Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum Working Group 1 May 2018, Miners' Hall

1. Welcome and apologies

Present: John Ashby, Sue Childs, Roger Cornwell (Chair), Ann Evans, Peter Jackson, John Lowe, David Miller, John Pacey, Matthew Phillips, Angela Tracy, Ros Ward.

Apology: Pippa Bell.

2. Notes of 24 April 2018

The notes of 24 April were agreed and **Sue** will post them on the website.

Matters arising:

- Sue and Roger are checking our criteria for green and urban open spaces.
- Sue and John L have started work on the SA template.
- Roger has checked DCC's brownfield register and there are no designations in our area as they are all too small. **Roger** will provide the weblink to the register.
- Sue has made the application for technical support for assessing additional housing sites.
- Roger will send our objection to the Peter Smith appeal and Sue will post it on the website.

3. AECOM Response and Next Steps in our Future Work Programme

- Ros reported that the consultant has not yet confirmed the project plan and no deadlines have been set. **Ros** will seek clarification of his evidence requirements. We need to make clear to him that we are currently revising a draft plan that has already been through a Regulation 14 public consultation. Carole Dillon has told Roger that DCC will decide on the extent of any further consultation in the light of our revisions. **Ros** will ensure that the consultant knows this
- A timetable for the initial revision of themes was **agreed**:

Theme 2 to be confirmed but probably in May

Theme 3 on 29 May

Theme 4 on 12 June

Theme 5 on 19 June

Theme 6 on 3 July

• It is expected that the DCC Cabinet will consider *Preferred Options* on 13 June so the papers should be available from 5 June and we should consider them at our meeting on 12 June. The evidence base might not be available until after the Cabinet meeting.

4. Report on Northern Heartlands Event

Angela gave a very full report of the event and will distribute it to the working group. She had found it a very inspiring day and the theme was how the arts can support public engagement in planning. Peter had also found it a very motivating and entertaining day. The Parish Council is the body to take forward the implementation ideas. David noted that the new tourism policies will deal

with attractions and accommodation in Our Neighbourhood.

5. DU Exhibition on Proposals for Mountjoy and associated infrastructure

Many members of the group had attended. The following points were made:

- The route from Mount Oswald to the New Inn needs to separate cyclists from pedestrians. It also needs to be accessible to those with mobility difficulties; it is very steep.
- The proposed Maths building is uninspiring and does not seem to promote energy efficiency.
- The impact of the proposed car park provision is excessive.
- The incremental effects of the university's expansion are hidden by their piecemeal approach to revealing their plans.

John L will forward to the working group John P's comments. **All** are then asked to send to **Sue** any further comments and she will submit our feedback to DU and DCC.

It was noted that the Church Street proposals put students' needs before all other users. The DU plans will have an impact on other routes such as Margery Lane and Quarry Heads Lane. **Ann** will draft a response on these proposals.

6. Revision of Theme 1 Sustainability

David and John L presented the revised draft of Theme 1 Sustainability.

a) Initial discussion centred on the methodology to be used to present revised versions and to record the changes and the reasons for them. It was **agreed** that the colour to be used for old text to be deleted should be red and that for new text should be green. This would be the text colour, not highlighting, to aid legibility.

It was further **agreed** that changes made in response to comments from the public consultation must be referenced with the code(s) of the comment(s). We need to keep handwritten notes on the categorisation tables to record our reasons for suggesting changes. In some cases there might be conflicting comments and then it would be necessary to offer alternative changes.

The purpose of this stage of the process (i.e. revising the themes in the light of comments) was to prepare options (i.e. the original draft plus the revised draft, including possible alternatives) that would be evaluated through the SA process.

In addition to changes suggested in response to comments, it was acknowledged that there would be editorial changes made off our own bat to improve the consistency and clarity of the text.

b) As far as the theme itself was concerned, the key change was that it was proposed to combine the original S1 and S2 into a single policy, the new S1. It was clarified that S1 provides generic criteria for all developments throughout the plan; other policies might need to include specific criteria in their particular context (e.g. Arts, housing). As we go through this process of revision of the themes there is potential for cross-fertilisation and improvement of the themes.

It was **agreed** that the revised Theme 1 was suitable to go forward to the next stage of the process.

7. Notes of Meeting with DU

John L reported that Matthew Wright had now agreed that the notes of the meeting with DU held on 27 March were OK and **Sue** will post the on the website.

8. Contact with Dean and Chapter

Roger and John L had been introduced to Maya Polenz, the person responsible for the D & C's land holdings, at the DU exhibition. She had been aware of the Neighbourhood Plan as a resident but not in her official capacity. It transpired that the Dean had received Ros' letter and arranged for a reply but not through Maya. She will arrange a meeting with the working group.

9. Any other business

- Sue will contact Bearpark Parish Council about the Neville's Cross battlefield site.
- **John A** will attend the Neighbourhood Planning event in Belmont Community Centre on 8 May and raise the issue of the small area there that is not in any parish.

10. Date of Next Meeting

Thursday 8 May following the 9.00 am Forum meeting at the Miners' Hall