

Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum Working Group 10 April 2018, Miners' Hall

1. Welcome and apologies

Present: John Ashby, Pippa Bell, Roger Cornwell (Chair), Alan Doig, Ann Evans, Peter Jackson, John Lowe, David Miller, John Pacey, Matthew Phillips, Ros Ward.

Apologies: Sue Childs, Angela Tracy.

2. Notes of 3 April 2018

The notes of 3 April were agreed and **Sue** will post them on the website.

As a matter arising we discussed the **technical support for the Sustainability Appraisal (SA)**. John A reported that he and Ros had had a conference call with the AECOM consultant and John has sent him the documents that we submitted for our draft SA. We might need a separate contract for the assessment of the additional housing sites proposed during the public consultation.

It is possible that we would be required to do a further formal consultation on both the revised plan and the associated SA. Alternatively, we might only have to consult the statutory consultees. The consultant will advise on this. We have no definite start date for his support and any consultation might be as late as September. By then we shall need to take account of DCC's *Preferred Options* document.

Changes to our documents will not only need tracking carefully in accordance with the protocol prepared by Sue, but also justified through the SA process. We need to focus on substantive changes and not just technical textual alterations.

3. Categorisation of Theme 6 Community – for review and endorsement

Roger had prepared the categorisation and thanked Sue for her assistance. She had incorporated Matthew's comments.

Policy C1 requires community facilities to be **accessible**. Roger indicated the need to clarify what we mean by "accessibility". It can mean being able to get to an entrance, but it can also mean being able to move around within a building – this should be covered by building regulations for new buildings but it will not be possible to ensure full accessibility in all old buildings.

Pippa pointed out that "accessibility" can refer to the ease with which information and ideas can be understood, but it was generally thought that in the plan we were focussing on physical accessibility. This included being able to reach a site on foot, cycling or by public transport as well as provision for people with mobility difficulties. We need to check the Durham City Saved Policies and ensure that our plan takes full account of accessibility issues.

In the supporting text there is a reference to the **DLI**. Matthew asked whether we had responded sufficiently to the comments from the Faithful Durhams. A meeting is planned with them at which we shall also discuss DCC's proposals for Mount Oswald House. That meeting will be attended by **Roger, Peter and John L**.

Roger explained that the **Information Hub (Policy C2)** is not the same as a tourist information centre but it is intended to serve residents as well as visitors. The policy would enable the parish council, for example, to provide this service. We should probably drop the idea of branding it as “Love Durham” as DCC is so committed to its own branding.

There is an implementation project (No.4) related to this policy. This gave rise to the comment that we need to review our **categorisation of projects**. Currently the implementation projects related to policies are in Section 5.2 while the aspirational projects to improve the economic, social and environmental realm are listed in Appendix A. They are related to themes rather than policies.

Policy C6 is about **Health Care and Social Care Facilities**. We have not had a response from the medical authorities about this matter. **Ros** will pursue this.

David suggested that we need to consider the **fairness** of the plan as a whole. Perhaps something could be included in the overall vision that covered all policies. This needs further consideration.

The categorisation was endorsed and the issues for further consideration will be discussed with DCC officers on Monday 16 April at 9.30 in the Miners’ Hall.

4. Future Work Programme

Ros explained that this could not be established in detail until more feedback was received from the AECOM consultant.

It was decided not to hold the usual Forum and working group meetings at 9.00 am on Tuesday 17 April in view of the number of other meetings that week. See item 8 below.

It was agreed that someone would take notes at sub-group meetings (e.g. with BID) if John L was not there.

One of the things we need to include in our work programme is a **gap analysis**. DCC had suggested that we should look at the work done in the Great Aycliffe Plan. To some extent we have already done this in our Context sections and in the Scoping Report. **John A** offered to prepare a template for this work.

5. Neighbourhood Plan Event in Darlington

John A explained that CPRE intended to arrange an event on a Saturday morning (10.30 – 12.30) in Darlington town centre for groups working on neighbourhood plans to share their experiences. Suggested dates are 12 May or 16 or 30 June. **John A** will reply that we would be able to be represented on any of those dates.

6. Peter Smith Appeal

John L explained that Mr Smith was appealing against DCC’s refusal to grant planning permission to demolish the bungalow where he lives in Sidegate and build 8 town houses on the land extending towards the DCC car park. The site is in the Green Belt. Given the plan’s intention to protect and indeed enhance the GB, it was **agreed** that we should object to the appeal. **John L** will draft a letter for Roger. The site is not the same as the Lovegreen site that Mr Smith has proposed as an additional housing site in his response to the draft plan.

7. Any other business

- **Neville's Cross Battlefield Site**

Last week it was suggested that part of the site outside our boundary came within the scope of the Witton Gilbert Neighbourhood Plan. Further investigation shows that it is within the Bearpark parish area and they are just starting to develop a neighbourhood plan. **Sue** was asked to write to Bearpark rather than Witton Gilbert about this matter.

- **Notes of University Meeting held on 27 March**

John L checked that his draft notes of the meeting were agreed and could be sent to the University for their agreement. This was **agreed** and **John L** will send them to Matthew Wright.

Peter commented that sub-groups should not agree to significant changes when taking part in such meetings. It was **agreed** that this was the responsibility of the full working group, always subject to the ratification of the full Forum.

8. Dates of Next Meetings

Monday 16 April: Working group meeting at 9.00 am; followed at 9.30 by Community workshop with DCC Officers. This will be held in the Miners' Hall.

Tuesday 17 April at 1.30 in the BID offices: meeting to discuss primary and secondary shop frontages with **Adam, John A, Peter** and **Pippa** to attend; other working group members welcome. **Carole** or other DCC representative also invited.

Thursday 19 April at 6.00 pm: Monthly Forum "Warp-up" meeting. This will be held in the Miners' Hall.