Item 8 on the agenda: Assessing our policies against the sustainability framework – what is the best approach to take?

Ros is preparing the Executive Summary. John A has prepared a structure for reporting the various policy appraisals. Sue explained the approach she has adopted (see her email of 21 August). Not all options will be applicable to all policies and those should be scored as neutral. The purpose of the exercise is to fine-tune the policies.

Ros will contact Malcolm Reed about the Transport policies. **Peter** will ask Adam if he is able to assist Pippa with the Economy policies and Peter will also assist. (Post-meeting note: Peter has reported that Adam is willing to help with this, though unable to attend meetings.)

NB. This task needs completing for 5 September

5. Review of the Draft Plan

Sue emphasised the need to freeze the text as soon as possible to give her time to prepare it for web publication. Minor changes to policies could still be incorporated, but the main text will need to be frozen on 5 September.

It was **agreed** to adopt John L's suggestion that all the vision statements should have the same introductory words referring to Durham City. **Sue** will amend them accordingly. (Post-meeting note: Sue has done this and the revised text is attached with these notes.)

It was also **agreed** that we need to check that all objectives are matched by policies and/or projects. **All** should do this when assessing the policies against the sustainability framework.

Sue will add text about monitoring the plan. It was noted that DCC's biannual updating of the *Durham City Masterplan* would provide useful information for monitoring.

6. Revised Screening Report

Ros reported that she has added comments from the statutory bodies as an appendix.

7. Statement of Public Engagement

Ros is preparing this for the inspector. She will complete it after the public consultation. It was suggested that she should study the successful Great Aycliffe model.

8. Assessing our Policies against the Sustainability Framework

This was discussed with Item 4 above.

9. Project Plan Update

It was **agreed** to bring forward the deadline for booking venues. This will be discussed at our next meeting.

10. Forum Meeting to launch the Public Consultation

It was **agreed** to launch the public consultation at a meeting of the full Forum on Friday 3 November at 6.00 pm in the Lantern Room of the Town Hall. **John L** will write to Stuart Timmiss to ask if DCC can support us by allowing us to use the room free of charge as we don't have the funds to hire it. An alternative affordable venue would be the North Road Methodist Church. **John L** will invite the MP to attend and also alert Forum members to this event and to the need for their help in publicising the consultation. (Post-meeting note: I have written to Stuart and Roberta. I'll write to Forum members when the venue is confirmed.)

11. NPF objection to the St Mary's Field development proposals

Our main objection is to the congestion caused by by large numbers of students entering / leaving the site at set times. The consultants' response to our objection simply refers to industry standards that they have applied. These are inappropriate for the particular circumstances. **Roger** will ask the eminent traffic consultant Malcolm Reed to draft a response on our behalf.

12. Redevelopment of the St Margaret's Student Flats

The developers' consultation was extremely limited. The development would contravene our proposed PBSA policy. We should also seek to restrict serious building activity in built-up areas. We shall make our views known when the planning application is submitted.

13. Date of next meeting

Tuesday 5 September, 9.00 – 12.00 in the Miners' Hall.