

**Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum Working Group
31 July 2018, Miners' Hall**

1. Welcome and apologies

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

Apologies: Pippa Bell, John Lowe, David Miller, Matthew Phillips.

2. Notes of 17 July and 24 July 2018

The notes were agreed and **Sue** will post them on the website. As matters arising:

- (a) Item 3 of 17 July: Roger confirmed that he had spoken with the University's new Community Liaison Officer Hannah Shepherd following the correspondence with John A.
- (b) Item 6.2 of 24 July: Roger reported on a meeting called by the MP with the Milburngate House developers and local residents' groups regarding a re-design of the proposed Premier Inn. Further revised proposals will emerge. He noted that the developers indicated that the number of residential units will be less than the 441 approved in the outline application.
- (c) Roger noted that he had submitted the Forum's response to Preferred Options and had circulated a pdf for everyone to check. A question arose about an apparent typing error in the response re Policy 17; subsequently verified that the correct version had been submitted.

3. Consideration of draft responses to (a) Durham City Sustainable Transport Delivery Plan, and (b) Parking and Accessibility Guidelines

(a) **Durham City Sustainable Transport Delivery Plan:** after discussion of a draft response previously circulated and the comments already made, it was **agreed** to welcome the draft Plan and to offer, without prejudice, a short neutral response that urges the implementation of the proposals wherever possible without waiting for the proposed Northern Relief Road, and also refers to a possible view from the Parish Council (Action **John A and Roger**). Personal submissions using parts of the circulated draft response may be made.

(b) **Parking and Accessibility Guidelines:** it was **agreed** to not make a submission on behalf of the Forum. Again, personal submissions using parts of the circulated draft response may be made.

4. Re-writes of Themes

- Theme 1: Carole had responded to John L; **Ros** to request a copy from Carole.
- Theme 2a: Ros and Ann have sent to Carole, **Ros** will nudge her. There may be things from the Theme 1 further re-write that will need to be taken on board in other Themes (**action all**).
- Theme 2b: **Sue** is completing work on the data-base. The re-write had been sent to Carole but mislaid so has been sent again.
- Theme 3: Pippa is completing the re-write with more regarding hot food takeaways and the Stockton report.
- Theme 4: Sue and John A have sent to Carole.
- Theme 5: **John A** to write to Matthew for latest draft, copying in John L as he is aware of the agreements reached at a meeting with Carole that need to be reflected in the re-write.
- Theme 6: Sue and Angela have done C1 and C2 and will send to **Roger** to include in his sections.

Ros in her email Carole regarding Themes 1 and 2a will advise her to send her comment to the npf working group email address.

5. Re-write of Chapter 5

Sue's note (copied below) provides the basis for work on Chapter 5 about the Creative City, the Community Hub and new Chapter 6 on monitoring and revised Appendix re projects.

Chapter 5: A whole city approach

A 'blue sky' chapter comprising:

- (1) Whole City approach, currently with a focus on arts and culture, with the long term aim of being able to apply to be a UNESCO creative city.
- (2) The Community Hub as the key way in which we can start to achieve this. A bringing together of people and organisations to talk, exchange ideas, kick start projects. This needs a place for people to meet: initially in existing venues, in the future a new or repurposed building for the hub.
- (3) Projects that could spin out of the Community Hub, which initially could be (i) arts facilities, (ii) the information hub, (ii) the Emerald Network. Such projects, starting from the bottom up, could end up with more formal structures and the obtaining of funding and premises. The existing policy implementation projects 1, 3 and 4 (but without that title) could be talked about here to give examples of how such projects could develop.

However, the Community Hub would always remain as the central entity engaging people in our community and continuing to spin out new projects and initiatives.

Chapter 6 Monitoring

A 'bread and butter' chapter containing section 5.3 from the old Chapter 5 (with a little rewriting as required).

Appendix A

A 'bread and butter' collection of projects that are about the non-planning, management of the City that respondents want to be better done. Needs little rewording. The Policy implementation project 2 on converting HMOs into general housing should be moved here. These existing projects are also being reworded, plus new ones added, by each theme looking at the pre-submission consultation responses.

All ideas and draft texts to be sent to John A (**action all**).

John P drew attention to the successful hub in Sunderland, driven forward by Paul Callaghan and John Mowbray.

6. Re-consideration of timetable re Neighbourhood Plan and County Local Plan

The circulated revised version of the timetable note was agreed although noting the inconsistency between deadlines for Carole to provide comments on Theme re-writes by end August and for the our subsequent revised re-writes also to be completed by end August. The timetable will be a standing item on Working Group agendas (**action John L**).

(Note: the meeting did not check whether, in order to retain evidence for aspects of the timetable, **Ros** has provided Sue with copies of emails from AECOM and from Carole regarding their time frames).

7. Any other business

- 7.1 Request from Newcastle student for help via his on-line questionnaire: agreed each to help if time.
- 7.2 The role and ownership of the Town Hall was discussed.

7. Date of Next Meeting

Tuesday 7 August, after the 9.00 am Forum meeting at the **Miners' Hall**.