

Durham City Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Draft 2019

Some observations from [redacted]

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.

2nd Contents page: Appendix B title should have comma after “assets”.

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.

2.2: It would help to give the date of the Localism Act. 2011?

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.

2.24: This twice has “the DCN Plan Forum” rather than “Planning”.

2.26: Refers to accompanying reports but the Sustainability Report is not fully referenced and the Basic Conditions Report (Statement) is not yet completed.

4.4: The last line should have “Plan” rather than “Planning”.

4.26: “site” should be “Site”.

4.28: “conservation areas” should also start with capitals.

4.32: Insert comma between “environment” and “provides”

4.39: Insert closing bracket after “landowners”.

4.43: Omit commas after the first “City” and after “setting”.

H2 on p.38: Sub-para n) is the same as k).

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.

4.55 at the top of p.44: “properties” needs the apostrophe.

4.67: This is very cryptic. It is dealt with fully in 4.95 and perhaps there could be a cross-reference.

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.

G1 on p.54: In the top section, omit “in” after “within”.

4.86: This point is already made twice within the text of G1.

- 4.87: This point has already been made in 4.70.
- 4.91: In the last line it should be “value” rather than “values”.
- G2 on p.57: Need to identify it as Proposals Map 2 (as in 4.95).
- 4.95, G2.1 on p.59: Insert “the” in “It provides iconic views to the WHS”.
- 4.95, G2.2 on p.59: Insert “of” in “It provides important views towards and of the WHS...”
- 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”.
- 4.95, G2.2 on p.60: Insert “St” before “Aidan’s”.
- 4.95, G2.3 on p.60: Should something follow “...are an integral part”? Of....?
- 4.95, G2.7 on p.61: It should be “Neville’s” with the apostrophe.
- 4.96: I think it would help to name the neighbouring parish or parishes. Is it just Bearpark?
- 4.102 in sub-para 3: Should be “animal” rather than “animals”.
- 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.
- 4.110: It should be “Neville’s” with the apostrophe.
- 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?
- 4.116 last sentence: Four private schools are listed on p.172.
- 4.118 first line: Replace “is” with “are”.
- 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?
- 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.
- 4.140 on p.83: I’m surprised to see the statement “...the evidence indicates that there is an ample supply of student accommodation in Our N”. This is not in accord with the evidence presented in Appendix C, paras C16 – C21.
- E3 on p.85: In the first line we need to state that the number of the Proposals Map is 6.
- 4.145: The statement that “support will be given to any development that contributes to the evening economy” is a real hostage to fortune. Lap dancing anyone?
- E5 sub-para c) on pp.90-91: This does not follow from the stem.
- 4.153 on p.92: Omit a “the” from the first line.

4.162 on p.95: The sums don't add up to 6,586. I get 12,580. If this is correct than the student percentage is about 17%.

4.163: I don't think the last line should mention "Colleges". Proposals Map 8 shows just six PBSAs. But should some of them be labelled as colleges?

4.164: The second reference to Appendix C should give para numbers.

4.165: I don't understand why DCC's housing figure is "automatically sufficient".

p.96: I don't understand why the map of the Durham City Local Plan Monitoring Area suddenly appears here. The NP doesn't deal with Monitoring until p.143. 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.

4.175: Towards the end of the main para, it should be "three" rather than "four" possible allocations.

4.175, D1.2: Is it 2 or 5? Their original panning permission was for 5. There are no rights of way, trees or surrounding woodland associated with this site. There is an issue about access across the land now owned by Hanro, the company developing the new offices at the back of Diamond Terrace, but there are no rights of way as such.

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".

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.

4.182: The final sentence is vague and I understand why, but the policy text itself needs to address explicitly the issues that arise if most of the C3 houses in a street have already been converted to HMOs.

4.183: Can we be more explicit about the additional area that needs covering by an Article 4 Direction? Framwellgate and Newton Hall are outside Our N and reference to them could be confusing. And the issue of Letting Boards is not relevant to this policy.

4.205 on p.114: Towards the end of the first para is should be "Ipsos" not "Ipso".

4.208: In the middle it should say "...uses 12 questions..." Plural.

4.216: It should say "paras" Plural.

Page 125, Policy T1, para a): Delete one of the "be"s in "...garages may be instead be provided..."

4.257: First line should be "are" rather than "is".

4.258: Is something missing after the final "Durham"?

4.265: "Miners' Halls" and "Miners' Association" need apostrophes.

4.269: Why say the evidence is “anecdotal”? It is a fact.

Policy C3 on p.139: The second requirement (to demonstrate that an equivalent alternative facility is available nearby to satisfy the needs of the local community) is going to be redundant if the reason for closure was as stated in sub-para b), namely that there is no significant demand for the facility within that locality.

5.1: In the middle it should be “The identification” rather than “The Identification”.

A6 on p.146: In the penultimate line it should be “Neville’s” with the apostrophe.

A7 on p.146: In the penultimate line delete “which”.

C21 on p.160: I find the pairs of numbers given totally confusing

- line 4: “1,600 or so some 1,430”
- penultimate line: “about 640 530”
- last line: “about 1,400 1,000 people”.

C28 on p.163: The claim that perhaps 500 houses could revert from student to family use seems to be contradicted by the argument put forward in C21 (confusing figures notwithstanding).

D3 on p.174: In the middle delete the second bracket after “Commute”.

D9 on p.178, last line: I understand that there is now a ticket scheme for Tyne and Wear that provides interoperability.

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!

Reference on p.192: In the middle, the NPPF should be “2012”, not “202”.